

Why Obama's Excuses Are Delusive; Saul Alinsky: Ends Justify the Means; Progressives Have No Standards but Attack Traditionalists' Violation of Theirs

I have knowledge from an eyewitness — a person who has attended Trinity United Church of Christ, heard Rev. Wright speak, and conversed with him personally — that there is absolutely no way for a person to enter that church and not know its theology and Rev. Wright's views. It is consequently disingenuous for a person who is a church member, a personal friend of Wright's, and a follower for twenty years, not to know these things.

When Obama returned to Chicago following graduation from Columbia University, he began work as a "community organizer" on the South Side of Chicago where he became involved in community agitation using the Alinsky Method.

When it became apparent to those in the "community" that he was unchurched, Obama realized this created a distraction for those he hoped to organize. To remove it he joined Wright's church where he stayed for two decades.

Both Obama and Wright were involved in agitating the community and the congregation respectively. The underlying modus operandi for Obama was the Alinsky Method. For Wright, the same couched in black liberation theology.

Wright is Obama's confidant and was on his campaign advisory committee until the recent brouhaha resulted in Wright's dismissal.

For Obama to assert that for twenty years he remained ignorant of Wright's controversial oratory is duplicitous *ad extremum* although a typical Alinsky tactic.

This conclusion is supported by observing some of the tactics taught by Saul Alinsky, which takes us to our first excerpt from his *Rule for Radicals*:

Alinsky, Saul D. *Rules for Radicals: A Pragmatic Primer for Realistic Radicals*. (New York: Random House, 1971; repr., New York: Vintage Books, 1989), 10-13:

The Ideology of Change. The prerequisite for an ideology is possession of a basic truth. For example, a Marxist begins with his prime truth that all evils are caused by the exploitation of the proletariat by the capitalists. From this he logically proceeds to the revolution to end capitalism, and then into the third stage—the political paradise of communism. (p. 10)

An organizer working in and for an open society is in an ideological dilemma. To begin with, he does not have a fixed truth—truth to him is relative and changing. He is a political relativist. (pp. 10-11)

The free-society organizer is loose, resilient, fluid, and on the move in a society which is itself in a state of constant change. To the extent that he is free from the shackles of dogma, he can respond to the realities of the widely different situations our society presents. (p. 11)

The basic requirement for the understanding of the politics of change is to recognize the world as it is. We must work with it on its terms if we are to change it to the kind of world we would like it to be. We must first see the world as it is and not as we would like it to be. (p. 12)

Political realists see the world as it is: an arena of power politics moved primarily by perceived immediate self-interests, where morality is rhetorical for expedient action and self-interest. (pp. 12-13)

Thus the Progressive executes change by first concluding that dogma, morals, and virtues are flexible concepts that cannot be allowed to hinder advancement toward and attainment of the desired agenda.

Under this principle the end justifies the means and when the end is considered noble, then whatever means must be used to achieve it are virtuous:

Alinsky, Rules for Radicals, 24-25:

Of Means and Ends. That perennial question, "Does the end justify the means?" is meaningless as it stands; the real and only question regarding the ethics of means and ends is, and always has been, "Does this *particular* end justify this *particular* means?" (p. 24)

The *end* is what you want, and the *means* is how you get it. The man of action views the issue of means and ends in pragmatic and strategic terms. He has no other problem; he thinks only of his actual resources and the possibilities of various choices of action. He asks of ends only whether they are achievable and worth the cost; of means, only whether they will work. The practical revolutionary will understand Goethe's 'ger-tal "conscience is the virtue of observers and not of agents of action"; in action, one does not always enjoy the luxury of a decision that is consistent both with one's individual conscience and the good of mankind. The choice must always be for the latter. Action is for mass salvation and not for the individual's personal salvation. He who sacrifices the mass good for his personal conscience doesn't care enough for people to be "corrupted" for them. (pp. 24-25)

The next excerpt is taken from Alinsky's chapter, "Tactics," where we discover the method Progressives use to turn the Traditionalist's moral standards into a tool used against him:

Ibid., 126, 128, 152:

Tactics are those consciously deliberate acts by which human beings live with each other and deal with the world around them. In the world of give and take, tactics is the art of how to take and how to give. Here our concern is with the tactic of taking. (p. 126)

[Example #1] *Make the enemy live up to their own book of rules.* You can kill them with this, for they can no more obey their own rules than the Christian church can live up to Christianity.

[Example #2] *Ridicule is man's most potent weapon.* It is almost impossible to counterattack ridicule. Also it infuriates the opposition, who then react to your advantage. (p. 128)

Their Own Petard. The basic tactic in warfare against the Haves is a mass political jujitsu: the Have-Nots do not rigidly oppose the Haves, but yield in such planned and skilled ways that the superior strength of the Haves becomes their own undoing. For example, since the Haves publicly pose as the custodians of responsibility, morality, law, and justice, they can be constantly pushed to live up to their own book of morality and regulations.

No organization, including organized religion, can live up to the letter of its own book. You can club them to death with their "book" of rules and regulations. This is what that great revolutionary, Paul of Tarsus, knew when he wrote to the Corinthians: "Who also hath made us able ministers of the New Testament; not of the letter, but of the spirit; for the letter killeth" [2 Corinthians 3:6]. (p. 152)

Traditionalists profess allegiance to law and order, the divine institutions, and biblical standards of morality which include rejections of sin.

Progressives subscribe to no particular dogma, only the end they wish to achieve. Whatever means are necessary to accomplish the desired end is considered moral for that occasion.

Since Traditionalists choose to identify themselves by well-defined moral codes, they bite off more than they can chew if they do not understand Alinsky's tactics. No one is perfect, and the Progressive knows this. He has no professed absolute standards that guide, inspire, or restrain him. Therefore, he can use the Traditionalists' morality as a weapon against him.

On the other hand, when the Progressive makes his inevitable mistake he is able to skate since he is not bound by any creed except "whatever it takes." And if it appears he has been trapped by an apparent unsavory association with a person who is so ultra radical it can't be ignored, then he is free to lie his way out of it and will not be held accountable for doing so by media sycophants, whereas, under the same circumstances, his Traditional opponent is hoist by his own petard.

These tactics, although ingenious, are destined to ultimately come undone since they oppose the truth.

This does not mean that our client nation will not be required to endure the ultimate totalitarian regime that Progressivism ultimately imposes. That depends on the enlargement of the Pivot to which members of this congregation have personal obligation to contribute. Regardless of the outcome, *vincit omnia veritas*: doctrine conquers all.