

The Roots of Obama's Rage! By Dinesh D'Souza

Review by Dick Berkowitz

This is an eye-opening look at the mindset of Obama and dispels feelings that he is a far left American liberal, or even a true Democratic politician. Dinesh D'Souza first of all is a distinguished and prolific author (eight books, including several best sellers, *Letters To a Young Conservative*, *What's So Great About America*, *Ronald Reagan: How an Ordinary Man Became an Extraordinary Leader*, *The End of Racism: Principles for a Multiracial Society*).

He is also an educator – president of King's College in New York City and a weekly columnist on TownHall.com. He has served on the White House staff under Reagan and worked at the Hoover and American Enterprise Institutes, so he is a keen observer of American politics. Thus, no surprise his research took him to Obama's own writings (mostly *Dreams From My Father*) to try to decipher who this inscrutable new politician really is. (Much of Obama's real history is enshrouded in sealed records that someone doesn't want known about the traditional history of an American president.)

Why does D'Souza's book help you to understand Obama? Some thought of Obama before as "The Manchurian Candidate" because of his obscure and rapid emergence on the American scene. If anything, D'Souza's book reveals Obama almost as a "self-imposed/directed Manchurian Candidate".

The book begins by a walk through of Obama's early youth and his relationship with his white mother who embraced the black

race and culture. She married Barack Obama Sr. who quickly deserted that family, moved to Africa, and became influenced by various anti-Colonialist Kenyan political leaders. As a result of those associations, Obama Sr. was sent to Harvard to study economics, and then returned to Kenya, but his fortunes fell as the anti-Colonialist Kenya party he did not support came to power. He then lost his appointed public office and then took up with another woman whom he married, even though he was still married to his first wife. Eventually Obama Sr. came under the sway of alcohol due to his rejected circumstances, and killed himself in a drunken car wreck.

Surprisingly, Obama's mother instilled in her son a profound reverence for his father who had deserted them. Obama Sr. paid a visit to his old family in Hawaii when his son was about ten. Obama's teacher had invited the senior Obama to speak about the African experience and culture to his son's class at a private prep school in Hawaii.

Obama was so impressed with his father's presentation, from that moment on, the son began to morph into his father, or more precisely adopt his father's philosophy. The son changed his first name from Barry to Barack, took Hussein for his middle name, and embraced the anti-Colonial ideas of his father.

There are actually two forms of Anti-Colonialism. The first is against whites who exploited blacks in invading and taking control over African territories. The second is against neo-colonialism where the now independent countries are dependent on the economic influence of other countries. America is viewed as more the culprit here, since we never colonized Africa. Therefore this American "imperialism" needs to be stopped, in the view of its critics. "Justifiable" methods include 100%

confiscation of foreign assets. This is not state socialism as much as retribution for perceived past evils. It is this view that D'Souza believes Obama holds – to restrict American economic dominance in the world.

Next, the book deals with young Barack's pursuit of associations with Saul Alinsky, Andrew Kull, Frantz Fanon, Jeremiah Wright and other neo-colonialists. The chapters entitled "Becoming Barack" and "Putting On The Mask," show how all of these influences shaped Obama's thinking.

Alinsky's Rules for Radicals taught Obama how to get people to give voluntarily, even happily, and how to tap into the reservoir of American white guilt. But Alinsky was also a pragmatist. He knew this neo-colonial black agenda could not succeed without white support and white alliances. Alinsky also understood that the middle class was a large power base because of potential anger over a deteriorating economic plight.

The process Obama embraced is labeled "lactification" because it overtly avoided the race issue to project a nonracial image. Obama presented himself as part of the mainstream culture in order to become accepted by whites. Obama had to become the black who would not be threatening to whites, unlike two contemporary American black leaders who were more confrontational: Jesse Jackson and Al Sharpton. The latter, the author notes, has now begun to lose weight, wear suits and support Obama, whereas Jackson still views Obama as a rival.

Ironically, Jesse Jackson (and even Vice President Biden) saw through Obama's "lactification" process of changing his speech pattern, dress and even adopting "white" mannerisms. Obama

positioned himself as one who understood and embraced middle class values. The mainstream media also bought into this image, and to this day, is quite reluctant to criticize him. As Obama became more “Tom Brokaw”, liberal commentators like Chris Matthews and Anna Quindlen became part of "The Obama Choir."

In another chapter ("Humbling The Overclass"), the author describes Obama Sr.'s concept of neo-colonialism. Even after actual colonialism ends, exploitation remains through economic means. The remaining wealth of the colonized nation still belongs mostly to the installed Africans left behind.

Thus, the son interprets Obama Sr.'s writings in seeking to transfer wealth from “the big guys to the little guys” through taking over industries such as financial institutions and the nation's health care system. Obama has also sought to implement Alinsky's concept in enlisting the anger of the “out crowd” against the “in crowd” through class-warfare.

Obama also portrays himself as the “reasonable force for appropriate change” by cleverly setting up two mythical extremes and then positioning himself in the middle.

In "Taming of the Rogue Elephant", D'Souza characterizes Obama's foreign policy as not doing anything other than obfuscating. This stems from Obama Sr.'s role as an economist with a broad anti-colonial perspective that viewed the West, and specifically America, as an invader/occupier.

While not believing Obama is anti-American, D'Souza thinks Obama is seeking to radically change America's foreign policies

which Obama views have been bad for the world. Though Americans do not see themselves as colonialists, Obama is acutely aware that the American government did displace Native Americans and President Monroe did adopt a Manifest Destiny Doctrine. Obama's other book *The Audacity of Hope* documents his thinking for all to see.

Then if you think Obama believes Islam is another rock blocking the "spread of imperialism", you might begin to understand Obama's foreign policy initiatives. From apologizing for American arrogance to refraining from direct American attacks (Libya), these Obama policies are doomed to fail, but create the appearance of prudent, calm and sophisticated wisdom. (Actually this is not far from what our State Department has been practicing as diplomacy for decades.)

Obama wants the world to see he is a different president who will tame "Rogue America". For that, perhaps, Obama may have received the Nobel Peace Prize. It also explains Obama's rationale for Iranian sanctions, but he is smart enough to know they will not work because Iran wants to possess a nuclear bomb in order to achieve Middle Eastern supremacy. Though Obama may not like a nuclear Iran, he seems to have no intention of using American military to stop them even though that places him at risk with Jewish voters and money and certainly frightens the Saudis.

The political problem this raises for Obama is that he cannot be seen adopting an appeasement attitude. According to D'Souza, Obama believes America and Israel's nuclear arsenal pose a far greater danger to world stability than do Iranian bombs. Therefore Obama must craft a strategy that creates the appearance of one likely to work.

This desire to curb perceived American neo-colonial power explains most of Obama's foreign policy actions. Why deny the Poles and Czechs a missile defense? Why seek to reduce our nuclear stash with that of Russia's decaying one? Why Obama's desire to end occupation of Iraq? Why give General McChrystal less than what he asked for and coincidentally announce our withdrawal from Afghanistan?

Obama still has the political problem of withdrawing from Afghanistan, his “good War of Necessity” without allowing the appearance of an American defeat, while at the same time denying an American victory. Thus his negotiations with the Taliban and the Administration’s flip flop disparagement of Karzai.

D'Souza recites Lenin's view of capitalism as being in an advanced stage of crisis and seeks to postpone its inevitable collapse by invading and occupying foreign countries. Obama believes Bush was engaged as such in Iran as "the War of Choice." Ironically, in *The Audacity of Hope*, Obama also accepted the intelligence reports: "I assumed Saddam had chemical and biological weapons of mass destruction and coveted nuclear arms. I believe he had repeatedly flouted UN resolutions and weapons inspectors and that such behavior had to have consequences."

Finally, D'Souza discusses Obama's solicitous treatment of terrorists and Islamic militants. The anti-colonialist view is that they are simply resisting American imperialism and, while not virtuous, their suicide attacks are on the right side of history. Thus Obama and his Attorney General have been careful to

define al Qaeda operatives not as terrorists or enemy combatants but as common criminals. His administration has also provided them with taxpayer-paid legal representation even though they are not U.S. citizens.

D'Souza does not suggest Obama wishes harm to our nation. Obama simply seems to want America to go the way of Kipling's Britain. By crippling America's economy with debt, for the purpose of transferring wealth, Obama conveniently can justify reducing funds for America's military "rogue elephant" status. This contributes to long-term neo-colonial goal of diminishing American influence over world affairs.

In Chapter Ten, "The Last Anti-Colonial", the author cites the irony of the most powerful country in the world being governed according to the dreams of an African Luo tribesman of the 1950s - a polygamist who abandoned his wives, drank himself into stupors and raged against the world for denying him the realizations of his anti-Colonial ambitions.

Another irony is that Obama is expanding power at home while contracting America's power abroad. *The Weekly Standard* states it another way - omnipotence at home, impotence abroad.

Remember the Administration's statement about our space program? It should not be a symbol of American greatness because placing our flag on the moon was deemed colonization all over again but in space.

D'Souza also makes three predictions (remember this was

published in 2010):

- 1) There will be more spending, and no deficit reduction.
- 2) Iran will be allowed to develop nuclear weapons, with Obama doing little effectively to stop them.
- 3) Obama will seek to have U.S military personnel hauled into courts for alleged war crimes in Iraq and Afghanistan.

As for Obama's efforts to implement his father's anti-Colonial themes, D'Souza suggests they are failing for a number of reasons. First, true global trade is proving a boon, in contrast to UN and other foreign aid programs, because poor countries have low labor costs and are learning how to export goods and services to richer countries.

Second, and more important, anti-Colonial attitudes no longer sell because countries that earlier “suffered” Colonialism are now involved with Western technology and financial investments are thriving, e.g. India.

Also, the poorer “colonized” countries are the ones further removed from Western influence. So ironically it turns out the length of Colonization has become a positive determining factor. The Internet and globalization have also exposed the world's youth to undreamed opportunities so anti-Colonial feelings are now deemed backward thinking.

Consequently, the anti-colonialism movement may be an historical and vanquished relic of bygone days except for the man who occupies The Oval Office!

