MORE ON "ObamaSCHTYLE"
– A LITTLE BIT OF THIS, AND A LITTLE BIT OF THAT

Stephen L. Bakke – September 7, 2010

I have previously presented my "take" on people and concepts that have shaped our President – Saul Alinsky for example, and Obama's views about concepts common to liberation theology. I have also stated that we are now learning what ObamaSCHTYLE really means. Here I carve out some more characteristics which, in my opinion, help define and explain our President.

Aloof and Impatient

It was said during the last presidential campaign that Obama was great at the "rally" part of campaigning, but had trouble "closing the deal." But what does that really mean? I believe that was an attempt to explain that candidate Obama could certainly proclaim things but was rather lacking at thoroughly explaining his opinions and policies in a truly persuasive way. That is what Jonah Goldberg meant when he suggested that Obama has lost his appetite for persuasion – if he ever had it – and that Obama confuses explanation with persuasion. Goldberg also describes this as aloofness and as reflecting the opinion that Obama knows best – and people should just listen to him. Obama is frustrated with the "great unwashed" (that's you and me) who just don't intuitively come to the same conclusions that he does. He truly believes that any clear thinking individual would certainly agree with him. He's had it too easy this far in his life – he was always getting his way. If he explains, we should therefore listen.

Obama can make great statements that listeners can agree with – like "do you want our country to have better health care and lower unemployment?" But then what? He resists giving details because he feels they can't be comprehended, and he considers it is a hassle to do so. He has indicated by his statements that anyone who merely questions, even short of disagreeing, is an obstructionist. He and his elite followers truly feel that the issues are too complex for much of the voting public to fully understand – so the public should just pay attention to their progressive explanations. As was stated on "Hardball" with Chris Matthews, listeners of (hard left) MSNBC are unique in their understanding of the issues because "we explain it to them." They think we are cognitively challenged.

And consider the recent statement by HHS Secretary Sebelius regarding the public's off base conclusions regarding the health care reform legislation: "We have a lot of reeducation to do." Never would she consider that, at least in certain things, the public's strong intuitive objection may have some merit. Those disagreeing are simply dismissed as being wrong. Valerie Jarrett suggests that a solution to mass disagreement with Obama's policies is "to find a very simple way of communicating …… (regarding certain concepts like cloture, reconciliation etc.) people don't know what that's talking about." **I object to such arrogance!**

Transportation Secretary Lahood, showing his utter comtempt for the ability of the public to make legitimate decisions, says he intends to "coerce people out of their cars …… about everything we do around here is government intrusion in people's lives …… I think we can change people's behavior."

Don't Distract the Prez With Those International and Security Issues

According to many observers, both liberal and conservative, Obama seems uncertain about his role of being firm and decisive in international issues and those related to security. His recent Oval Office address showed this very well. He tended to ignore what positives we had accomplished in Iraq, in favor of reminding us he was delivering on his campaign promises to oversee a withdrawal of military forces from Iraq. Setting certain policy assertions aside, similar disinterest seemed to emanate from his attitude about the Afghanistan conflict.

After quickly dispensing with the unsatisfying topics of Iraq and Afghanistan, he segued enthusiastically to selling his stimulus proposals. Charles Krauthammer put it very well I think: "Obama sees his wartime duties as a threat to his domestic agenda. These wars are a distraction, unwanted interference with his true vocation – transforming America."

And there has been little if any concern shown, other than through general, unspecific, diplomatic disapproval, of the evil empire of Iran's obvious power move to nuclear weapons. He seems willing to let it happen, all the while giving very empty verbal disapproval. He just wants to put that all behind him.

In like manner his recent "caving" in negotiations with Russia regarding nuclear arms limitation/proliferation leaves me with the impression that he wanted to just put that behind him – thereby resetting the international parameters of alliances.

In the opinion of many from all political philosophies, and I agree, he really is focused on/obsessed with completing a total transformation of the United States to his ideal utopian country. In other words he's in a hurry because his political "window of opportunity" may soon close – and remember from one of my previous articles, he expressed his belief that his personal salvation is at stake.

Why all this "putting it behind him?" There doesn't seem to be any enthusiastic, confident, comprehensive international strategy, certainly not in a leadership role, nor in the role of an international participant. **His international vision is limited, in my opinion, to becoming a better, more cooperative "citizen of the world." Forget, forever, American Exceptionalism.**

Politics as Usual

The "Post Partisan/Racial" President has disappointed immensely. As just one example of "politics as usual," it would be futile for anyone to argue that vicious, old fashioned "Chicago style" politics has not manifested itself in our President's strategies and statements thus far. He doesn't abide disagreement because he is such an ideologue. He can't imagine that his progressive political theories could ever be wrong. If they don't work, it is never a flawed policy; it is only because others are obstructing his progress. There is definitely an enemies list, of sorts:

- George W. Bush – responsible for all the problems which formerly existed, now existing, or those negative things which will develop in the future.
- Medical doctors – after all they are consistently reckless and charge too much.
- Wall Street "whatevers" – banks, insurers etc.
- Greedy Chrysler secured creditors who would, by their demands, harm union employees.
- Big oil and energy producers – evil and gittin' eviler – soon to be the "evilest" ever!
- The State of Arizona – don't defy us by attempting to enforce Federal laws – that's our (gulp) job – just ask the Prez of Mexico.
- Opponents of amnesty and those who want to first secure the borders.
- Anybody who opposes the new health care legislation.
- Anybody who is not a global warming alarmist.
- Small town Americans – "them who's not elites" – bitterly clinging to religion and guns.
- The rich – or anyone who has some loose change on hand.
- Fox News – way too fair and balanced.
- British Petroleum and anything to do with petroleum.
- Profits and bonuses – any compensation except that paid to public employees.
- Me and son Jason – can't keep our "traps" shut.
- U.S. Constitution – after all, while it's a good document Obama has stated that unfortunately it distinguishes itself by what it didn't deal with.

Demagoguery is alive and well in this "Post Partisan/Racial" world – and, it seems, "slash and burn" punishment is the only just response ever considered by the administration.

He Ignores Human Nature – Not on Purpose, but From Lack of Experience and Naiveté

Obama is beginning to find himself not knowing what to do to improve employment. He doesn't know how to deal with the unexpected chuckling at his public "apologies for America." He doesn't know how to become energy independent. He doesn't know how to reform our health care system to make it more efficient and cost effective. And it goes on and on. He constantly falls back on a mechanical, predictable, ideologically radical set of solutions. And still nothing good happens. But why, he asks? Consider and contemplate the following tendencies toward foolishly naïve predictions or expectations by Obama and his administration:

- Expecting the world to follow our lead if we disarm. Right – that'll work every time.
- If the enemies see us reaching out a hand of friendship, they will follow our lead and rush to the bargaining table – they will never see that as a sign of weakness.
- Expecting businesses of all sizes to seize on his TARP, stimulus, and health care legislation to increase hiring and expansion. They ignore the natural tendencies to "pull back" in the face of constant uncertainties present in the administration's shifting policies and contradicting rhetoric.
- Expecting individuals and businesses to act "according to his plan" (e.g. you can keep the same insurance you've always had) even though the coverage is inferior and costs much more. The administration is certainly not altruistic, so why should anyone else be?
- In evaluating and "scoring" any legislation, particularly for health care reform, they used assumptions which would give them the result they wanted, totally ignoring those of us on the sidelines crying: "That won't work! People won't react that way! That's wishful thinking." I think it's partly just naiveté, not just consciously misleading the public.
- If you direct Freddie and Frannie to create an aggressive "low doc" or "desktop" loan underwriting policy through their willingness to purchase aggressively underwritten loans, they can't imagine why you should expect a house of cards to develop?
- They have selective applications for incentives, obviously ignoring that incentives don't work selectively. Incentives and disincentives always work, not just when you want them to – e.g. tax breaks for certain taxpayers is a stimulus, while breaks for others isn't. Does it have anything to do with preferring a socialist ideal of equality over the true common good where "a rising tide lifts all ships?"

Obama is used to an audience who just want to follow and adore. This expectation continues and comes from his prior community organizing and professorial experience. **Why would the oppressed, the students, or the "great unwashed" public do anything but agree and adore? The problem is that he simply has no idea about human nature and how people, businesses, and nations react! His limited and inadequate background and experience, combined with his strong ideological tendencies, leave him handcuffed as a leader.**

MR. PRESIDENT, YOU CAN'T CONTINUE TO ASSUME AWAY REALITY!