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No-drama Obama, who has been accused of indifference to raging conflicts overseas and a litany of missteps by his administration, has focused heavily on ensuring the pubic sees him hard at work on containing the deadly disease.

[The] president … cleared his entire schedule last week so he could devote most of his time to Ebola, arguably the fastest-growing liability for Democrats in November even though the risk of an outbreak in the United States remains low.

He even canceled fundraisers to stay in Washington, something he declined to do after the Benghazi terrorist attack on Sept. 11, 2012, Russian troop movements in Ukraine, and a second shooting at the Fort Hood military base in Texas.

Obama spent days resisting the idea of an Ebola czar before abruptly appointing Ron Klain, former chief of staff to Vice Presidents Joe Biden and Al Gore, to the post.

His administration then announced that all travelers to the United States from the West African nations most affected by Ebola would be screened at one of five U.S. airports and subject to monitoring for three weeks.

Just days earlier, Obama expressed confidence that measures already in place would prevent a domestic Ebola outbreak.

Obama’s about-face on Ebola came after vulnerable Senate Democrats complained that the White House wasn’t doing enough to protect the homeland from a disease ravaging West Africa — not coincidentally, some Republicans would argue.

“With growing belief that Republicans are poised to take control of the Senate, it’s not surprising that the president is illustrating higher sensitivity to the Ebola crisis,” said GOP strategist Brian Donahue. “In light of the president’s recent gaffes responding to threats abroad, and with the increased public concern over Ebola, you must imagine the president’s situational awareness as it relates to the elections has increased.”

Obama’s Ebola response, in many ways, mirrors his handling of the threat posed by the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria. But his Ebola blueprint was devised much more quickly.

Motivating his shorter timeline for action, analysts suggest, is the visceral nature of the Ebola threat — the fear that the exotic disease could spread rapidly. Even though public health experts say there is little chance of a widespread Ebola outbreak in the United States, the public’s fear of the disease only continues to grow.

Obama is attempting to assuage those concerns and not appear as though he is marginalizing them. From the Oval Office on Oct. 16, Obama said he was cautiously optimistic that the Ebola situation was improving in the United States — an attempt to showcase improvements while not giving Republicans ammunition in the event that more Americans contract Ebola.

As for electoral consequences, however, some public opinion experts said it was too late for the president to change perceptions of his managerial skills.

“The cake is pretty well baked at this point,” said Republican pollster Whit Ayres. “It would take something out of the ordinary to have an effect on the electoral outcome.”

The White House seems confident that voters will not punish the president for his handling of the Ebola scare.

“It’s simple: You’re seeing action,” said a senior administration official. “The president is doing everything within his power to handle what obviously is of major concern to many Americans. I think voters would see through any attempt by Republicans to make it look like the president is sitting on the sidelines.”

<http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/obama-changes-the-crisis-playbook-for-ebola/article/2555242>. Washington Examiner.

Questions:

1. Is this editorial pro-Obama or anti-Obama?
2. Although politics is often criticized, it has been found effective in forcing government to formulate and initiate policies that are helpful to the public. The writer of this editorial hints that the only reason Obama decided to increase his efforts against ebola was in order to get votes for Democrats in the last election. The election went against the Democrats, and they lost control of the Senate. What does that say about the peoples’ belief that the president was doing all he should be doing about ebola?