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Significant attention has recently been devoted to Saul Alinsky’s “Rules for Radicals” and their application in today’s political environment. The association is, indeed, meaningful so it will be worthwhile to examine the relationship.

In this paper, I will introduce the person of Saul Alinsky for those who may not know who and what he was, look at the Rules for Radicals as defined in his book, examine how the current administration is using those rules to steal America from “We, the people” and to impose what it perceives to be “fundamental change” and then look at how Patriots might turn the tables and use the same approach in combating the disastrous path toward Obamaism. Finally, I will look at some “Rules for Patriots”. That’s a lot of ground to cover so I apologize in advance for the length of this paper.

Chapter 1 – Saul Alinsky

Saul David Alinsky was born in Chicago in 1909 to Russian Jewish immigrants and died in Carmel, California in 1972. That’s an interesting progression all by itself, being born into the labor racketeering capital of the US and dying in the land of the wealthy left.

Alinsky went to college at the University of Chicago, majoring in archaeology. His plans to be an archaeologist were abandoned during the depression when, in his words, “The guys who funded the field trips were being scraped off Wall Street sidewalks”. After a brief dalliance in graduate school, he went to work for the State of Illinois as a criminologist and began part time organizing work for the Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO) prior to its merger with the American Federation of Labor (AFL).

Alinsky is widely regarded as the founder or inventor of “community organizing”. Alinsky became involved in organizing the predominately black ghettos of Chicago, earning him the enmity of Mayor Richard Daley. He fled to California at the behest of the SF Bay Area Presbyterian Churches to help
organize the black ghetto in Oakland, which resulted in the Oakland City Council introducing a resolution banning him from that city.

Alinsky’s organizational concepts were enthusiastically adapted by college campus political activists in the 1960s. Alinsky wrote “Rules for Radicals” in 1971, a year before he died. In its opening paragraph, he states, “The Prince was written by Machiavelli for the Haves on how to hold on to power. Rules for Radicals is written for Have-Nots on how to take it away”. In 1972, shortly before his death, Alinsky described his plan for organizing the white middle class across America. Alinsky saw this as necessary because, in his view, the white middle class, the Silent Majority, was living in a state of frustration and fear, worried about their future and, as such, might be driven to a right wing view point, “making them ripe for plucking by some guy on horseback promising a return to the vanished verities of yesterday.” His stated motive was, “I love this goddamned country and we’re going to take it back.”

That is an interesting thought to keep in mind as we see how the Obama administration is using Alinsky’s rules to take power away from the people, even his precious “have-nots”, and consolidating it into an oppressive top down government.

Early in his career, Alinsky formed the Industrial Areas Foundation (IAF) to help the urban poor create a home grown revolution in the major cities of the US. After Alinsky died, Edward T. Chambers became the Executive Director of the organization that would, over the years, train or influence many community organizers and political leaders. Among these were Fred Ross (active in organizing migrant farm workers in California), Cesar Chavez (organizer of National Farmworkers Assoc. which became the United Farm Workers) and Dolores Huerta (co-founded National Farmworkers Assoc. with Chavez). Hillary Clinton’s senior honors thesis at Wellesley College (for wealthy liberal feminists) was on Allinsky's organizing methods. Keep this in mind as we move toward 2016. Other figures in America that have been deeply influenced by Alinsky include Ralph Nader, Jesse Jackson and, of course, Barry Hussein Soetoro Obama who followed Alinsky’s path as a Chicago community organizer. Alinsky’s influence on Obama is unmistakable and was clearly manifest in his 2008 campaign in its grassroots organizing.

Chapter 2 - Rules for Radicals – Structure of the Book

First Chapter – The Purpose of the Book

Alinsky began his book “Rules for Radicals” with the statement, “what follows is for those who want to change the world from what it is to what they believe it should be.” He then defined what he believed to be the class structure of America. First was the “Haves” or upper class. The Haves, he posited, are the smallest class but have all the money and power and wish to retain the status quo to preserve what they have. The second group that he defined were the “Have-little-want mores”. This group is the middle class, the largest group in the US at the time. Alinsky believed that this group had, potentially the greatest power but was the hardest to sway because, overall, they were more content than the lower class. The “have-nots” were those in poverty. This group, Alinsky believed, was
the most easy to sway because of the general discontent and lack of resources. He believed that all people in this class would react to the same causes that affected the entire community.

Second Chapter – On Means and Ends

The traditional question asked when seeking to achieve a specific goal is “Do the ends justify the means?” Alinsky modified this to, “does this particular end justify this particular means?” This opened up the discussion about goal setting in community action. Alinsky strongly believed that unorthodox methods were perfectly acceptable for bringing about change therefore if the particular actions employed brought attention to a problem the community faced, those methods were acceptable.

Third Chapter – The Importance of Words

Alinsky was very concerned about the words that became associated with a cause. He was particularly concerned that some words may hold negative connotation to a particular cause. In this chapter, he addressed specific words that may hold negative connotation. This is a very significant chapter in that it discusses in some detail the potential of negative connotation for each of the words. Words such as “Compromise”, “Power”, “Self Interest” and “conflict” are in his list. The reflection of this thinking is seen in current words such as “stimulus package” instead of borrowing and spending, “income equality” instead of income redistribution and “community organizer” instead of agitator. “Wealth gap” becomes a demonizing word referencing the wealthy rather than a more accurate description of the simple fact that some people work harder and are smarter than others.

Fourth Chapter – Educating Organizers

The purpose of organizing is to unite people around some common cause. To do this, community organizations must have strong and effective leaders. In this chapter, Alinsky discusses how these leaders are created. In his view, leaders must adapt their characteristics to the community and learn from experience. He states that his rules are a guide and not a crutch. A good organizer must have the ability to analyze situations and learn from mistakes.

Fifth Chapter – Communications

This is a very straightforward chapter. In it Alinsky states that the most critical tool of an organizer is the ability to communicate with his organization. An organizer can lack any of the other skills but this one. He stated, “One can lack any of the qualities of an organizer with one exception and still be effective and successful. That exception is the art of communication. It does not matter what you know about anything if you cannot communicate with your people. In that event you are not even a failure. You’re just not there.”

Sixth Chapter – In the Beginning

This chapter details the steps that a new organizer must take to become successful. The major step is to establish an identity as this allows the organizer to be accepted by the community he wishes to
organize. To do this, new organizers must get the support of existing community leaders. Having gained acceptance and trust from the community, the organizer can then bring about the desired change.

**Seventh Chapter – Tactics**

In this chapter, Alinsky proposes different tactics for different types of organization. He suggests that if the organizer is dealing with a very large broadly based organization that it can be paraded openly before the enemy in an obvious display of power. With a smaller organization, conceal the members but make a lot of noise so that the opponent thinks you have a bigger organization than you really do. If you have a really small organization, Alinsky advises “stink up the place”. It is in this chapter that he lists the 12 rules which I will discuss later.

**Eighth Chapter – The Genesis of Tactical Flexibility**

Having introduced the main tactics for community organizing in the previous chapters, in this chapter Alinsky discusses how they should be implemented. Alinsky makes very clear that the reactions to implementation tactics are not always predictable and that accidental unintended consequences often arise making on-the-fly improvisation necessary. The best organizers use these unforeseen consequences to their advantage. Organizers cannot be rigid in their tactics. Alinsky states that free and open communication between the organizer and the community is an absolute necessity. Organizers should be alert for these unintended effects and use them to advantage.

**Ninth Chapter – The Way Ahead**

Alinsky believed that the white middle class, known at the time as the “silent majority”, was the future of organizing, more important than lower income groups. He believed that by organizing the middle class, he could unite the most powerful socio-economic group in the nation. With the power of the middle class behind him, implementing policy change and direct action tactics would be much more effective because of the resources this group processed. He saw this as the next major step in moving America toward what he regarded as a more equitable society.

**Themes of Rules for Radicals**

There are several repetitive and dominant themes throughout Rules for Radicals. These are symbol construction, common enemy, direct action, non-violent conflict and empowerment of the poor.

Symbol construction is the creation of symbols with which a movement can identify. These, according to Alinsky, are uniting features, something with which the community can identify which makes mobilizing support easier. Symbols might be a dominant church or religious group, a union or geographic area; something with which the community could easily identify.

Once a common symbol has been established, Alinsky suggests that a common enemy be identified. A common enemy might, for example, be a politician or agency that is not acting in the community’s interest, at least as perceived by Alinsky. The action mechanism is non-violent conflict, the conflict between the common symbol and the common enemy. With a common enemy identified and
demonized, the community unites against the enemy. The heightened awareness of the community of
the common enemy serves to accentuate the common bonds of the community. This all allows the goal
of the group to be defined. Now, with a common enemy, the goal of the community is to defeat the
enemy.

With a common symbol in place and a structured organization formed, another major element of
Alinsky’s teaching becomes possible, direct action. Symbol constructed organizations create conflict
which strengthens community unity and promotes accomplishment of the goals. In furtherance of this,
Alinsky promoted over-the-top public demonstrations that could not be ignored by the media or public
at large which, in his experience, made overcoming bureaucratic process easier.

Finally, a main theme of Alinsky was empowerment of the poor. This was a class with a large and visible
membership that quickly united behind common symbols and was easily led to common enemies to
create the sought after conflict for change.

The Rules

Rule No. 1 – Power is not only what you have, but what the enemy thinks you have.

Power comes from various sources but prominent among them are money and people. Alinsky’s “have-
nots” have an abundant supply of people and not much money so must build power from masses of
people. Government and corporations, on the other hand, have the money but often have a hard time
appealing to people. Their appeal is even more difficult because their arguments are more often than
not economic in nature and do not resonate with those who have few economic resources. A
corporation can be attacked by the threat of a boycott, for example. Those threatening the boycott
allege that they will mobilize “millions of people” to not buy some product. Can they? If they can
convince the corporation they can, they win because the corporation thinks they will lose money or
market or whatever is being threatened. Obama, the organizer, recently convinced the masses that not
having a budget in place would “shut down the government” and cause all sorts of dire consequences
like no welfare checks, no social security checks and so on. Would it have? Not likely but he convinced
the masses that it would and they, in turn, put the pressure of masses on vote counting politicians.
Immigrant worker groups have convinced consumers that if their illegal immigrant constituency is not
permitted in the US, the prices of farm produce will rise dramatically. Will it? Irrelevant because they
have convinced the “enemy” that they will. These are all examples of perceived power.

Rule 2 – Never go outside the expertise of your people

When an organization attempts to do something for which its people are not equipped, it results in
collision, fear and then retreat. Conversely, when the people in an organization feel secure in what
they are doing, they feel strong and cohesive. When organizations are under attack by groups, they
often complain that the radicals are not addressing the “real issues”. For example immigrant advocacy
groups do not address issues of economic policy, such as American worker displacement, for two
reasons. One is that it does not fit their narrative and the other is that they are not comfortable or
equipped to deal with policy issues. They argue human rights and family issues. With these they are
comfortable and equipped. Labor unions attack companies over wages and benefits and stay away from competitive issues.

**Rule 3 – Whenever possible, go outside the expertise of the enemy**

This is the corollary of Rule Number 2. Cause your enemy to go outside his expertise. Seek ways to increase anxiety and insecurity. This is a lesson straight from Sun Tzu who said select your battlefield and control the terrain. Bring your enemy to the battlefield and don’t be brought there by him. Don’t rely on the enemy not coming but on your own readiness to receive him. Don’t rely on the chance of the enemy not attacking but on having made your position unassailable. In short, choose the battlefield and lie in wait. Alinsky advocated using people power to create large numbers of arguments, whether they were relevant or not, to overload the system and cause the enemy to consume precious time and resource addressing issues that do not contribute to his cause. This is what we see on a national scale when the government introduces issue after issue into the public debate to deflect attention from issues it cannot deal with. This is why, for example, gun control, immigration and other unrelated issues are continually reintroduced during the Health Care debacle, the Benghazi discussion and the Fast and Furious debate. This has had exactly the desired effect, causing the opposition to spend time arguing other issues and the media to take its attention from the painful issues. This is sometimes called “shiny object diversion”. This prevents the enemy from choosing its battlefield and forces them to your position of strength, that is, ability to control the discussion.

**Rule 4 – Make the enemy live up to its own book of rules**

Any organization’s credibility is its profession of its values. Impugn, rightly or wrongly, an organization’s credibility and you diminish the organization. All organizations have rules and some can be subverted for the gain of others. For example, many consumer products organizations proudly profess their commitments to quality and customer service. They may declare, for example, that their policy is to respond to every customer letter. OK. Send them thousands upon thousands of letters. They can’t possibly respond to all so they publically violate a stated policy. If their policy is to investigate all quality complaints, send thousands of complaints. They can’t possibly investigate them all. If the credibility of the organization is damaged in one area, the attacking group can more easily continue to attack credibility in other areas. Interestingly, this is what is happening, in some form, to Obamacare. Many promises were made and those promises are being attacked massively. The organization cannot respond factually to each problem so, in desperation, it manufactures more unkeepable promises which are, in turn attacked. The credibility of the whole program then sags under the weight of lack of credibility. The other response is to invoke Rule 3 and produce more “shiny objects” to divert attention from the problems.

**Rule 5 – Ridicule is man’s most potent weapon**

Ridicule need not be based on any factual context. It is irrational and there is no effective defense against it other than ignoring it, deflecting it or returning it. Because it is irrational, logic and fact are ineffective. Ridicule is often used to force an enemy into concessions as a way of minimizing damage.
Ridicule is most effective when the group using it controls the conversation by, for example, controlling media coverage. The normal reaction to ridicule is anger and fear, neither of which is useful in winning a battle. If ridicule is to be employed, be sure to bring it on hard and fast, preventing the enemy from deflecting it with its own ridicule. We are seeing today that the administration is very thin skinned and does not react well to ridicule. Their reaction is to attempt to shift blame (deflect it). This might have worked at one time but it is a counterproductive strategy today. Administration attempts to ridicule the opposition worked at one time, not so much now. Community groups regularly attempt to ridicule the “haves” for lack of empathy with the poor, excessive incomes and lavish lifestyle.

**Rule 6 – A good tactic is one your people enjoy**

Alinsky’s radicals are no different than any other people in that they will do what they prefer over that which they do not prefer. The extension of this is in the next rule.

**Rule 7 – A tactic that drags on too long becomes a drag**

Just because a tactic works for a while does not mean it will work forever even if its proponents enjoy it. People get bored. They lose enthusiasm. The less the radicals liked the tactic to begin with, the faster it will become a drag and run out of gas. This reality is well known to labor unions, for example, when strikes or agitations drag on for long periods of time. Consider also external influences on a tactic. A demonstration in the summer has a better chance of continuing for some time than the same demonstration when it’s snowing and 20 degrees outside. Why did the Occupy movement peter out?

**Rule 8 – Keep the Pressure on. Never Let up.**

Most enemies are adaptive. Eventually they will figure out what you are doing and come up with an effective counter so keep implementing new tactics. Overwhelm the defense. Always keep the enemy off balance. Do not give them an opportunity to regroup or re-evaluate. Attack from as many different directions as possible. Environmental activists seem particularly adept at this. They will attack the coal industry then attack the XL pipeline. They will bleat about global warming and then they will file lawsuits over some issue and then launch a publicity blitz somewhere else. Then they’ll attack hydro-fracking and then push the EPA for greenhouse emission standards.

**Rule 9 – The threat is usually more terrifying than the thing itself.**

Planting the seed of fear or doubt can cause the opposition’s mind to aid in dreaming up possible consequences. Large organizations always tend to prepare for worst case scenarios (plan for the worst, hope for the best). The more potential consequences that an organization can plant in the minds of an enemy, the more often illogical extensions will be imagined and the more energy and resources will be expended on things that do nothing to combat the actual attack. Mis-information and dis-information can be very effective in this pursuit.
Rule 10 – If you push a negative hard enough, it will become a positive.

Sometimes symbol construction is unintended and potentially negative. Sometimes negative symbols are constructed intentionally. Mass demonstrations and violence are examples. In the early days of unionism and through the mid 20th century, large demonstrations, particularly persistent demonstrations, initially viewed negatively, were often met with intentionally provoked violence from the other side. That violence frequently swayed public sympathy to the side of the demonstrators. The negative symbol of violence imparted positive connotation to the formerly negative mass demonstrations.

Rule 11 – The price of a successful attack is a constructive alternative.

Winning an attack is only part of the goal. Generally, organizer attacks are intended to get the group a seat at the table, a part in determining the solution to a problem. The goal is to have a forum to wield power. If an organization wins a seat they need to be prepared to offer a solution to the problem. A demonstration contending, for example, that “management is unfair” gains nothing if the group cannot offer specific reasons why management is unfair and what an equitable solution to correcting the problem might be.

Rule 12 – Pick a target, freeze it, personalize it, and polarize it.

This is a very powerful concept and is often used in conjunction with Rule 5 concerning ridicule. A great example of this was the 2008 presidential campaign where the left isolated Sarah Palin and pummeled her with every form of insult and accusation from her family to her politics. By isolating her in personal attacks, they did not allow her to become effective in the campaign as a whole. They succeeded in polarizing not only fellow leftists and conservatives but the Republican Party itself. The same was done to Barry Goldwater in 1964. This tactic is in play today in the demonization of the coal industry and of conservative talk show hosts.

Chapter 3 – Alinsky’s Influence on Obama

Barry Hussein Soetoro Obama is an enigma. Virtually nothing is truly known about his upbringing or his education. Even his actual birth is shrouded in mystery and suspicion, his personal past unproven by verifiable documents. So what is Obama all about? How has this person been shaped and his world view molded?

What we do know about Obama is that he has been heavily influenced by socialist and communist operatives, Saul Alinsky being one such prominent influence. We also know that Obama began his “career” as a community organizer in Chicago, just as Alinsky, sitting at the feet of the master, as it were, learning the craft of organizing. Since that time, his actions and his tactics map remarkably well with those proposed by Alinsky in his “Rules for Radicals”.

Take, for example, Rule 4, make an opponent live up to his own rules and use these rules against him. Alinsky said that it would be impossible for the Christian Church to live up to its own rules. In his view,
this provided a great opportunity to also apply Rule 5, Ridicule, to beat his opponent into submission. On today's national stage, Christianity is being singled out for this type of dersional attack and the same type of attack is being made on freedom itself.

Today, the Obama government is trying to convince the people that freedom is dangerous and “the people” are not capable of making responsible and correct decisions therefore the government must assume that responsibility for us. We are being told we cannot make good decisions on how to eat, how to educate our children, how to raise our families, how to invest our money, how to provide for our health and how to provide for our own safety. How is this occurring? It begins with destroying our morality which is why it is necessary to destroy the Christian Church. Lack of morality leads to the destruction of the nuclear family by promoting promiscuous behavior, homosexual marriage and rewarding single parent families, which leads to children and young adults growing up in a “no rules but me” environment. This leads to excesses of all sorts with attendant crime and societal disruption. The message is then that we require a police state to deal with everything we do since what we are doing isn’t working. The police state invades every corner of our being as we are seeing with the NSA snooping into our phone calls, our mail, our internet, our social media, our financial transactions, where our car goes, where we go and who we meet. The grand prize is the discrediting of the Constitution which we see in progress. In all of this, we see Rule 1 regarding power, Rule 3 regarding creating anxiety, Rule 4 regarding making the enemy live up to its own rules, Rule 5 regarding the use of ridicule, Rule 8 regarding never letting up and Rule 12 regarding picking a target, freezing it, personalizing it and polarizing it.

So what, more specifically, are we seeing in Obama’s words and actions?

**Rule 1 – Power**

Politics is all about power relations. The corollary is that, to achieve power, one needs to cast one’s positions in the language of morality. Moral sounding statements cloak actions that are entirely focused on self interest in high sounding and saleable rhetoric.

The base strategy for the Obama administration, right from Alinsky, is the need for communication, better described as constant propaganda, to assert that the enemy’s means are immoral and that their own means are ethical and rooted in the highest human values. We hear constantly about the administration fighting for freedom, equality, dignity, compassion and so on. Negative words are recast as high moral objectives. For example, confiscation by taxation becomes income equality, amnesty for illegals becomes preservation of families, socialized medicine becomes affordable healthcare, same sex marriage becomes marriage equality and so on. The same moral characteristics of the opposition are cast as tax loopholes for the rich, unconscionable exclusion, disdain for the poor and needy, homophobia etc.

Power is also about perceived power. We see a grand example of an activist group trying to portray more power than they probably have playing out as this is being written. The agitators are the pro-amnesty (moral sounding name “immigration reform”) gang. Speaker of the House Boehner has said that he will not bring a Senate Amnesty bill to conference committee. Amnesty supporters are throwing
a hissy fit and threatening “revenge”. They are yelling that if this congress can’t pass an immigration bill, they’ll elect a congress that can. To do that, they vow to take back the House. The Republicans have a 17 seat majority. The amnesty gang says there are “five or 10 Republicans that could be defeated if Latinos go to the polls in large numbers” (not exactly electing a congress of their liking). This, they say, would “send a message”. First, one must ask, what is different about Boehner not bringing a bill to conference than Harry Reid not considering legislation on a regular basis? Maybe they can get people out to vote, maybe not. In any case, they are trying to portray power that is not yet in evidence. This type of maneuver plays into the Obama plan of attacking from many directions, however, because while the opposition is defending this attack, other groups will be going after the “homophobes” who oppose gay marriage or the “1 Percenters” for opposing tax increases or some other cause. The battle never ends.

Chapter One - View of Class Structure

To Alinsky, there were only “Haves”, “Have little-want-mores” and “Have-nots” in this world. These became the rich and powerful oppressors, the middle class whose apathy perpetuates the status quo and the poor and disenfranchised oppressed. In this view of society, the haves have all the money, power, food, security and luxury and are very resistant to any change that would relieve the have-nots of their burden of poverty, poor housing, disease, ignorance, political impotence and despair. (I hasten to point out that, today, the vast majority of those presumed to be the “have not” class live hugely better lives than very large numbers of people elsewhere in the world.) The Have-a-little-want-mores, or middle class, becomes the do-nothing class, those who talk about relieving poverty, promoting justice and equality and then do nothing or even discourage meaningful change.

Every bit of Obama’s verbiage promotes the idea that “the rich” have somehow achieved their wealth dishonestly or by exploiting others and are not entitled to what they have. Remember his comment regarding executive compensation, “How much is enough?” How often do we hear comments about the “rich” paying their “fair share” in taxes? The poor, at least those who are poor in his view, are the target of his “organizing”. These are the biggest group that identifies with his symbols of organizing; increasing minimum wage, more welfare, expanded food stamps and free healthcare to name but a few. To augment this group, he promotes programs that make even the Have little-want-more group, the middle class, beholden to his ideals. These are the labor unions, public employee unions, federal employees and middle class unemployed or under employed. The programs on offer do not pretend to eliminate the problems the groups suffer but rather they will make their conditions more permanent. What, for example, does increasing the definition of “poverty level” do to eliminate poverty? It simply assures more will be securely included in the government dependent group. Does his drive to grant amnesty and citizenship to illegal aliens really have anything to do with fair treatment and keeping families together, as advertised, or is the real purpose adding more bodies to the organizable pool? All these actions serve to increase power (see Rule 1).

Where, in Obama’s mind, is all of this headed? One hears that he is a communist or socialist. Neither is really correct. He is an Obamaist. Here are the differences.
Communism is a system of government in which the state plans and controls the economy and a single, authoritarian government holds power. This government claims that it is striving for a higher social order in which all goods are shared equally by all people.

Socialism is a system of government wherein the means of producing and distributing goods are collectively owned or are owned by a centralized government which plans and controls the economy.

Obamaism is his belief that the Constitution of the United States is obsolete, that capitalism exploits and oppresses the ignorant masses, that government knows better than the individual how they should conduct their private affairs, that centralized planning and control is more effective than private enterprise and free markets, that self-defense, national defense and national security are tools of war mongers and that national borders should be obliterated and replaced by world government control. There’s more but this is the essence.

I mention these because they are the ultimate extension of Alinsky power.

Rule 8 - Keep up the pressure

By this Alinsky rule, change is brought about by relentless agitation and “trouble making” of a nature that radically disrupts society. How is Obama engaged in this? As previously noted, the upper and middle class want no part of socialistic nonsense so this is where Obama is focusing on stirring up dissatisfaction and discontent. By Alinsky’s teaching, agitation must be taken to the point of conflict. The agitator must foment “angers, frustrations and resentments” that will lead to the destabilization and disorganization of the existing structure and allow organization of the new. This is done by creating fear, confusion and despair. In the current context, consider healthcare as one example. Upper and middle class people are almost paranoid about their healthcare. Threatening to make it go away or become less complete causes panic. What is happening? Consider that the plan for Obamacare never was to provide affordable i.e. lower cost healthcare but to completely destabilize the insurance market while ratcheting up costs and increasing deductibles. This certainly creates fear, and confusion in the upper and middle classes. When this gets bad enough, the organizer offers a solution – single payer government controlled healthcare (socialized medicine) as the only and fastest way to provide health coverage. As an “only available solution” the previously resistant classes buy in. Think that’s far-fetched? Go back to statements made in the past by Obama, Pelosi, Reid and Sebelius that they all favor single payer healthcare and think it’s the solution to universal healthcare, that is socialized medicine. Next, consider financial markets. The housing bubble was created by the government primarily through requirements that banks make mortgage loans to people that they know will never be able to pay them off then they set up Freddie and Fannie to pump huge amounts of money into an inflated and unsustainable market. When that collapses, the upper and middle class are in a panic as all financial markets plunge. The government then steps in to subsidize, that is effectively nationalize, many major corporations, something they could not do under other circumstances. Today, we see that we have learned nothing from previous lessons and are allowing another real estate bubble and a health insurance bubble to build. This time, however, the government has no flexibility to bail out companies
because of all the bonds issued from the previous debacle. Now the whole economy collapses and the government becomes the owner of most business and much of the wealth of the upper and middle class is wiped out. All on the trajectory toward Obamaism.

Also along the lines of keeping the pressure up and isolating the target (Rule 12) is the disinclination of the Obama administration to even discuss any situation with the opponents. Alinsky was very clear on this issue. He said “Never communicate with anyone purely on the rational facts or ethics of any issue”. (Press Secretary Jay Carney is the embodiment of this principle) The opponents must be demonized and put on the wrong side of the moral discussion. To talk to them would be to humanize them. Says Alinsky, “Men will act when they are convinced that their cause is 100% on the side of the angels and that the opposition is 100% on the side of the devil.” A basic principle of organizers is not to act until issues are polarized to this degree. We see this in such things as budget negotiations and executive orders in lieu of legislation. We see this in the refusal of the AG to enforce laws. No discussion, just agitation. It is quite clear that Obama cares not a wit whether these actions are legal or not, whether they will be reversed or not. The point is that they polarize, agitate and cause fear.

Rule 8 Again - Never focus on just a single issue

There are many reasons for hitting one issue after another. Moving from one issue to another keeps the organizer’s cohorts interested and alive. There is constant energy and challenge. Multiple issues draw in multiple constituencies increasing the force of agitation and diluting the opponent’s ability to deal with the issues. Remember Rule 7 that when a tactic drags on too long, it becomes a drag. With constantly evolving issues, as one loses its luster, another is ready to take its place and keep energy high. We see this in action with Obama as multiple issues are introduced and recycled. There are good reliable issues that can be reused. Gun control is a good example. The administration knows this is going nowhere but when they need to deflect attention from a problem or pump up the faithful, it can always be recalled and the opposition will go nuts. False flag events can be created to draw attention to the issue. Gay marriage is another reliable issue that keeps coming back. Immigration is a little different in that it really doesn’t go away but keeps appearing in slightly different form. Energy policy is a tried and true issue that can be raised and raised again in almost limitless variations.

Rules 1, 3 and 6 – Taunt, ridicule, keep up pressure, achieve the “moral” position

It is the primary task of the organizer to place himself on the side of the people, to identify with the have-nots. This is why Obama’s speeches about being “President of all the people” are so disingenuous and hypocritical, if not outright lies. He has no desire to be the choice of the haves and most of the have-little-want-mores, the wealthy and the middle class. He has nothing to say to them that is constructive in nature. His objective is to taunt and bait them into labeling him as a “dangerous enemy”. To a large measure, he has been successful in doing this. If he is the enemy of the rich, he must be the friend of the poor, so Alinsky’s logic goes.

Obama’s short term strategy is to pump up the “have-nots and associates” by increasing the pool of the government dependent but many of these will be shocked when they find out that they are, ultimately, also the enemy. Obamaism will not share power with labor unions. The herds of overpaid government
workers will not retain their middle income status. The dreams of owning homes and cars, an intrinsic part of this group, will vanish in smoke. The illegal immigrants cum new citizens will never achieve the “American Dream” because it will be transformed by Obamaism. At the end of the day, the government will own everything and everybody, at least by Obama’s script. That is one reason why it is so perplexing to see the continued adoration of wealthy white liberals and Hollywood types and well as self-sufficient middle class democrats. They buy into the lie of national unity and they don’t realize that Obama does not want unity. Despite frequently invoking “American ideals” in his rhetoric, he has clearly stated that he wants to “fundamentally transform America”. There can be no unity with people that he wants to fundamentally transform.

Obama, the organizer, the apostle of Obamaism, constantly purports that the nation is gripped in perpetual class warfare waged by the “Haves” against the “Have-nots”. He uses every opportunity he can to demonize both the “richest 1%”, who he accuses of not paying their “fair share”, and the Republicans, who he whines, are impeding his, HIS, plans for Obamaism. So much for democracy, freedom and the will of the people.

As I have pointed out, true to the principles of Alinsky, Obama moves from one point of attack to another, from gun control to amnesty to immigration reform to healthcare, then to same sex marriage. All part of the Alinsky driven plan to keep the nation polarized, disoriented and fearful. He does not want unity. He wants the Obama nirvana.

This is why it is so important for elected officials and local citizens alike to know what Saul Alinsky advocated and why, when Obama speaks and acts, Alinsky’s plan is clearly in his mind. It is important that they understand where this is really headed.

Chapter 4 - But Wait – There is Hope

The social dynamics of Alinsky can work both ways. Organizing can take place with conservative groups and independents just as they can with the Alinsky defined “Have-nots”. There are a lot more conservatives than there are liberals. The tactics will be a bit different, as well as the targets, but understanding Alinsky can work for Obama opponents, too.

Let’s look at Alinsky’s rules as they might be used by conservatives.

Rule 1 – Power is not only what you have but what your enemy thinks you have.

The left has long used the threat of a boycott to force conservative groups to bend to their will. It can work the other way, too. The left has, for example, used the boycott to target conservative radio. This might be turned back on them. There are 120 million people who self-identify as conservative and almost twice as many who identify as Christians. What if this huge group could be motivated to boycott movies, TV programs, targeted products or subscriptions to magazines and media? The more often this tactic is used, the more effective the threat becomes. What would the high flying leftist Hollywood types, who live by box office receipts, do if many millions of dollars of receipts failed to materialize? How about a boycott of leftist TV shows during rating season? Conservatives threatened to cut MSM TV
out of the next presidential debates if they aired a Hillary Clinton bio-propaganda series before the election. The networks scrapped that plan in a hurry. It can work.

Rule 2 – Never go outside the experience of your people

Obama’s leftist cadre has been very successful in creating the “Republicans are racists” and “Republicans will not let immigrants become citizens” mantra among the black and Hispanic communities. They have done this by using black and Hispanic proxies with whom these communities could relate such as Jesse Jackson, Al Sharpton and many La Raza leaders. Majority communities have been unsuccessful in reaching minority communities not because of message as much as the spokesmen who are mostly the wrong color and are generally ignored or play into the leftist message that Republicans are racist because they have no minority leaders. The few Hispanic Republicans leaders seem to be able to make some connection with the Hispanic community (they get elected). A very few black Republicans can connect but they are few and they are ridiculed for being “one percenters” or for being traitors to their race. The leftist message on racism must be countered by pointing out the inherent racism in many leftist programs. Until there are conservative spokesmen for this message on the national stage, there will be no progress in this area. Hire some and the whole dynamic could be changed.

Rule 3 – Whenever possible go outside the experience of the enemy

One of the biggest areas of vulnerability for the left is religion. 76% of the people in America identify as Christian and yet conservatives continually avoid the topic. The left, applying Rule 1, have seemingly convinced conservatives that they have a lot more power than they do. Atheists and secularists make noise and file law suits and have developed a completely false picture of “separation of church and state”. There is no language in the Constitution regarding religion. The First Amendment states that the legislature shall, “make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof”. This says that the government shall not establish a religion, such as in England, nor shall it prohibit the free exercise of religion as the left seeks to do. Thomas Jefferson in a letter in 1802 said, “Believing with you that religion is a matter which lies solely between Man & his God, that he owes account to none other for his faith or his worship, that the legitimate powers of government reach actions only, & not opinions, I contemplate with sovereign reverence that act of the whole American people which declared that their legislature should "make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," thus building a wall of separation between Church & State.” The term “wall of separation” has been taken completely out of context and is promoted by the left as preventing the expression of religion. The left has become rabidly and identifiably anti-Christian. Why do conservatives shy away from this topic? This is an issue that can bring together a broad spectrum of groups across the “haves” to “Have-nots”. It can unite the various communities of Whites, Blacks, Hispanics and others. From 1979 until the late 1980s, the Moral Majority was a potent political force and can be so again. The left should be hammered relentlessly for their anti-Christian bigotry. This takes them well outside of their experience in the best tradition of “organizing”.


Rule 4 – Make the enemy live up to their own book of rules

This should be fertile territory for attacking the left because hypocrisy runs rampant with them. They talk about conservatives being racist. If racism is a problem, how can Obama or anyone in the administration associate with people like Jesse Jackson, Al Sharpton or Jeremiah Wright? If they want to talk about taxes, how can they have a tax cheat as Treasury Secretary, cabinet members who owe taxes and a huge portion of federal employees owing a lot of back taxes? If Ozone Al Gore wants to beat lips about the environment, he should sell his mansion. If the “One percenters” are so evil, how do they associate with the Warren Buffets, George Soros’s and Hollywood people of the world? If they are against drugs, make Obama and others explain their drug use. If Obamacare is good for America, why isn’t it also good for Congress and Obama? If Social Security is sound, why don’t members of Congress participate? Organize the majority, the conservatives of the country, to go after them on these issues. Make them play by their rules.

Rule 5 – Ridicule is man’s most potent weapon

When conservatives debate liberals, their arguments usually employ logic and fact. This seldom wins the day because liberalism is all about emotion and is unresponsive to logic and fact. Liberals seldom have fact on their side of the discussion. The answer, then, is to inject emotion into the debate, inject ridicule and scorn into the discussion. Many conservatives think this is beneath their dignity but what dignity do liberals exhibit? Do we want to be dignified or win the war? It works. Just look at how Obama reacts when he is called out on issues. He starts piling lie upon lie and simply makes matters worse. Get him off script and he is lost. Conservatives need to constantly beat on liberals at all levels with derision and scorn for their failures. These are legion and are not hard to bring into the conversation. Conservatives vastly out number liberals and could take over social media if they were organized to do so. This would not only drive liberals to distraction but deprive them of one of their more effective tools. And what about the press. Call them out when they are blatantly biased and lie or distort facts. The press has a smug and unrealistic view of its “integrity”. Destroy the myth and you destroy the credibility of the liberal press.

Rule 6 – A good tactic is one your people enjoy

Conservatives tend to be way too serious about what they do in politics. Organizing people to action is a serious business but people can enjoy the trip. What is enjoyable depends on which group and where you are talking about. Conservatives do not, as a rule, enjoy “union rally” type events, for example. Great, so have a rally at a shooting range or a golf course. Conservatives do not usually enjoy walking neighborhoods and hanging cards on doors so how about information booths at malls and public areas with some entertainment? Maybe a mailer stuffing wine and cheese party. A collection for postage may be easier than organizing walking groups. Rural areas tend to be pretty conservative so how about a farm show or a kids rodeo to draw people for some speakers? Whatever works, but we have to do something to get people motivated.
Rule 7 – A tactic that drags on too long becomes a drag

A great example of a tactic that dragged on way too long was the “Occupy” movement. Eventually the participants lost interest and the public soured on it. No tactic will last forever. The Republican primary schedule is another example. This gets longer and longer and loses its punch. Many states vie for relevance by wanting to be first or early so they can get candidates but that becomes an economic program by hotels and venues rather than an effective political strategy. Many tactics of limited duration will beat a long drawn out affair for effectiveness any day. Drawn out tactics tend to consume resources far in excess of their value returned.

Rule 8 – Keep the pressure on

Go back and read Rule 8 where Alinsky’s tactics were discussed. By Alinsky’s teaching, agitation must be taken to the point of conflict. The agitator must foment “angers, frustrations and resentments” that will lead to the destabilization and disorganization of the existing structure and allow organization of the new. This takes time and perseverance. Conservatives lose interest too quickly. Time and again, conservatives have had Obama and his troops on the ropes on an issue and then eased up before inflicting maximum damage or winning meaningful change. This is, in part, because conservatives do not view political and social conflict as conflict where there are winners and losers. They tend to act rationally and equitably. They make their reasoned argument and assume that will carry the day. This is probably why Hollywood types and liberal candidates have no fear of taking swipes at conservatives, Americans and Christians before a movie release or an election. They know that there may be initial reaction but that it won’t last. They also know that when conservatives score a telling point on them they needn’t circle the wagons and defend themselves, the point will be dropped shortly before it becomes a problem. That is why Obama so blithely disregards being called out on his many lies and failures. Have you ever seen conservatives push the point until real damage is done or the problem is corrected? The debacle attending the launch of the Obamacare web site should be hammered home as an epic failure of not only the ability of the administration but Obamacare itself. Republicans should be all over why no one has been fired for incompetence, why it took hundreds of millions of dollars to produce a badly flawed site that the administration then said could be fixed in a month (and has not been). It is already disappearing from the discourse, replaced by discussion of how to fix O-care rather than the need to scrap it. The out of control cost of the plans should be a major issue that will scare the daylight out of people but it is receiving little attention. Hammer it home. The opportunities are certainly there. Worse yet, conservatives have allowed the liberals to frame the discussion assuming some form of national healthcare is a given. It should not be. Where is the discussion of why government is in the healthcare business at all? This would be a natural stepping stone to a broader discussion about limiting the role of government but that won’t occur if the discourse is not changed from the liberal agenda.
8a – The premise for tactics is the development of operations that will maintain constant pressure upon the opposition

This is the how-to part of keeping the pressure on. Effective attacks on an enemy cannot be random and disjointed. There has to be a plan and a direction. Tactics are all about conceptualizing a plan of action to achieve a specific goal. Tactics are the organization of forces for a specific goal. Tactics are the coordination of one or more actions to work in concert to achieve a defined goal. Note the words “specific goal”, “conceptual plan”, “organizing forces” and “coordination”. In the political arena, conservatives miss out on most of these and liberals do not. For an effective plan, there has to be a strategist; there has to be a planning body; there has to be leadership to organize; there has to be a coherent command structure to coordinate. Obama was very clear what the liberal strategy is – to fundamentally transform America. The plan is Alinsky’s book, Rules for Radicals. Valerie Jarrett is probably the chief strategist. The Iranian born Jarrett grew up in the same Chicago as Obama and has ties to radicals Bill Ayers and Frank Marshall Davis. Many call her the “shadow president”. In any case, there is effective strategy, planning and coordination in the “transforming of America”. The same is not true on the other side. Republicans seem to use a good portion of their energy and resource beating on each other with no focus on beating democrats as a group. Republicans seem more intent on fighting between the opposite ideological sides of the party than achieving cohesion. They are focused on internal litmus tests of who is and isn’t “conservative enough”, often based on single issues such as immigration, abortion, taxes, financial policy and gay rights. A current example of this self destructive tendency is the budget battle. Republican leadership is more focused on attacking conservatives than on moving the economy in a more conservative direction. The conservative wing is entrenched in an all or nothing stance and unwilling to accept an incremental step. Victory won’t come all at once. It is a step by step, long term process. Liberals do not seem to focus internally on single issues but are willing to accept a great deal as long as the ball is moved inexorable to the left. You seldom hear of one candidate or leader being too far left or not left enough. As long as they are left, it seems to be OK. Consequently they manage to take care of their support base and keep Republicans off balance. They focus pressure on the opposition and not themselves. Republicans badly need leadership and strategy. They need to stay with the attack on liberals and nanny government. They need to keep up the drumbeat that O-Care is a disaster for all involved, that Obama lies, that Hillary Clinton lied about Benghazi and can’t be trusted, that the economy is in shambles despite what the WH says, that the IRS is still illegally targeting conservatives, that the NSA is violating American’s Constitutional rights on a daily basis with the knowing approval of Obama, that the military is being purged of real patriots and the leadership being replaced by Obama yes men and on and on. The strategy might be to show that the democrats are corrupt, incompetent and are destroying America. Whatever it is, there needs to be a plan to attack the enemy unceasingly and an organization in place to do it.
Rule 9 – The threat is usually more terrifying than the thing itself

The liberals believe that they can get away with anything they want and therefore can threaten anything they want with impunity because conservatives will always prepare for a worst case scenario and shy away from any retaliation. This causes conservatives to waste a lot of time and resource preparing for something that will never happen. This works because conservatives are more often part of large organizations and businesses that focus on containing risk rather than winning the war. To use a sports analogy, they go into a “prevent defense” and give up a lot of shorter yardage. What threats might liberal organizations respond to? Getting arrested is a badge of courage. Lawsuits, same thing and it gives their ACLU law team something to do so those are out. How about direct confrontation? They are used to shouting down conservatives, what about turn about on some of their speakers? How about encouraging unions to strike liberal companies or picket their facilities? How about threats of boycotts of the products and services of liberal outfits? How about massive ad campaigns outing fraud and malpractice, particularly as it impacts the middle class and lower class? Create symbols of conservative choosing that the middle and lower classes can identify with. Somehow, they need to know that attacking conservatives is not without a price.

Rule 10 – If you push a negative hard enough and far enough, it will become a positive

In the game of politics, as in life, winning requires being on the offense. Again using a sports analogy, you have to shoot to win. Liberals push negatives until they become positives all the time. For example, they spend infinite time calling conservatives racists, homophobes, woman haters and enemies of the poor. Conservatives then put forth well-reasoned responses about why this isn’t true and say that the liberals may have stretched the truth. Heaven forbid they actually call them liars. The liberals just repeat it ad nauseam until it becomes “common knowledge”. A grand example is the “settled science fraud” of climate change. Being called a liar the first dozen or two times has no effect. Rather than being a negative, the action becomes a positive. Good explanations and reasoned defenses don’t win the game. Attack, attack, attack. There will be times one has to defend but those times should be minimal and well chosen for strategic reasons. The attacks should be part of a tactical plan and a strategy to achieve a definable goal. Targets of opportunity are fine but more effort should be focused on those attacks that will fit together in a coordinated plan for victory.

Rule 11 – The price of a successful attack is a constructive alternative

Conservatives do quite well at offering plans to address problems. Liberals, acting at the emotional more than the rational level, scream and yell about ripping out some part of functioning American society so that they can then install some idealistic, socialistic hodge-podge of “stuff” that they think will shift more power to them or provide more transfer of wealth to their constituency. These plans seldom work. They don’t really care. What they want to achieve is government dependency, ever larger government, centralization of power and transfer of wealth. That they are doing. Look at virtually every plan that the left has ever devised or “fixed”. None work but government is bigger, more people are dependent and more wealth is transferred. Conservatives usually do have a workable plan. The problem is that they need to place themselves in a position to be able to implement the plans.
Attracting liberal failure unceasingly and in a focused manner would certainly help. The Obama “investment” in green energy is a great example of an opportunity for conservatives. Billions of dollars have been literally flushed down the toilet with no results. Who is attacking this waste? Who is winding up the middle and lower class about money being siphoned off for the left’s “One Percenter” buddies? Who has told the middle and lower class that the liberal elites even have a bunch of “One Percenter” buddies? That these are not the unique embodiment of conservatives? Every month or so, another example floats to the top of the cesspool and attracts little attention because it is not connected to previous failures and not shoved in the faces of people it would most upset. What would conservatives have done to produce a better result? Enable private enterprise? No plan, no result.

**Rule 12 – Pick a target, freeze it, personalize it, and polarize it**

This tactic is liberal bread and butter. Polarization is what they seem to do best. According to liberals, conservatives hate blacks, Hispanics, gays, Jews, Muslims, women, the poor, the environment and almost everything else but money and power. It makes a great narrative if you are one of these groups and it certainly sets the conservatives apart from them, makes them easy to regard as the enemy, makes them easy to fight against. The problem is that the narrative isn’t true and, in some instances, just the opposite is true. Sure, conservatives put forth reasoned responses but that is just playing defense and, as we have noted before, that doesn’t win the game. Liberals also have no problem attacking conservatives personally with wildly inaccurate garbage either. Sarah Palin is a good example. She was attacked with vile slander as was her family. While she was defending that, she was not attacking liberals. Mitt Romney was maliciously attacked about his religion and his family business. Many candidates at the state and local level were similarly attacked. Michelle Malkin is regularly slandered. Rush Limbaugh, Bill O’Reilly and Sean Hannity are regularly ridiculed and demonized. In response, conservatives have mounted few issues to really attack that were capable of polarizing the liberals.

Conservatives need to pick in your face issues to go after the liberals, to freeze them and to polarize them. Some obvious candidates are declaring that the Democratic Party has become openly hostile to Christianity. How about declaring that most white liberals are racists? These are, after all, the people who instigated affirmative action because they think blacks can’t compete with whites on an even footing. These are the same people who instituted affirmative action and racial set asides. Liberals want poor Americans to stay poor and dependent on the government because, as long as they are dependent on the government, they will continue to vote Democrat. Conservatives are very hesitant to attack individuals but it needs to be done. Attack Obama on his inattention, on his lies, on his failures on attending an anti-American, anti-white church for 20 years. Attack Eric Holder for Lying about Fast and Furious, refusing to enforce the law and for ignoring Congressional subpoenas. Attack Hillary Clinton on her incompetence, her lies, for her lack of any identifiable achievement and for her failures like Benghazi. Attack Al Gore as a fraud who is profiting mightily from his “sky is falling” nonsense and for being a “One Percenter”. Attack any number of liberals for their many criminal acts that have landed them in jail. Attack Harry Reid for his own obstruction. It just goes on.
Conservatives need to drive home the truth that the Obamaists do not like or care for this country. They see it as a terrible place overrun with Bible and gun clinging hayseeds, racists, greedy capitalists and an ignorant population underserving of their grand vision. They have so far succeeded in convincing some of the masses that this is what America is. If this is your view, why would you not hope for change? The majority of Americans, however, love their country and its values. 70% are Christians with Christian morality. They want to see it succeed. Both they and the Obamaist deluded masses need to know that the Obamaists hold them in utter contempt and that not only will they will not see their dreams come true but they will become servants of the state.

Turning the Alinsky principles against the leftists is one way to begin to take back America but it will take dedication and hard work. Right now, too many people of Christian and conservative views are more inclined to do nothing or “write a check” than to become involved. That is a prescription for suicide.

Chapter 5 - Rules for Patriots

A Conservative group called Freedom Works recently published a document titled “Rules for Patriots”. It contains some very practical instruction for those who love America and are unwilling to surrender it to liberal tyranny. It’s fairly long and detailed but I will try to capture its essence and add some of my own thoughts in a brief sketch.

Rule 1 – Freedom Works

It is true, freedom does work despite what some of our elected leaders seem to think. Freedom, as an organizational principle gives people the opportunity to strive for equal opportunity to succeed to the best of their own abilities and to risk what they will toward a goal they believe in. Note that freedom does not grant equal outcome as leftists advocate. The top down imposition of equality of outcomes never works.

Rule 2 – Freedom’s Right

It is right and just for people to live free lives. This seems a difficult idea for Obamaists and other elected leaders to accept. Free people support the ideas of individual responsibility, economic opportunity and constitutionally limited government, not just because they work but because they are right.

For politicians, politics is a balancing act such that every decision is calculated to win as many or lose as few as possible from each side of any vote or decision to promote getting re-elected. Their objective is to make as many people as possible on both sides of the question either happy or not mad. The problem, of course, is that the policies they implement all too frequently damage the people and society for generations to follow.

What they don’t seem to realize is that good policy is good politics. The measure of success is not, or at least ought not, to be short term political gain or appearances on Sunday morning TV shows. The measure of good policy should be what kind of a nation we pass on to our children.
Rule 3 – Freedom Requires Work

When Wendell Philips said that, “eternal vigilance is the price of liberty”, he wasn’t referring to soldiers or professional political operatives, but to every American. If ordinary, concerned citizens do not take an active and involve role in defending freedom, the elitists, the Obamaites, win. The American Revolution was a grassroots campaign. Samuel Adams said “it does not take a majority to prevail, but rather an irate, tireless minority keen to set brush fires of freedom in the minds of men.” It is somewhat ironic that this is what Alinsky is all about.

Rule 4 – We Win By Building

Ideas matter, but organizations win. Alinsky wrote, “Change comes from power and power comes from organization. In order to act, people must get together.” The Obama cabal has built a group named “Organizing for Action” to promote the Obamaist agenda. Its’ stated goals are to build grassroots organizations, to support the leftist agenda, to train the next generation of grassroots organizers and to organize around local issues. This is pure Alinsky and it works. Patriots need to do the same thing. With equally effective organization, Patriots will win because leftist emotionalism cannot compete with fact and reason. But people must be stirred and the message must get out in a way that it is understood.

Rule 5 – Government Goes to Those Who Show Up

When an elected lawmaker leaves his home district and heads to either a state capital or to Washington DC, he may leave with the values of his constituents in his heart and mind but when he reaches his destination, he is immediately besieged by lobbyists, special interest groups and other organizations all of which seek to influence how that representative votes and sets policy. The old saw says, “Most politicians go to Washington to do good and end up doing well.” Too true.

Patriots need to have a constant presence with their legislators. Be in his office, e-mail him, call his office, send letters, write letters to papers and be sure to see him when he visits his district.

This must be an organized effort. It will not be effective if it is a haphazard and unfocused effort. Patriot groups need to develop communication directors or teams to be sure that their message is being clearly and consistently delivered. The groups need to educate their members about issues so that they may communicate intelligently. Communication needs to be focused, succinct, factual and devoid of emotional rants. It needs to clearly indicate its purpose and what the expectations of its sender are.

Showing up can be time consuming but it is necessary and effective if done right.

Rule 6 – Winning is More Important Than Who Gets Credit

Ronald Reagan once said that, “There is no limit to what can be accomplished if you don’t care who gets credit.” This is an exploitable weakness of the centralized top down leftists. With centralized power comes centralized ego. How often does Obama use the words “I, me, my and mine”? Unfortunately, right now, the Republicans are falling prey to the same disorder. Different factions are jockeying for
position and each is trying to position itself to take credit for successes. The predictable result is few successes. To effectively challenge the leftist Obamaites, Patriots must agree on an overall strategy and direction and each group must then do what it is qualified to do to achieve the objective.

**Rule 7 – Think Like a Revolutionary**

America was born of revolution. Many presume that the revolution began April 19, 1775 at Lexington and Concord or maybe on July 4, 1776 with the Declaration of Independence but the revolution that set the United States on its path to greatness began long before those two events. Maybe the revolution began quietly and politely with the Stamp Act Congress in 1765 or violently with the Boston Massacre of 1770. Maybe it began with the Boston Tea Party in 1773. Regardless of when one perceives the revolution beginning, it was a long and evolving process. Those who began this nation’s first revolution were able to organize citizens, mobilize citizens, identify issues to attack and move citizens to action. Various organizations collaborated with each other to achieve an identified common goal. Coalitions were built. New organizers recruited and trained to expand and continue the effort. This is revolution and this is what must occur now. As the colonists overthrew the oppression of the British monarchy, so must Patriots today overthrow the oppression of an increasingly tyrannical leftist government.

In a previous section on using Alinsky’s rules against leftists, I noted how his principles can be used by Patriots. It will work but not without singleness of purpose, strong leadership and common direction. Organize and Act.

**Rule 8 – Drive the Conversation**

Not only do Patriots need to get their message out, they need to be the ones guiding and directing the conversation. We cannot be in a constant position of responding to the left’s propaganda as we are all too often right now. We need to be the leaders in communication. Sending e-mails and social media messages to fellow believers may pass around thoughts but it does little to convert anyone or change any minds. The conservative message has to be out in public and drown out the leftist drivel.

Traditional media is still the mass media for driving conversation and public opinion. It is easy to say that the media is left biased. It is. But it can be overwhelmed and turned into a conversation driver. Never underestimate the power of the press.

There are basically two types of media; earned and paid. Earned media is the free press exposure an organization gets when media show up to cover events or when it publishes a letter or article. Understand that reporters for the media are hard to control so what is said to them must be carefully presented but it is free and is generally regarded as credible, often undeservedly so. Paid media, advertising, can be expensive and most regard it as less credible than earned media.

There are many ways to garner earned media. Letters to papers and publications is probably the most obvious. Letters can be on current issues or in response to articles or editorials. Be sure to find out what a particular paper or magazine’s rules are for letters. Generally, they should
be short, concise and to the point. Try to limit a given letter to one or maybe two points. One page or 200 words are often the limits. State clearly the letter’s purpose in the opening paragraph, provide facts and then offer a conclusion. Stick to the truth and avoid emotionalism. Ad hominem attacks will not be printed. Have multiple people send letters since most media will not print frequent letters from one individual. Do not use “form letters”. Write original letters.

Some papers and magazines accept op-ed submissions. These are generally 400 – 900 words. Again, state the purpose, develop one or two points, possibly suggest a couple action items and offer a strong conclusion. Make every word count so edit and re-edit. Convoluted logic and big words will not be useful. Op-eds are often accepted from the leaders of groups as representing the group’s position on an issue. It is much harder to get an op-ed published so good contact with the editor and staff is helpful.

Call talk shows and discuss current topics. Don’t be afraid to call shows of differing opinion. Preaching to the choir is easier but gains no new ground. Prominent persons in the organization may have the opportunity to appear in radio or TV programs. See if your community has a public service station that interviews people on various topics or allows the presentation of programs on issues.

Build a media contact list and e-mail or mail information to reporters, writers, editors and producers on a planned basis. Find out who covers local, state and national issues. Call them and introduce yourself and your organization. Meet them for coffee. Invite them to events. You might find a friend. Again, be careful what you say. Don’t make off-hand remarks. Plan what you want to convey. Whatever you say might show up in print and might be taken out of context.

**Rule 9 – Everyone is a Printing Press**

The power of the press is immense. Being able to think, write and rapidly distribute thoughts to a broad population is invaluable.

In today’s world, communication can be nearly instantaneous using social media. Facebook, Twitter and YouTube present infinite possibilities for communication. Just remember that virtually nothing is really private. Assume that whatever you say may eventually find its way to many people you never imagined as an audience. This can be good or bad depending on how careful you are. The Blogosphere is another wide open venue for communication. Blogs exist on virtually any topic you can imagine. Organizations or individuals might consider setting up a blog to disseminate information and draw people into discussion. Participate in other blogs. Just be careful of trolls and provocateurs who try to goad people into saying extreme things to discredit them and their point of view.

**Rule 10 – The Day After the Election is Even More Important**

Local organizations often work very hard to get a person elected to a local, state or national office. When that person is successful in the election effort, the real work only begins. Local organization must now keep the pressure on the elected official and constantly keep their views and desires in front of that person. Remind them how they got elected and who elected them. Unfortunately the
moment they arrive at their office they will be besieged by lobbyists and representatives of special interest groups. Keep up the contact. Many politicians use some sort of multiplier equating one phone call or other contact with so many constituents that feel the same way. Grassroots lobbying is important.

Understand your elected official’s organization. Who has the boss’s ear? Who is the influential policy advisor? Who handles screening communications? Get to know the Chief of Staff, the Legislative Director, Press Officer and others. Learn who can get you an appointment to see the official or get the official to return a phone call. Learn who controls the schedule and can get the official to attend a meeting or event you plan.

Nothing works like a face to face meeting. Set up appointments for members of your organization to sit down with your officials and explain what your organization wants to accomplish and why it is to the official’s benefit to help accomplish the goal or explain your point of view on a contentious issue. Follow up letters are effective. Stay in touch with his staff on issues. Use the services your elected officials can provide.

Remember Rule 5, that government goes to those who show up.

Rule 11 – Leviathan Won’t Go Away

Wish as we might, big government will not go away overnight. It will take years to tear it down. It takes the stroke of a pen to create bureaucracy and, once in place, it does not disappear willingly or easily. Dismantling big government structures will take years of focused and dedicated activity and it won’t happen without doing all the things previously discussed. Decide what you want to attack, keep communicating with your elected officials and vote for people who share the vision of smaller government. See previous discussion on Alinsky’s Rule Number 8, keeping the pressure up.

Rule 12 – Recruit for the Future

The people must come together to take America back from the Obamists who are in the process of trying to destroy it. The conglomeration of special interests, self-serving politicians and socialist ideologues must be stopped as they try to subjugate our individual liberties to government control. This can be stopped by developing a national community of grassroots activists, people who organize locally and affiliate nationally, who will work tirelessly to replace the current cadre of corrupt and leftist officials with people who hold the values of freedom, liberty, the Constitution and individual rights; People who believe in a free economy and small government.

This will only result from unceasing pressure. Remember Alinsky’s Rule No. 8 – Keep the pressure on. Never let up. Change will not happen overnight. It will take massive effort over a period of time. For this to happen, new members must be recruited into the organization to both grow it and to sustain it.

To effectively recruit new members, an organization must have clearly defined goals, resources for recruitment, a continuing recruitment plan and a plan to get new members meaningfully involved from
the outset. Get new members involved in recruiting new members. Recruit across demographics. An
effective organization is like minded but not necessarily all the same. It is not a social club. Don’t drive
people away with long and boring meetings. Use meeting time to learn and to work on action plans.
One very effective recruitment tool is to use all the Alinsky principles to define the enemy and focus
specific actions on that enemy. When people see an organization is active in the community, promoting
an America they want to be part of, they will join the organization. Have an identity and be seen as
active in the effort to take back America.

Rule 13 – Don’t Tread on Me

Every two years a number of new political critters arrive in Washington. Every two years we hear from
these people that they will bring new ways with them. They will stamp out corruption, they will seek
bipartisan effort, they will balance the budget, they will improve the efficiency of government, they will
toss out lobbyists and special interests and that they will change the culture of Washington. Every two
years many Americans fall for this because they want to believe it. It would be the right thing to do.

Every two years, it takes about a week for the same old rot to consume the new arrivals. There seems
to be something in the air of the capital that causes ego and the need for power to grow virulently and
spread like a cancer. The desire for personal power melds with institutional power and the newbies become part of the old power structure that is fed by larger and more intrusive government. The answer to all problems then involves more government meddling and more government control. Beginning the next campaign they day they arrive in the
capital, most politicians work for their own survival rather than the good of their constituents, despite
their press releases. Have you ever heard a politician say something like, “I was elected for one term
and I will do everything I can to clean up the rot even if it means I will never be elected again?” No, it’s
rationalized in all sorts of ways like “it takes several terms before I have the power to change anything
(translated, I want this job for a long time)”, or “I have a diverse constituency and I need to work for
them all (translated, I have no principles but just want to get re-elected)” or “we have to work across the
aisle (which means I’ll compromise my principles to stay in power)” and so on.

Politicians won’t change willingly so we, the people, have to change. We have to stop accepting the idea
that politicians leave their self-interest at the door when elected. We, the people, need to change the
culture of politics. We need to return to the Constitution. We need to eliminate the tyranny of
unelected agencies. We need to get government out of everything except that which it is
constitutionally mandated to do. We need to restore morality to our nation and our government. We
need to restore our educational system to the people and make it cease being a political indoctrination
system for the left. We need to do so many things. We need to organize and attack those things that
are identifiably wrong. Remember what Alinsky said – the price of a successful attack is a constructive
alternative. Our alternative is very clear. It is built on the values that were enunciated at our nation’s
founding, values that honor respect, humility and hard work; Values that build individual respect;
Values that reward effort; Values that truly represent this country as “One Nation, under God”.
This will be a long and difficult struggle but it is one we can win. We cannot win it alone or in small clusters but rather by building large and active organizations that will assert power, attack the enemies of liberty, keep pressure on leftist tyranny, destroy those ideas that oppress liberty and present constructive alternatives. We must protest peacefully but forcefully. We must, as organizations, join to change the culture to take back America. We do this by holding every group of elected officials accountable for their actions, every day, every vote, every election. We can change America. We can regain the nation our forefathers built.

Saul Alinsky may have been a Marxist but he was often right about how to combat that which is wrong.