

Shiver: Obama, Hillary, & Alinsky Tactics: Hoisting Your Opponent by His Own Petard; the Problem at Trinity Is Not Wright's Rants but His Theology

Shiver, "Obama, Hillary and Alinsky's Tactics":

Over the last week, Hillary has baited Obama on the race issue, but so far he hasn't let go of the high ground and provided her with the heated reaction she is seeking. Hillary is well aware of Alinsky wisdom on successful tactics:

"The enemy properly goaded and guided in his reaction will be your major strength." (*Rules for Radicals*; p. 136)

However, when a great many media outlets pounced on Obama's church connection to Louis Farrakhan, Hillary aptly concluded, perhaps, that she needed to do nothing more than wait for Obama's rule book to come into play against him.

Obama still has an awfully strict rule book up to which he must demonstrably live 24/7. Can he?

Obama's Inclusiveness Rule Book

Racial inclusiveness was a major chord in Obama's speech to the 2004 Democratic National Convention, and on that note, he proclaimed:

"There is not a black America and a white America and Latino America and Asian America - there's the United States of America."

This was met with thunderous applause from Democrats searching the political landscape for a new messiah.

And Barack Obama is campaigning for president of these United States on the unspoken rule book of absolute racial equality and inclusiveness. He is also using his Christian church membership to call voters to a socialist government response to all injustice, whether it be discrimination, poverty, or disparity in medical treatment access.

Yet, the Farrakhan flap, and Obama's forced denunciation via spokesman, made rather reluctantly under immense media pressure, would seem to contradict his inclusive racial and religious message.

Obama's Own Statements Regarding Race

Obama writes in his book, *The Audacity of Hope*:

"...such trust between the races is often tentative. It can wither without sustaining effort. It may last only so long as minorities remain quiescent, silent to injustice; it can be blown asunder by a few well-timed negative ads featuring white workers displaced by affirmative action, or the news of a police shooting of an unarmed black or Latino youth." (p. 238)

In his entire chapter on race lurks the unquestioned proposition that racial prejudice occurs only *one* way: white against black. Always. Every single time.

Obama recounts having to prove himself *beyond* the white racism of voters in Illinois, to Democrat Party insiders, whose support he needed. He got their support, he says, only after seven years of demonstrating his vast intra-racial appeal:

"They (insiders) had seen white mothers hand me their children for pictures and watched white World War II vets shake my hand after I addressed their convention. They sensed what I'd come to know from a lifetime of experience: that whatever preconceived notions white Americans may continue to hold, the overwhelming majority of them these days are able—if given the time—to look beyond race in making their judgments of people." (*Audacity of Hope*; p. 235)

The question now, however, might seem to be whether Obama can measure up to the same standard he sets for white people.

His own rule book of inclusion.

Obama's Afro-Centric Church

In Obama's opinion that racism is a character defect inherent in whites only, he appears to have swallowed whole-hog the proclamations of his pastor, Rev. Jeremiah Wright.

I visited Trinity United Church of Christ last weekend, and witnessed for myself the ubiquitous Afro-Centric message of Pastor Wright. It's everywhere.

The Church's book store has a wide range of spiritual books, not necessarily all Christian, but seemingly all written by African-Americans, including Malcolm X and Nation of Islam luminaries. In fact, the only standard seemingly applied to the array of books for sale in Obama's church is that they be written from an African perspective.

But in Obama's church, even the Bible studies are formulated around black liberation theology, which presupposes that the entire world history of oppression has occurred within the framework of *Whites oppressing Blacks*. But surely an Ivy League-educated man like Barack Obama knows this is a blatant falsehood.

As Thomas Sowell elucidates in his book, *Black Rednecks and White Liberals*:

"For most of its long history, which includes most of the history of the human race, slavery was largely not the enslavement of racially different people. People were enslaved because they were vulnerable, not because of how they looked.

The peoples of the Balkans were enslaved by fellow Europeans as well as by the peoples of the Middle East, for at least six centuries before the first African was brought to the Western Hemisphere." (p. 113)

Yet in Barack Obama's church, the message doled out to young African-American children in book after book is that they continue to be victims of white oppression that has always been the rule, without exception. Is this a message of inclusion? A message of hope?

If Mr. Obama is the new face of American politics, a uniter, a change agent for good, a new standard bearer of hope, then one must wonder why he is so intimately connected to a pastor, who honors an outspoken anti-Semite, anti-white racist—Louis Farrakhan, and who preaches a historically inaccurate and racially divisive message. This contradiction may indeed become Hillary's most potent weapon, choking Obama on his own petard in perfect Alinsky fashion.

Since this article's appearance two months ago it is Mr. Obama that has lifted Mrs. Clinton by her petard and is primed to lift the rest of us in like manner.

The purpose of this series of studies is to illustrate the results of how rapacious lies have consumed the souls of a population brought to ignorance by a forty-year Long March through our institutions.

We have examined Antonio Gramsci's *Prison Papers*, Pope Paul VI's address following Vatican II that initiated Liberation Theology, and Georg Hegel's system of dialectics. R. B. Thieme's concept of anthropocentric academic speculation, principles of disinformation and of propaganda, and Socrates's dialogue with Glaucon. Saul Alinsky's *Rules for Radicals* and B. K. Eakman's comments on change agents, cognitive dissonance, the science of coercion, and the Alinsky Method. Jesus and Paul's teachings on the difference between tolerance and discernment, Jeffrey Satinover's neurological analysis of homosexual behavior, and Kyle-Anne Shiver's commentaries on Barack Obama's apprenticeship under Alinsky and Jeremiah Wright. Carl Prince's essay on Wright's apprenticeship under Samuel DeWitt Proctor and James Cone and Herbert Kohl's precise definitions of "change, conservatives, progressives, and reactionaries."

Shiver's analysis of black liberation theology and Obama's twenty-year exposure to its teachings and, finally, Obama's communication of Wright and Alinsky's teachings in his enigmatic campaign speeches.

PRINCIPLE: If you don't know the truth, you will believe the lie.

PRINCIPLE: Propaganda is what they do to you; brainwashing is what you do to yourself.

The primary sources of the lie have concentrated themselves in the American academia from kindergarten to university. The warfare on the souls of America's youth and the damage it has done to the nation's future cannot be fully measured for some time to come.

The problem, although in its infancy, was clearly evident thirty years ago and the sin of selling the merchandise of the lie is described by one of my favorite writers:

Kirk, Russell. *Decadence and Renewal in the Higher Learning*. (South Bend: Gateway Editions, 1978), 18-19:

The Academy, if it is to enjoy rights, must acknowledge some principles of truth, and not constitute itself as a mere sophisticated debating-society, doubting everything, sneering at all old convictions. The Academy sins if the Academy places falsehood on the same platform with truth. And when college or university offers instruction in a subject, this implies that some truth may be found in the discipline. If the rising generation already could perceive every difference between truth and falsehood, the rising generation would not need to enter the Academy at all. (pp. 18-19)

The objects of a decent society have been known for a great while, within and without the Academy: they are order and justice and freedom. But the "ritualistic liberals" had dropped those objects, and so were decadent, and involved the Academy in their decay of reason. (p. 19)