Did President Obama fulfill his promises made in his inaugural speech?

Introduction

Obama speech was filled with magniloquence and soaring of a better site interwined with vague policy goals. Some of his goals such as the health care reform, and ending the war in Iraq have been implemented. But not all promises have been implemented. His promise to alter the political tone in Washington seems to fall on the way.

During his inaugural speech, Obama had promised to establish a new form of politics to Washington, which was also one of the first times he entailed during his 2009 inaugural address. The nation was divided between the partisan surrounding in Washington during the Bush administration. This had divided America over the Iraq war, surveillance programs and torture. When Obama came to power, Washington proved that there was too much partisan polarization for him to change. Also, critics claimed that Obama worsened it. Nevertheless, most of the key legislation that Obama supported passed along partisan lines. These incorporated the economic stimulus, financial and health reforms. Obama was also capable of avoiding the budget battle over expenditure, debt ceiling, and taxes. Fortunately, the nation risked shutdown thrice.

Obama first year as the president of America, comprised of a stable job loss as the nation lost more than3. 5 million jobs since February 2009. But since then about 4.8 million jobs have been established. His administration credits his policies, incorporating the stimulus, which was his first deeds upon coming to power for assisting ease the downward spiraling trajectory of the economy. However, the critics' point that the White House approximated that the level of unemployment would increase above 8% with stimulus legislation. Nevertheless, the level of unemployment was hovering around 10% whereby Obama was not capable to create extra legislation for the remainder of his first term.

Therefore, it is clear that though Obama campaigns and his inaugural speech promised to fundamentally change America to the best, not all promises were met by Obama during his first term in office. There is still racism in America, which instead of declining, it started increasing. It is as if the speech acted as bonfire toward racism. And instead of Obama following his promise to stop racism, he seeks the supports of the liberal, which he only gets a small portion. Thus, It is like Obama lead America into division between the liberals and the democrats. Therefore, Obama did not hold his promises and duty as the president of America.

*What similarities exist between the 1992 LA Riots and the Watts Riots in 1965?*

After the Watts riots of 1965, a group of social scientists embarked on an ambitious multi-disciplinary study effort on the rioting, whereby much of it was documented in a volume edited by Cohen (1970), who leading the group.

Considering the two riots, the regions of the rioting seem to be the same; the South Central Los Angeles. As a matter of fact, the root of the rioting in 1965 was “watts” a region around 103rd street and Central Avenue, whereas in 1992, its root was some distance to the northwest. However, in both cases, the rioting was centered in regions that had been predominantly black since the second world war.

Typically, during the 1965 riots, Americans in general, were in the midst of the great postwar economic surge. It was an era, which had finally and irrevocably integrated the European immigrant team of the late 19th century and early 20th century into mainstream Amercian society, many into the middle class. The blacks were the major disadvantaged group. In 1992, this was still true. More young black men were in jail than in college, unemployment was soaring. Also, most black children were being brought up in female-headed households.

*Why did America invade Panama? What would account for the differing opinions for the invasion?*

In 1989, America Invaded Panama to overthrow the dictator who had to Panama prisoner without the progress he warranted. This event altered the course of the Republic of Panama to a land of opportunities and investment, economic vision to reach the top in this now two decades later.

Because of America invading Panama, this drawn different opinions from the people. This is because Noriega was initially a strong America and was on the CIA payroll since the 1950s up to 1986. In 1983, when Noriega promoted himself to be the General, he took the United States off his trail of crime and proved once again to be a noteworthy ally as he permitted America to set up listening posts in Panama and helped the Pro-American forces through acting as a middle man between America money and weapons. Associations had turned very tense between Noriega and the American government due to various allegations whereby the most vital was being a spy on the United State and for Cuba under Fidel Castro. For over 30 ears, Noriega had been working as a double agent, gathering a paycheck from the American government and from Cuba, assisting in the sale of restricted American technology to Soviet nations and selling to Cuban guerrillas. By the late 1960s, his actions were becoming increasingly unacceptable to American legislation enforcement. The wife of a Marice was injured when a Panama Defense Forces fired a shot through her window, there were schools bused detained by Panama forces and murdered a United States Marine stationed in Panama City. This formed the last straw. As far as the American concerned, Noriega had declared war with America, and in December 1989, the American authorities put an order for his arrest.

Therefore, it is clear that what realistically account for the differing opinions for the invasion of Panama was because Noriega was an ally of America. Noriega felt immune to United States punishment or reprisal. Thus, it could have given him warning or stop him rather than invading Panama. It is for this reason that Noriega did not believe that Americans would use force to catch him.
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