

Confrontational POLITICS

How to Effectively Practice The Politics of Principle

SENATOR H. L. RICHARDSON, RET.



LEADERSHIP INSTITUTE
SPECIAL EDITION

NORDSKOG PUBLISHING, INC.
Ventura, California

STOP EDUCATING AND START ORGANIZING AROUND HOT BUTTONS

A NUMBER of years ago, I was waxing eloquently to an elderly acquaintance about how to pay off our national debt. After listening to my enlightened dissertation, the wise old gentleman threw me a book of wooden matches and said, “Here’s some wood, build me a house.”

I didn’t understand so I dumbly asked, “What do you mean by that?”

He then explained to me that although the matchbox contained the wood ingredients, there wasn’t enough of it to build anything, much less a home. He told me my esoteric “solution” required a complete change in the voting habits held by the majority of Congress. While others might share my illustrious ideas, few of them were elected to office. I had no real, practical plan, just a lot of hot ideas and wild hopes. Unless I could put the wood to my “solution”—including a way to elect a new Congress—my idea was just so much verbal smoke.

He was right. My solution to the national debt problem required a new majority in Congress with legislators committed to cutting the federal budget to the bone. I was expounding esoteric answers when the votes weren’t there to make change occur. I had a goal but no road map, no vehicle, no methodology to get there.

Just about everybody has an “idea” on how to solve the national debt. Cut welfare! Phase out entitlements! Lower taxes! Close loopholes! Change to a flat tax! Up tariff taxes! Raise tobacco taxes! Institute value

added taxes! Reduce the marginal tax rate! Listen to any talk show. The solutions offered are endless, but the only ideas that count are those held by the majority of congressmen and senators. Many who are still in office are the authors of, or voted for, the present tax laws. They have purposefully enlarged the debt. The statutes will remain until the Congress alters its thinking or there is a different Congress, one with sufficient fortitude to withstand the cries of those on the receiving end of government.

It's one thing for a congressional candidate to tell constituents he is willing to cut entitlements, but quite another to tell the mass of recipients who will descend upon his office in Washington. The welfare business will see that the halls of Congress are full of old folks in wheelchairs when the cuts are discussed.

To put it bluntly, ideas count for nothing unless there is a way or will to implement them. To return this country to fiscal sanity will take guts and structure.

The leftists have put wheels under their lousy concepts and have implemented them by the systematic election of their own to public office.

How did they do it? They organize around Marxian class concepts—labor, race, age, etc.,—and seize upon hot class issues. They also form a series of special interest movements. The elitist leadership, working with class interests and special-issue interests forms a series of circles of influence. They then rally their target classes and single-issue interests around their chosen candidate. Knowing that no one special interest group is capable of comprising the majority vote needed to elect, the left combines a number of special interests, each one contributing a percentage to it. Slowly but surely, using this technique, the left has organized and elected their own. The leftist leadership of these separate circles of interest networks with each other, selects one of their own, and elects him. They intentionally keep their special interest membership blissfully ignorant of the overall humanist philosophy of their candidates.

The radical-left hard core is the glue that holds these separate circles of interest together. Rarely, if ever, do the groups' general memberships

come in contact with each other, mainly because of the differences they have regarding key issues. This explains how the teamsters and long-shoremen unions would support the same candidate as the homosexuals and feminists. This is why many of the patriotic, World War II elderly voted for the same candidate as the radical, pot-smoking Viet Nam demonstrators. The information they receive on the candidate's views speaks only to their own self-interest. By pulling together these circles of special interests on Election Day, leftist candidates garner sufficient votes to win.

Through the organization of these special interest groups, the leftist elite develops new cadre members with leadership potential. Properly indoctrinated, they then spin off, forming new circles of interest. From the activities of these special interests, these ad hoc committees, the new political leadership emerges. Once elected, those who have come up through the leftist ranks introduce the appropriate socialist legislation while the special interest staff does the legwork.

Most legislators are not the intellectual authors of their own legislation, nor do they do most of the work to ensure its passage. Key legislative personnel and the staff of the special interests do the details and the lobbying.

The legislator is, more often than not, just the front man, the spokesman, the shill.

The radical left has been doing the above for seventy-plus years.

The conservative opposition, usually active within the Republican Party, has been a loose collection of traditionalists, irritated by the incremental socialist advance, coming together and occasionally winning. When conservative Republicans are elected, there is no plan of positive confrontation, nor any purpose or resolve to dismantle the incumbent bureaucracy. They run headlong into a minority of elected moderate Republicans who have the silly idea they should run the government "better." All the moderate Republicans have accomplished so far is to manage a larger bureaucracy put in place by past leftist legislation and administrations.

Within the past forty years, some conservatives have gotten smart and started to set up their own special interest groups, networking with others and impacting legislative races. Suddenly, the liberals became agitated and disturbed over the emergence of these new organizations, especially the ones with PACs. What was good for the left-wing goose wasn't good for the right-wing gander. The demand for "campaign reform" was raised, invariably hurting the conservatives while leaving relatively intact the resources and power of leftist groups, specifically the unions.

It's a fact of life, and I'll say it again, only a small percentage of Americans participate in the elective process. Voting in the general elections is the most the vast majority will ever do. What does that tell us? It should tell us that conservatives have to organize differently.

Let's theorize that we split the 5 percent of the people who are political activists into two camps—2.5 percent on the left side and 2.5 percent on the right—the socialist activists against the traditionalists. As I've stressed before, the small percentage of leftists, knowing the public disinterest in politics overall, has successfully organized over the last century around Marxian class concepts—forming laborers and government workers into unions, organizing feminists, students, anti-war pacifists, environmentalists, etc.

What are the conservative activists attempting to do? Are they not trying to educate everyone on every issue? Failing to understand that only a small percentage thinks in political abstracts, they use a shotgun approach, thinking they can swell the conservative ranks, the 2.5 percent, into a majority, 50 percent or more. They keep hoping their educational efforts will enlighten enough people for conservatives to win in the political process. They are attempting the impossible, trying to expand the unexpandable, random shotgunning when rifle shooting is what's needed.

We are not in need of another national conservative group or a new party trying to reinvent the conservative wheel, banding together and then falling apart anew, tripping over the same mistakes while trying to educate everyone on all things. We need a knowledgeable hard core

that knows politics, not a groaning band with no realistic goals. We are in need of knowledgeable leadership—forming single-issue structures with good citizens who aren't politically sophisticated, then networking with other leaders to change the political process.

Our strength is in American diversification and individuality.

We don't need one organization focused on everything, but multiple organizations focused on single issues, networking with others at election time, led by confrontationally trained traditional Americans.

The role of our activists must be to identify sensitive, high-intensity issues and provide leadership by forming structures for single-issue-minded people to join. Then, translate that energy into volunteerism and, if possible, professional political action.

The effective combination of multiple "single-issue" groups networking with each other can overpower any combination of those advancing the "class concept" structure. In fact, hot-button topics around which we should and can organize are legion.

With patience and structure, we can cut heavily into the opposition.

One of the advantages of building structure around a given issue is that it is much easier to recruit people into action. Traditionalists need not spend their time trying to convert liberals into conservatives; all they need to do is get single-issue-oriented Americans politically organized. Churchgoers work within the church, gunners organize gunners, businessmen organize businessmen, and young women work with other like-minded women on moral subjects.

The point is, one never has to wander far to be effective. Young parents can gather around educational issues, old folks around fiscal responsibility, farmers around farm issues, veterans around defense—the issues are seemingly endless.

To be effective, we don't have to appear on television debating some slick, greasy-tongued liberal, or go door-to-door handing out literature in some high crime part of town. Provide the money for printing and stamps to mail brochures. Let the post office do the walking. Sponsor, with friends, a neighborhood fund-raiser barbecue in a backyard or put



together a group yard sale. Clean out the garage for good government.

One doesn't have to confront the humanist crowd in person to be effective. There are plenty of ways to be active without directly scarping verbally with the bad guys. There are plenty of single-issue white hats to organize and offer moral, political direction.

The humanists, with a small minority of activists, moved into and now dominate the Democratic Party. They are now working their way into the ranks of the Republicans. Are we so inept that we can't do the same? I think not.

HOW NOT TO LIVE THE PARTY LIFE

THE general public believes the Democrat and the Republican parties are the political leadership of the country. Far from it. In reality, both are better-defined as large social clubs for political groupies, fundraising fronts, and media outlets. In fact, both structures are little more than a means of legally registering to vote and a haven for bit-salary political hacks who squander most dollars given them. Both parties are perennially in debt.

There is no litmus test given upon joining a political party, no loyalty oath, nor commitment to any specific course of action. To register in either party, all you have to be is eighteen and warm. In some states with lax registration laws and laggard enforcement, even being warm isn't a necessity.

Both parties have clubs and party affiliations where a person can join to associate with other political groupies. Some of these party groups endorse in the primaries and serve worthwhile functions. Others are no more than paper structures. Some of the party faithful register voters and turn out votes on election day. Sometimes they even perform this function adequately, but neither party is the driving force behind policy once their choices are elected. Party platforms are blissfully ignored. The Republican Party rarely punishes its officeholders who go astray. The party structures don't even usually select or help candidates in the primaries

and, under some states' laws, are prohibited from doing so. They have to wait until candidate selection is accomplished by sophisticated special interests who have no such restrictions. Political parties are, by nature, eunuchs, incapable of impregnating any worthwhile ideas in anyone. At conventions, they are nothing more than platforms of blather and blab.

On the Democrat side, the people who get the action from officeholders are the special interest leadership. They punish and they reward. Thus, they are listened to. They father candidates in primaries, give them money, and are the real sires of political action.

The labor unions are a leading example of those who know how to inflict pain. With less than 10 percent of the total workforce unionized, they are powerfully influential on all legislative bodies. Their leadership knows how to use their clout and remind politicians with short memories as to where their money, troops, and votes come from.

The homosexuals are another effective political interest. With a very small segment of the population, their high-pitched political voice is loudly heard.

Contrast that with the Christian community, which constitutes vast numbers of citizens. Policy-wise they are largely ignored and often vilified. Until recently, their voices have been barely a soft murmur. Fearing the latent power that exists within the faithful, the left preemptively strikes against members of the religious community, seeking to mute their voices. They have had a surprising degree of success, dissuading many Christians from wandering out of their pews. Most just piously pray and delegate to God all political action. Others are quickly energized to work and vote for a favored politician (or against a disfavored one), and then just as quickly go back to political sleep. Meanwhile the favored, and now safely elected, politician begins the inevitable peer-group shift to the left.

It need not stay this way.

In the early 1920s, the Democrat Party was in disarray, a feeble force in America. The humanists, socialists, communists, and leftist intellectuals abandoned the socialist parties and found ripe pickings in the Democrat

structure. The union movement was a special interest vehicle they seized and controlled. Using the union movement effectively and exploiting the travail that prevailed during the Great Depression, they capitalized on the anguish to consolidate their hold on the Democrat Party.

Slowly but surely, they systematically gained control of party leadership. They focused their attention on the populous northern states. By the early '60s, the radicals had gained a majority of the Democrats in Congress, wresting power away from the more conservative southern Democrats, thereby leveraging the entire Democratic body.

Although they had attained dominance in the Democrat ranks, impacting the one party wasn't enough. Leveraging both parties has always been the goal of the left. The Republicans have been more difficult to dominate since their rank and file have historically been basically conservative, supporters of the status quo with a more affluent membership. Nevertheless, the left has been successful, to a debilitating degree, electing a few "Republicans" who are outright liberals and "moderates," who constantly stand in the way of any attempt to cut back aggressively on the incumbent bureaucracy.

The leftist Republicans are always meekly willing to compromise and give up more ground to the leftist Democrats. But within the Republican caucus, they are extremely aggressive and antagonistic in opposition to the conservatives. The reason is simple: Their ethics and political persuasion are barely distinguishable from those of the Democrat humanists.

The conflict, therefore, is not between Republicans and Democrats; it's between conservatives and liberals—traditional American values adherents against humanists.

Both parties are mere platforms of babble and blab, but one must register in order to vote. Giving one's total loyalty to either party is foolishness. The selection of which party to register in must be a pragmatic choice. Within which party can the conservative do the most good?

At the present time, the Republican structure is where the conservative has the best ability to consolidate control. At present time, the opportunities for leverage are far greater there than in the Democrat Party.

The Republican surge during the 1990s gained control of the U.S. Senate and Congress. Because this control was not wisely used, the control of Congress slipped from their grasp. It is time for the leadership to move into the hands of confrontationally wise, traditional American conservatives. When this is accomplished, the liberal Republicans should be isolated, ignored, and when practical, systematically replaced. This is what the liberal Democrats did to the conservative Democrats. As long as they were useful in maintaining the majority, they were tolerated and, if possible, isolated. But whenever the opportunity arose, the liberal leadership quietly and efficiently replaced them. The liberals never forget it's a numbers game. The one who has the numbers wins.

Party loyalty has its place. It houses the faithful who vote for their party through thick and thin, regardless of the qualifications of the candidate. Each district has its bowlers and they should be identified as an element in every election, since party loyalty is their hot button. In many cases it's not so much that they love their own party but that they hate the other. These rather narrow folks are called "yellow dogs" because they would vote for a yellow dog rather than vote for the other party. This feeling runs very deep in some people, but fortunately, not in most. My great-grandfather, a solid rock Republican, would not permit my grandmother to marry her first love because he was a Democrat. Several of my uncles idolized Franklin D. Roosevelt and wouldn't dream of voting Republican.

This dislike for the opposite party is not uncommon. I ran across it with some regularity while serving in office. The intensity of it in some folks is rather unnerving and sometimes humorous. Once, at a cocktail party, I was introduced to the mother of the host. She was a small prune-faced old lady whose sour countenance was exceeded only by her lack of civility.

"Mama, I'd like you to meet Senator Richardson." The old gal cocked her head, curled her lip and inquired in an acidic tone, "What are ya', Republican or Democrat?"

"I'm a Republican," I responded, turning on my most charming,

never-fail, vote-getting smile.

“I wouldn’t vote fer a Republican if ya’ were the last man on earth,” she spat out while leaning menacingly in my direction.

Not to be intimidated, I continued with my most engaging grin and asked, “If Joe Stalin ran as a Democrat against a moral Republican would you still vote for him?”

Without hesitation she shot back, “You bet I would!”

I knew the hostess was a Christian so I assumed her mother was also. I piously asked her, “What if ole Joe Stalin was running against Saint Paul, a Republican?”

This time she did hesitate, but only to screw up her face, raise one eyebrow to her hairline while dropping the other to her chin. “I’d still vote for Joe,” she venomously enunciated.

I would call that old gal a yellow dog Democrat.

On another occasion, a good pal of mine was seeking a seat in the California state assembly. The district was heavily Democrat. My friend, Gordon Browning, was a sergeant in the Los Angeles police department. While going door-to-door ringing doorbells he was rudely confronted by an obese housefrau, hair up in curlers and still in her housecoat.

“What do you want?” she suspiciously inquired. The screen door was slightly ajar and around her fireplug legs darted a small monkey which quickly attached itself to Gordon’s leg and attempted to bite him through his pants.

Gordon, being one of Los Angeles’s finest, ignored the little varmint and began his pitch. “How do you do, madam, my name is Gordon Browning and I’m running for . . .”

She rudely interrupted, “What are ya’, Republican or Democrat?”

“Well, I’m a Republican.”

Again, using the same old yellow-dog response, “I wouldn’t vote for ya’ if you wuz the last man on earth!”

“That is your prerogative ma’am. It is a free country. But lady, could I ask a favor of you?”

“What’s that?” she suspiciously asked.

“Would you ask your child to let go of my leg?”

In order to show yellow-dogism is not a one-party phenomenon, here is another anecdote. In Vermont, Miss Tillie was the town’s most ardent Republican. For seventy years she had voted the straight party line, never varying one iota from the party of Lincoln. You can imagine the shock when everyone in town learned that Miss Tillie had reregistered as a Democrat. A town meeting was called to discuss this momentous event. All could only guess, but none knew why the past president of the state Republican Women’s Club and perennial delegate to the Republican National Convention would do such a scandalous thing. Finally a committee was formed to ask Miss Tillie why the change of heart. Why did she switch from elephants to donkeys?

The delegation, made up of the leading citizens, phoned for an appointment. Bright and early the next morning, they all were seated in Miss Tillie’s living room, brimming with curiosity. After polite formalities, the mayor summoned the courage to ask the question.

Miss Tillie demurely replied, “Well, last week I was feeling rather poorly so I went to see my doctor. The news was not good, and he told me I had but a few months to live. I figured if I had to go, I’d rather it be one of them instead of one of us.”

Proper polling can identify the yellow dogs in any district. The object is to maximize the turn out of your own bowzers and try not to agitate the canary-colored mongrels on the other side. They are the last people you want receiving the literature of your favorite candidate. It’s better they don’t know a competitive election exists because it tends to galvanize them into action, making Rottweilers out of shaggy, yellow puppies.

Unless there’s a major disaster, comparable to the ’20s, no third party has much of a chance of success. In fact, third parties most of the time only hurt the Republican side. Americans, for close to two centuries, have been comfortable with the two-party system. Disenchanted at times, but still satisfied. Besides, special interests have too much invested in the Democrat Party to switch to another. On the conservative side, the opportunity to control the Republican structure is a reality and within

sight. To abandon that goal for a third party would be a calculated waste of time and money.

Third-party attempts distract primarily from the Republican side, prolonging conservative attempts to be the dominant voice within the Republican structure. Third-party efforts have little impact on the Democrats since their organizational control over the special interests under their umbrella is hardly affected. Third-party efforts are for the unsophisticated and politically gullible, usually those who are new to politics, libertines, and those looking for, and desiring, a fast fix. Sadly, it is also home to some well-intentioned activists who give up after a few failures or ugly incidents within the Republican Party.

One need do no more than objectively study the ineffectiveness of the Perot movement or the machinations of the Libertarians to see their negative impact on the conservative movement. Liberals delight in both movements since they know full well how both Perotites and Libertarians have helped the reelection of many a left-wing Democrat incumbent.

It's worth saying once more—politics is a numbers game. Ignore the numbers, and you lose.

Is a successful third party possible? Yes, when all the circumstances are right. What would be needed is a national calamitous event of disastrous ramifications coupled with outstanding national leadership deserting both political parties. It would take a real shock to jar Americans loose from the present two-party system.

But why should we even bother thinking about third parties?

Conservatives have a good foothold in the Republican ranks. With patience, applied confrontation, and a strong stomach, the traditional American can rule the Republican roost and, in time, perhaps the Democrat roost as well.

How? By establishing structure and understanding confrontation.

It may sound like a contradiction, but the situation will sometimes need to get worse in order to get better.

The leftists are in power positions in education, the media, and the bowels of government. They won't go away easily. They will continue

to promote their programs while thinking up new excuses to socialize America. They have an immense self-interest in protecting the government programs they have created. Of course, they will justify the use of state power to thwart any opposition. Each time they are heavy-handed, they place opportunities before us. A lot of sleepy Americans will be angrily awakened, constituting a powerful body—if we organize them politically.

Purchase this title at NordskogPublishing.com