

# A Model-for-Progress vs. Great Speeches

I offer a few conjectures:

The United States of America, or any nation that aspires to have a government that is "*for the people, by the people, and of the people*" needs **political decision transparency**.

Human minds are not able to make transparent decisions, nor, on average, are powerful people even inclined to try.

"Great Speeches" resemble no-brains-needed bedtime stories that are far removed from a coherent "Model-of-Progress".

Hence, entirely contradictory speeches can, and do, each sound great!

"Great Speeches" don't clarify what will be pushed off the table, or slid beneath.

We've experienced our fair share of "Great Speeches" which lacked great results.

The idea that: "inexperience is the best teacher" is an oxymoron.

Political decisions don't have to be nearly so heavily dependent on whom we elect as our leaders, & there is no wisdom in forcing such strong dependence.

We can evolve to judging "leadership excellence" as the contribution of enduring improvements to our national "Model-for-Progress".

Simulation could eventually provide political decision transparency.

Jeff Setterholm  
September 4, 2008