

Lan's Corner

Lan...as we will call him/her will be writing some articles here of interest. Our plans are to change them weekly by Sunday night.

I've taken some time in deciding which topic I would use for the first article in the series. I've always been a firm believer in that understanding the other side of an equation is a key step in the resolution process, assuming a resolution can be reached.

In this case I would like to reference an old Alinsky text, Rules for Radicals, and compare it to some of the things we are seeing today.

=====
=====

Saul Alinsky – Rules for Radicals

1. “Power is not only what you have but what the enemy thinks you have.” – I am reminded of the US buildup leading up to the gulf war. In it's early stages we were vastly outnumbered and information was “leaked” to the press that we had ~100k troops at the border when in actuality we only had 10k and would have been unable to defend an all out attack at that point.

More recently I think of the “hard and damning” evidence of collusion we've heard about from the media the past few years. Or war with N Korea and a crashed

stock market are guaranteed if Trump wins. There's no doubt, a weaponized media is definitely a powerful tool.

2. "Never go outside the expertise of your people." – Keep it simple. Make statements that are not able to be, or hard to be, refuted with facts. Make emotional statements. Use strategic wording like "I'm unable to say with certainty that obstruction did not occur". The local DA is unable to say with certainty that I didn't speed today (I didn't), but with this wording guilt is implied and the burden of proof of my innocence is now on me. We know it doesn't work that way, but one of the reasons this process is under attack is it relieves the accuser of all effort, accountability, and knowledge; then places these burdens on the accused.

3. "Whenever possible go outside the expertise of the enemy." – If the enemy relies on facts, argue the hypothetical. Make them defend against baseless accusations that shouldn't even be part of the equation. More on this later in the list.

4. "Make the enemy live up to its own book of rules." – Exploit, plain and simple. If you can challenge a decision that is unfavorable to you, then do it, regardless of the outcome. Don't like a law the state passed, challenge it in court, keep appealing till you get the decision you want or all avenues have been exhausted. Don't like an election result, appeal... sue, do whatever you can to resist. We don't have to look far to see

these tactics in action.

5. "Ridicule is man's most potent

weapon." – This is an easy one. Get your laminated note card of derogatory names to call the opposition and go down the list every chance you get. (You may have already been provided this card depending on your political party preference.) This rule ties in with rules 2 and 3 above, it's easy for all people to follow and challenges your opponent to step out of the real world and into the land of make believe. Religious bigot, racist, xenophobe, orange man bad, etc. Ever heard any of these before just because you had a different opinion from someone else?

6. "A good tactic is one your people

enjoy." – We do not accept the results of the 2016 election, or the voter id law, or the local Sheriff's election. I'm so angry I want to fight, resist, obstruct, do whatever I can to fight "this". The past 2.5 years in a nutshell, ladies and gentlemen.

7. "A tactic that drags on too long becomes

a drag." – I call this the "outrage of the week" strategy. Radical activists love to fight. If you are losing the fight on one stage or it is losing steam, pick a new "assault" topic. It doesn't have to be relevant, they'll be happy as long as they get to fight.

8. "Keep the pressure on." – Russian collusion. A 1 year FBI investigation picked up by Mueller for another 2 years. Three (3)

years. A lot of strategic wording, but at the end of the day, no indictments, and NOT because the accused is a sitting president. Sad the investigator had to be called out to confirm that, but that's this tactic at work and indeed there are still discussions and hearing going on till this day. Kind of reminds me of a certain county's Sheriff's election.

9. "The threat is usually more terrifying than the thing itself." – Another diversionary and pressure tactic. Throw out some what-if's, let the media or an activist groups get their hands on it. It will mushroom way out of proportion. Do not underestimate the ability of imagination to make a mountain out of a mole hill.

10. "If you push a negative hard and deep enough it will break through into its counter-side." – Reactions come to mind here, cause and effect. An official is improperly under attack for an extended period of time and eventually lashes out at their attacker. This response is then viewed in a negative light when the originating cause was in itself, false.

11. "The price of a successful attack is a constructive alternative." – Turn the tables, spin it around.. call it what you will. If you are wrong, do not admit it, deflect, provide alternative scenarios where you aren't wrong, and so on. Example. Hillary will win by 92% (gotta love polls), the market will crash if

Trumps wins, we will go to war with N Korea, Collusion, and so on. Yet has the media been wrong even once? Not according to them.

12. "Pick the target, freeze it, personalize it, and polarize it." – This is the polar opposite of "attack the problem, not the person". Don't debate a policy when you can ridicule the originator. If you debate the policy you will need to delve into facts, and "you" don't want to deal with facts as an activist. Make it emotional, make it personal.

=====
=====

In closing, I hope this article has given some insight into some of the practices in use by the far left today. I challenge you to look for and recognize these rules as you read/watch the news, or engage individuals in conversation.

Until next time. – Lan.