Preface

This book takes a journey in search of democracy, through an America that Tocqueville and Whitman never knew.[i] It begins in New Orleans in the wake of Katrina, and moves on to the Houston Astrodome, in the days when the hurricane survivors were there. It tours the borderlands of Texas, where hundreds of immigrant shantytowns somehow became habitable neighborhoods. It touches down briefly in Arizona, and then passes through some of the poorest communities in California, before ending in a well-to-do synagogue in Marin County.

In each of these places, we will meet people who want to explain, on the basis of their own experience, what they think citizenship means. Their stories will have much to teach us about the nature and prospects of grassroots democracy. Periodically, in the course of the journey, I will pause long enough to clarify some feature of life in a modern republic: power, authority, domination, freedom, anger, grief, leadership, ideals, values, ends, means, passions, interests, religion, secularity, and the concept of democracy itself.[ii]

There is a lot of talk these days, most notably from the president, about the need for change to come from the bottom up. There is also a good deal of confusion over what this might mean, how it might work, and what it can achieve. To dispel the confusion, we need to look away from the centers of elite power, and ask ordinary citizens what they are actually doing in their own communities to get organized, exert power, and demand accountability.

How do they build an organization? How do they analyze power relations? How do they cultivate leaders? What role does religion play in the organizational process? What objectives are being sought? What concerns, passions, and ideals lie behind those objectives? What have concerned citizens actually achieved and how have they achieved it? What have their setbacks been? Who are their friends and their foes? What obstacles stand in their way? By answering these questions, we can strengthen our grasp on what grassroots democracy is.

We will also need to consider the criticisms that have been raised against it. It is said to place too much faith in the myopic and apathetic masses, to undermine excellence and authority, to pursue unacceptable goals, to employ unfair tactics, and to mix religion and politics inappropriately. These are serious charges. The most important criticism, however, comes from people who think bottom-up change would be a good thing, but doubt that it, or anything else, can cure what currently ails our politics.

Grassroots democrats have had some success at holding local elites accountable: mayors, school superintendents, police chiefs, developers, and so on. But local political struggles disclose problems and structures that transcend the local level. This is one reason for undertaking a journey, instead of a longer stay in one site. All of the stops along the way

are nodes in a single network of cooperating organizations. If grassroots democracy is going to have effects above the local level, it will be because networks of this kind are strengthened, extended, and multiplied. I want to bring this possibility into focus.

Presidents, federal legislators, judges, bureaucrats, Wall Street bankers, insurance executives, media moguls, and generals are making decisions every day that have a massive impact on our lives. Together they wield unprecedented power. The sheer amount of power they exercise is worrisome, even if they aren't carrying out a grand conspiracy. Why think that ordinary citizens can end a war, deal adequately with global warming, achieve a just and wise resolution of the financial crisis, make health care affordable for all, or bring multinational corporations under rational control if the most powerful people in the world dig in their heels? Why suppose that the establishment *can* be held accountable to the rest of us?

Candidate Obama's hopeful answer, born of his own experience as an organizer in Chicago, was that ordinary citizens can indeed "take the country back." His supporters chanted, "Yes we can!" as if trying to convince themselves of their own power. He refers often to the need for "accountability."[iii] Where, then, is the promised accountability going to come from? In the early months of the Obama presidency, accountability remains in short supply.

This thought forces us to confront a widespread doubt about democracy itself, the doubt against which "the audacity of hope" positioned itself, but which the election of Barack Obama has perhaps only put on hold. If our most powerful elites are now essentially beyond the reach of accountability, as they increasingly seem to be, then why suppose that our polity qualifies as a *democratic republic* at all? It appears to function, rather, as a plutocracy, a system in which the fortunate few dominate the rest. And if that is true, then honesty requires that we stop referring to ourselves as *citizens*, and admit that we are really subjects. The question of democratic hope boils down to whether the basic concepts of our political heritage apply to the world in which we now live.

The stories I shall be recounting come from spirited, committed proponents of that heritage.[iv] They think of themselves as citizens, as people entitled to demand a say in their society. Many of them are living under desperate circumstances. The law classifies some of them as illegal aliens. Yet, as Ernesto Cortés Jr., an organizer who will figure prominently in these pages, put it to me, "They do the work of a citizen." They have begun to lay their hands on the levers of power that a constitutional democracy puts at their disposal. They have entered into new relations of authority with one another, and acquired habits and skills they had formerly lacked. Their talents, virtues, and accomplishments are not ordinary at all.

Listening closely while these people describe their struggles, victories, and setbacks brings the ideal of good citizenship down to earth. I want readers to experience something

like what I experienced when talking, face to face, with citizens who believe that democracy's health depends on one-on-one conversations, small-group meetings, critical reflection, and organized action.[v] I also want to explain clearly and precisely what these practices involve and set them in comparative and historical perspective. Contemporary grassroots democracy warrants the sort of respectful examination that is more often accorded to ruling elites and to the democratic heroes of the past.

To imagine the future of our politics in light of these stories is to allow the actual political practice of ordinary people to influence our vision of the politically possible. Saying this is not to prejudge the question of what we can reasonably hope for in politics. Perhaps there are insuperable obstacles preventing us from moving very far at all down the paths these people are treading. The only way to find this out, it seems to me, is to go down those paths and press against whatever obstacles we find there. If the practices of organizing and accountability require modification or expansion, in order to address the daunting problems now threatening democracy, that is itself something that will have to be decided on the basis of experience. It is not the sort of thing one can deduce from a theory.

Blessed are the organized. This is shorthand for the central claim of grassroots democracy. It needs elaboration and qualification. There are good and bad ways of organizing: effective and ineffective ways, democratic and non-democratic ways. Only some of the ways now being tried have any likelihood of promoting the common good and thus any chance of making our communities happy and just places to live. I do not claim that the examples considered here give a full picture of contemporary democratic practice. Many groups of different kinds are needed to achieve a genuinely inclusive republic that is free from domination. We would benefit from books on each kind. But I will try to show that the kind of group examined in this book, the broad-based citizens' organization, has an important contribution to make. I will also try to show how the rest of the political landscape looks from the perspective of such organizations.

Will people who are now meek, weak, and isolated inherit at least some patch of the earth, and establish there a society in which even the most powerful are held accountable in a system of just laws? I am not certain that they will. Neither, however, am I certain that they cannot. It is in the uncertain, broken middle that the hope for democratic accountability manifests itself in the deeds and words of ordinary women and men.

1. The Responsibilities of a Citizen

> [W]ell and wisely trained citizens you will hardly find anywhere.
> -- Thomas More (1516)[vi]

The idea is hardly new that democracy depends for its very survival, as well as for its health, on what citizens do. Montesquieu voiced the idea in *The Spirit of the Laws*, Tocqueville applied it in *Democracy in America*, and Whitman spun it into poetry in *Leaves of Grass.* Of course, the idea gives rise to a worry that has haunted democracy all along, for it has never been obvious that ordinary citizens are up to the weighty task democracy assigns to them.

In an era of economic crisis, globalization, terrorism, and melting ice caps, that task is growing weightier. Yet all too many citizens are too alienated, deluded, ill-informed, or fearful to advance their own interests wisely, let alone sufficiently virtuous to seek the common good. Our elections are, for the most part, exercises in mass manipulation. Candidates declare their allegiance to democratic ideals, but behind the scenes something anti-democratic is going on. Many citizens feel they face a choice between permitting the puppeteers to pull their strings and withdrawing from the process in disgust.

An old adage has it that the cure for democracy's ills is more democracy. The adage assumes that there is a cure for those ills. It implies that the cure is to be found in democratic activity of some kind. But what sort of behavior, if any, could cure what ails democracy today? And why should we think that real-life citizens are capable of such a thing?

It will help to begin by defining some terms. *Citizens* are individuals who have a share of responsibility for the arrangements and policies undertaken by a republic. A *republic* is a polity officially devoted to securing liberty and justice for its citizens. By separating executive, legislative, and judicial powers, and by granting citizens the rights of political participation, republics strive to make it more difficult than it would otherwise be for a single person or group to dominate others.[vii]

Who, then, qualifies as a citizen? An individual counts as a citizen in the formal sense only if he or she is recognized as such under law. The legal system confers the official status of a citizen on individuals. But when the legal category is applied in an arbitrarily narrow way, it can come into conflict with an informal process of mutual recognition among the people. In a broader sense, then, citizens are individuals who treat one another as bearers of the relevant kind of responsibility. To be a citizen, in this sense, is to be

recognized by others as such, or, more strongly, to be worthy of being recognized. The trouble, of course, is that the informal process of recognition is a work in progress and has its own contradictions. The concept of a citizen, like other value-laden notions, is contestable and often, in fact, contested. At any given moment, various people are applying it in somewhat different ways, and either recognizing, or refusing to recognize, certain others as legitimate bearers of responsibility in public life.

Citizens are supposed to be able to fulfill their public responsibility non-violently: by casting ballots, speaking out freely, informing themselves, petitioning for the redress of their grievances, and assembling peaceably into groups. Beyond the affirmation of these rights, a republic is *democratic* insofar as it: (1) removes arbitrary restrictions on who counts as a citizen, (2) opens up sufficient opportunities for citizens to influence and contest official decisions and laws, and (3) is animated by a spirit of mutual recognition and accountability.[viii]

The issue of immigration shows that the ability of the United States to satisfy the first criterion remains in question, despite adoption of the 13th, 15th, 19th, 24th, and 26th Amendments to the Constitution. Aliens currently classified as illegal perform essential labor for us, yet many are exploited in the workplace and live in fear of deportation. They are here because their alternatives are worse. Most of us realize, but few us say openly, that if we faced their dilemma, we would do as they have done. Some of them contribute significantly to the civic life, as well as to the economy, of the United States. They bear civic responsibility while lacking the corresponding form of authority. This means that they are denied representation in the government, a denial that echoes the battle cry of the American War of Independence. Their defenders argue that the category of citizenship is being applied arbitrarily, at the whim of those already represented. The claim, in short, is that illegal aliens lack what our tradition calls liberty – security against domination. If so, then our treatment of them as non-citizens violates one of our basic ideals.[ix]

As for the second criterion, while there are more opportunities than there used to be for citizens to contest and influence official decisions, some of the most powerful people in our society are not in fact being held accountable for actions that have gravely negative effects on many of their fellow citizens. Economic power is accumulating in novel ways, and is increasingly concentrated in the hands of a few. The multinational corporation and the modern banking system are plutocratic in tendency, and have been extraordinarily successful in escaping and undercutting democratic attempts to rein them in. For several decades they have essentially transcended all existing forms of accountability, and even the near collapse of international finance has not decisively changed the drastic imbalance of power in society. So long as economic power is exercised on a global basis, beyond the effective control of nation-states, and translates with ease into political power within nation-states, the existing means for influencing and contesting decisions made on high will seem feeble in comparison.

What, then, about the third criterion? Central to the *spirit* of democracy, as I understand it, is a people's disposition to care about liberty and justice for all and to act in ways that make this concern manifest. Caring involves taking an active interest something, in contrast with being apathetic about it or unconcerned with it.[x] Caring about the goods of liberty and justice for all is manifested in striving for their realization in law and public policy; in joy, relief, or satisfaction when liberty is protected or justice is done; and in anger, grief, or disappointment when these goods are violated. But it also involves a disposition on the part of citizens to hold one another accountable for the condition of the republic and thus to treat one another *as citizens.*

The behavior of the American people has, however, hardly been consistent with concern for liberty and justice for all, and the habits of mutual recognition and accountability seem to have atrophied in most domains of public life. The hopes aroused by the emergence of Barack Obama as a political leader arguably show that many citizens yearn for bottom-up change, but much more than a few electoral victories of this sort will be needed to revive the democratic spirit that once manifested itself in abolitionism, the struggle to win the franchise for women, and the civil rights movement.

Grassroots democracy, the topic of this book, is an evolving collection of practices intended to perfect the exercise of political responsibility by citizens in a republic that officially aspires to be democratic. The central claim of grassroots democrats is that the ideal of liberty and justice for all can be achieved *only*: if the category of a citizen is itself applied non-arbitrarily, if ordinary people cooperate in the responsible and prudent exercise of their rights as citizens, and if they embody a spirit of mutual recognition and accountability in their actions. In other words, only by forming groups of the right kind and behaving wisely, as well as justly, are citizens able to fulfill their public responsibilities and succeed in holding the most powerful members of society accountable.

But this claim brings us back to the age-old worry about democracy. Where are the citizens who can do what grassroots democracy demands of them? There are many books on the behavior of lazy or myopic or easily manipulated citizens, and many more books proposing abstract ideals by which the conduct and character of citizens should be judged and found wanting. There are also some books on what good citizenship used to look like in practice, as recently as the civil rights movement. But there are very few books on present-day citizens who are behaving as grassroots democracy says they ought to behave. Is that because such citizens are few and far between, or because we haven't paid much attention to them?

To see why the lacuna is worth filling, if it can be filled, consider a few analogies. In business schools future executives learn about something called "best practices." The phrase has become trite, but the wisdom behind it is that anyone who wants to run a business had better look closely at enterprises that are already being run well. A steady diet of bad

examples would be dispiriting, as well as misleading. Some businesses succeed. Good examples promise to inspire and instruct. They show us what successful practice looks like, thereby giving us something to aim for.

Coaches, in any team sport, look to successful organizations for clues about how to win. If we want to start a sports team, we assemble it, and in doing so, we understand the value of a good a coach. Ideally this is turns out to be someone who has actually played the sport we want to play, and has accumulated the relevant sort of practical wisdom along the way. Under his or her mentorship, we play the sport, and, with luck, get better at it as we keep playing. The game, our teammates, and the coach alike become our teachers.

This is not, however, how most of us approach politics. When the safety, well being, and freedom of a community are at stake, citizens who are not professional politicians rarely hire a coach, an "organizer," to help them. They do without mentors and good examples. They assemble haphazardly, if at all, giving little thought to building a powerful and skillful team. They spend little time reflecting critically on what they are doing. The likely results are defeat, disappointment, retreat, and, eventually, resignation.

Not all citizens behave in this self-defeating way, however. Thousands of ordinary people gather regularly in living rooms, churches, synagogues, mosques, and schools. They swap stories, identify shared concerns, work through differences, investigate the relevant facts, and select leaders. Over time, with the help of professional organizers, they build powerful organizations. The organizations cultivate leaders, teaching them, among other things, the importance of reflecting critically on what they are doing. When the groups act, they often do so with a well-constructed plan and with considerable effect.

In the southernmost region of Texas a Latino priest brings his parish into a citizens' organization known as Valley Interfaith. His motivation, he tells me, is fidelity to the church's teachings on social justice. Why does he think that something good can come of his efforts? It is because Valley Interfaith has already succeeded in transforming hundreds of impoverished shantytowns along the U.S.-Mexico border into habitable neighborhoods. An organizer is helping him figure out how to energize his parish. The heroes of the shantytown struggle enliven his imagination.

The section of Los Angeles formerly known as South Central is riddled with violence and ethnic tension. Yet in a public school there the principal, the teachers, and some of the parents, with the help of organizers, have constructed an island of civility where children can learn. The principal tells me that citizens of good will are in a life-and-death struggle with gangs over the allegiance of the young. He says that whoever does the best job of organizing, wins.

Near San Francisco, 60 delegates from citizens' organizations in northern California are meeting together for the first time. Among those represented are labor unions and religious institutions of various kinds. In welcoming the delegates, a rabbi says that the

work of a citizen pertains to the preciousness of human beings, to something we ought to hold sacred. The next speaker is a Latina, who represents farm workers in the Napa Valley. Later, a nurse asserts the need to build power. The chief organizer is a nun who tells me that it isn't enough to care about social change; you have to know how to bring it about.

A priest, a principal, a rabbi, a farm worker, a nurse, and a nun: these people and many others like them will be heard from in these pages. They are eager to convey how they go about acquiring and exercising power. Their successes are encouraging. Their frustrations reveal what they are up against, what *we* are up against if we want to hold elites accountable. These ordinary citizens are practicing grassroots democracy and helping each other get the hang of it. Hearing them out is a good way of learning what citizenship can be.

In light of their testimony, we can then consider the gap between grassroots democracy as it is currently practiced at the local level and the large-scale systemic problems that have tilted our national politics in the direction of plutocracy and perpetual war. With that gap clearly in view, we can return to the president who was once a community organizer and ask what his rhetoric actually amounts to.

Our first stop, in the next several chapters, will be New Orleans in the wake of Hurricane Katrina.[xi] One of the organizers there at the time of my visit was Broderick Bagert, who kindly agreed to take me on a tour of the area. Brod had grown up in New Orleans. When the levees broke, he was 29 and for 3 years had been working as an organizer in Houston, where many Katrina survivors were taken. But a month before my visit to the area, he returned to his hometown to work for the Jeremiah Group, a citizens' organization there. The city was still in shambles, and there was much to be done. The lead organizer for Jeremiah is Jackie Jones, an African-American woman who used to be a teacher in New Orleans and had also done her apprenticeship as an organizer in Houston.

Jeremiah, like the other groups I mentioned a moment ago, is an affiliate of the Industrial Areas Foundation (IAF), a network of community organizations founded in 1940 by the legendary Saul Alinsky. Alinsky's mission was to be the kind of mentor to ordinary American citizens that Machiavelli had been to the princes of Renaissance city-states: realistic, pragmatic, and yet dedicated to the ideal of liberty. Alinsky is best known for his work in the Back of the Yards neighborhood of Chicago in the 1930s and in Rochester, N.Y., in the 1960s.

Two of Alinsky's books, *Reveille for Radicals* (1946) and *Rules for Radicals* (1971), vividly describe his experiences and tactics as an organizer.[xii] He fashioned himself as an irreverent radical, but both books express reverence for a tradition whose heroes include Patrick Henry, Sam Adams, Tom Paine, Thomas Jefferson, John Brown, Thaddeus Stevens, Walt Whitman, Henry David Thoreau, Edward Bellamy, and Upton Sinclair (*Reveille,* 13-14; *Rules,* 7). The true democrat, Alinsky insisted, is "suspicious of, and antagonistic to, any idea of plans that work from the top down. Democracy to him is working from the bottom

up" (*Reveille,* 17). The purpose of Alinsky's organizing, and of his writing, was to show ordinary people what bottom-up change involves.

Democracy, in his view, "is a way of life, not a formula to be 'preserved' like jelly" (*Reveille,* 47). Implicit in that way of life is a commitment to liberty and justice for all. These ideals become an ideological fog when they are abstracted from the activities of ordinary people. Liberty and justice are made actual in the lives of people who struggle for them. In the struggle to achieve liberty and justice for all, the "Have-Nots of the world" need to provide a counterweight to the "Haves" (*Rules,* 8, 18-23). Yet they can do this only by gathering in groups and exerting power.

> If we strip away all the chromium trimmings of high-sounding metaphor and idealism which conceal the motor and gears of a democratic society, one basic element is revealed – the people are the motor, the organizations of the people are the gears. The power of the people is transmitted through the gears of their own organizations, and democracy moves forward. (*Reveille,* 46)

Alinsky's books explain how such organizations are built and what they can do to seek democratic objectives by democratic means. By traveling to New Orleans and various other places where IAF groups have formed, I thought I might be able to see what Alinsky's heritage amounts to today.

The groups discussed in this book all belong to a single network supervised by Ernesto Cortés Jr. Around the time *Rules for Radicals* appeared, Ernie had grown frustrated with the organizing he had already been doing as a young man in Texas, and enrolled in Alinsky's Training Institute in Chicago. By that time, however, Alinsky was spending most of his time on the road, giving speeches and raising funds. Within a few months of Ernie's arrival, Alinsky died of a heart attack, and Ed Chambers, Alinsky's successor, became Ernie's mentor. After working on several projects in the Midwest with Chambers and a brief stint of organizing in California, Ernie returned to his home state of Texas in 1973, and began laying the groundwork for citizens' organizations in several major cities there. He is best known for the success of an organization he founded in San Antonio called COPS (Communities Organized for Public Service). He has since organized elsewhere in Texas and in California, and now coordinates IAF organizers in a region that stretches from Mississippi to Idaho to the West coast.

Since Brod's return to New Orleans, a month before my visit, he and Jackie had been conducting a "power analysis" in preparation for a major expansion of Jeremiah that Ernie had urged them to undertake. Before long they hoped to have founded a new, much more inclusive citizens' organization encompassing the entire metropolitan area. The new organization would consist, as Jeremiah does, of churches, synagogues, parent-teacher associations, unions, and other non-governmental groups. Each of these institutions would pay dues to Jeremiah, with the money going mainly to the salaries of the organizers. By

joining the organization, the institutions would also be committing themselves to a great deal of internal organizational activity.

What that activity amounts to will become clearer in the next three chapters and clearer still, I hope, in the remainder of the book. For now, it will suffice to say that the internal organizing now going on in various New Orleans institutions is directed toward two initial objectives. The first is to get people within a given institution talking with each other about their concerns. In the case of a church this would mean hundreds of individual conversations and small gatherings – called "one-on-ones" and "house meetings," respectively – among church members. The second objective is to identify and cultivate leaders from within. These leaders would then represent their institutions in the citizens' organization and in the broader forum of public discussion. Drawing together institutional leaders in this way creates the sort of power base that the citizens' organization can then use to hold governmental and corporate office holders accountable.

[i] In addition to Tocqueville and Whitman, I would cite the lesser-known Harriet Martineau as one of my nineteenth-century models in itinerant public philosophy. All three merged their observations as travelers with reflections on the nature and prospects of democratic life. Behind this modern tradition of political thought stands an ancient etymological connection in Greek between *travel* and *theory,* a connection Tocqueville in particular had very much in mind. See Sheldon S. Wolin, *Tocqueville between Two Worlds: The Making of a Political and Theoretical Life* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 34-36.

[ii] Readers are free to concentrate on the stories and skip the extended reflections. The former are easy to find, because of the prevalence of quotation in them. But I would caution scholarly readers against skipping the stories. The journey undertaken here is not only a movement through actual American terrain, but also a cyclical movement from the concrete to the reflective and back again.

[iii] See candidate Obama's address at the "Take the Country Back" conference in June 2007. The "Yes we can!" chant was first used, I believe, by the United Farm Workers. Many of Obama's campaign speeches made reference to the need to restore accountability. The Obama post-election transition team created something called the "Government Accountability Project." The president's Inaugural Address promised that "those of us who manage the public's dollars will be held to account."

[iv] All quotations in the text that are not accompanied by citations in the notes will be from conversations I have had with organizers and leaders involved in the Southwest network of the Industrial Areas Foundation. Most of those conversations took place in the summer of 2006 and the winter of 2007.

[v] As someone with no ambition to become an ethnographer or any other sort of social scientist, I have benefitted greatly from reading the existing empirical literature on contemporary grassroots democracy. See especially: Stephen Hart, *Cultural Dilemmas of Progressive Politics: Styles of Engagement among Grassroots Activists* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001); Paul Osterman, *Gathering Power: The Future of Progressive Politics in America* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2002); Robert D. Putnam and Lewis M. Feldstein, *Better Together: Restoring the American Community* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2003), chapter 1; Mark R. Warren, *Dry Bones Rattling: Community Building to Revitalize American Democracy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001); and Richard L. Wood, *Faith in Action: Religion, Race, and Democratic Organizing in America* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002).

[vi] Thomas More, *Utopia*, in *The Complete Works of St. Thomas More,* volume 4, edited by Edward Surtz and J. H. Hexter (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965), book I, p. 53. Quoted in *Wolin, Tocqueville*, 36,

[vii] Philip Pettit, *Republicanism: A Theory of Freedom and Government* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), chapters 2 and 3.

[viii] See Pettit, chapter 6.

[ix] See David Bacon, *Illegal People: How Globalization Creates Migration and Criminalizes Immigrants* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2008). Similar arguments arise concerning the political effects of disproportionate incarceration of the African-American population. See James Samuel Logan, *Good Punishment? Christian Moral Practice and U.S. Imprisonment* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 2008), chapters 1 and 2.

[x] Harry Frankfurt, *The Reasons of Love* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004).

[xi] An excellent interactive map of New Orleans prepared by Dan Swenson for the Times Picayune displays the city's layout and details how the storm waters engulfed many of its neighborhoods on August 28, 2005: http://www.nola.com/katrina/graphics/flashflood.swf.

[xii] Saul D. Alinsky, *Reveille for Radicals* (New York: Vintage Books, 1989; originally published 1946); *Rules for Radicals: A Pragmatic Primer for Realistic Radicals* (New York: Vintage Books, 1971). For a biography of Alinsky, see Sanford D. Horwitt, *Let Them Call Me Rebel: Saul Alinsky—His Life and Legacy* (New York: Vintage Books, 1989). For the reflections of latter-day organizers in the Alinsky tradition, see: Edward T. Chambers (with Michael A. Cowan), *Roots for Radicals* (New York: Continuum, 2004) and Michael Gecan, *Going Public: An Organizer's Guide to Citizen Action* (New York: Anchor Books, 2002). For relevant social scientific studies of IAF, see the works by Osterman, Warren, and Putnam and Feldstein cited above. Other works that include illuminating treatments of IAF groups are: Harry C. Boyte, *Community Is Possible: Repairing America's Roots* (New York: Harper, 1984); Romand Coles, *Beyond Gated Politics: Reflections for the Possibility of Democracy* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005), chapter 7; Samuel G. Freeman, *Upon This Rock: The Miracles of a Black Church* (New York: HarperCollins, 1993); William Greider, *Who Will Tell the People? The Betrayal of American Democracy* (New York: Touchstone, 1993), chapter 10; David Harvey, *Spaces of Hope* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2000), 121-130; Alexander von Hoffman, *House by House, Block by Block: The Rebirth of America's Urban Neighborhoods* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003).