

*American Resistance*  
Chapter 1: How Did We Get Here?  
Dana R. Fisher

UNEDITED DRAFT, CURRENTLY UNDER PEER REVIEW

**What is the Resistance?**

It's important to start with a clear definition of terms, particularly when a term is relatively new and has been used in many ways. Here is my working definition of the Resistance:

The Resistance is people working individually and through organizations to challenge the Trump Agenda. The Resistance includes people working as individual citizens, through their professions as lawyers, artists, scientists or professional athletes. It also includes organizations that run the gamut in terms of their levels of professionalization: the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), Greenpeace, professional associations like the American Sociological Association, and Indivisible are all playing parts in the Resistance. In addition, the Resistance includes actors within the government itself that are working at multiple scales, including the town, city, state, and federal levels. The oft-discussed violent fringe that has stirred in response to White supremacist activities around the US—the *Antifa*—is also part of the Resistance to the degree that it is focusing specifically on targeting the Trump agenda.

Although there is evidence that the Resistance represents a merging of movements—including Black Lives Matter, Occupy Wall Street, the Women's and Climate Movements—the bonds between these movements and the organizations that coordinate them are fragile.<sup>1</sup> To understand the emergence of the American Resistance, we need to look more broadly at the political context from which it emerged.

Since Donald Trump won the presidential election without winning the popular vote, there has been substantial and continuous protest against the Administration's plans for the United States. Street demonstrations are some of the most visible forms of opposition to the new Administration and its policies. Hundreds of thousands marched in pussy hats on the day after the inauguration; thousands stood in airports to show support for an America that is open to immigrants; tens of

thousands of people marched (some sporting brain hats) to support science; and hundreds of thousands circled the White House to show concern for climate change and the ways the new Administration is quickly undoing all the previous administration's progress toward regulating greenhouse gases.<sup>2</sup> In summer 2017, protest erupted around the US in response to White Supremacists' rallying and the President's response to the violence in Charlottesville, VA. As Americans repeatedly experience moral outrage in reaction to the statements and actions of President Trump, protest continues in America and the American Resistance grows.

At the same time, the Resistance has extended into Congressional districts. Constituents have flooded the town hall meetings of their Congressional members to voice their concerns. Pressure from members of the Resistance has been credited as one of the reasons why the Republican-led Congress has failed to repeal the Affordable Care Act,<sup>3</sup> as well as why the Democrats won in local elections around the US in November 2017.<sup>4</sup> People working within the US government itself have also resisted through rogue social media accounts and data preservation.<sup>5</sup> Even numerous members of Presidential advisory panels have resigned, with the entirety of the Presidential Committee on the Arts and Humanities quitting with an explicit message of resistance.<sup>6</sup> In late August, a US State Department science envoy stepped down from his appointment. The first letters of the paragraphs in his public resignation letter were an acrostic spelling the word "impeach."<sup>7</sup> In other words, the election of Donald Trump has revitalized democracy in America. People are no longer bowling alone,<sup>8</sup> they are marching, yelling, and working together.

Although there have been numerous claims about how the election of Donald Trump will galvanize the progressive movement—spanning issues of race, class, gender, and sexual orientation—little has been written about *how* the progressive movement has come together to form the Resistance.<sup>9</sup> This book documents the American Resistance, focusing on the issues that are mobilizing participants and the tactics they are employing. It concentrates on three specific

components of the American Resistance: Resistance in the Streets, Resistance in the Districts, and Resistance from Within. It concludes with a discussion of what the Resistance means for democracy and politics in the United States. The Resistance is America's response to an out-of-touch Democratic Party, a President who shows no interest in compromise, and the reach of conservative donors' usage of Dark Money. In this chapter, I discuss these three factors and how they have led to the American Resistance we see today, and I provide an overview of the book.

### **The 3Ms of Politics in America and the 2016 Election**

Almost a year after the 2016 election, a majority of post-mortem discussions have focused on problems with the Electoral College, Russian interference with the election, and, of course, FBI head James Comey's focus on Secretary Hillary Clinton's emails.<sup>10</sup> At the same time, there has been varying discussion about what I have called “**the three M's**” of politics in America and how they contributed to the outcome of the 2016 election. They are: 1) the **Man**, 2) the **Message**, and 3) the **Members**.<sup>11</sup>

People who live and work inside-the-Beltway, like the politicians who run campaigns, think tanks, and advocacy groups in Washington, DC, focus much of their attention on the differences between the **men** (in this case, the **man and woman**) who were the candidates for the office. As one might expect given the outcome of the election, there has been a lot of talk about the ways that Hillary Clinton was not a great candidate.<sup>12</sup> It is worth noting that plenty has also been written about how Donald Trump was a less than ideal candidate, with a lot of discussion of his temperament.<sup>13</sup> I have previously discussed the dangers of relying on a charismatic candidate to win elections; it can be problematic for a number of reasons. “Only people with charisma can use it to their advantage, and it is unclear whether elected officials who win by means of charisma have strong political coattails.”<sup>14</sup>

Even though President Barack Obama was a very charismatic leader with a strong message of change who had mobilized a grassroots movement to get himself elected in 2008, his coattails proved to be quite short. During his eight years as President, the Democratic Party lost control of both houses of the US Congress, which is not uncommon. At the same time, the Party lost control of statehouses around the country, which is much less common.<sup>15</sup> As of March 2017, Republicans controlled both chambers of the state legislature in 32 states, whereas Democrats controlled both chambers of the legislature in only 14 states (three states split control and Nebraska is unicameral and nonpartisan).<sup>16</sup> As Dickinson summarizes, the eight-years of the Obama Presidency “papered over the fact that the party was being hollowed out from below. Over Obama's two terms, Democrats ceded 13 governorships to the GOP...Across federal and state government, Democrats have lost close to 1,000 seats. There are only six states where Democrats control both the legislature and the governor's mansion.”<sup>17</sup> Based on these recent trends, some critics have pronounced the Democratic Party to be “in shambles in statehouses across the country.”<sup>18</sup>

At the same time, the difference between the two candidates’ **messages** (and the implications of these differences) in the 2016 election was notable. Although Donald Trump’s success involved a mix of factors, numerous accounts have discussed the ways that the candidate succeeded, in part, by promoting a message that Cox and colleagues have termed “fear of cultural displacement,” which resonated with the white working class.<sup>19</sup> In contrast, the Clinton campaign has been criticized for simplistic messaging focused on the point that a vote for candidate Clinton was a vote *against* Donald Trump.<sup>20</sup>

While there are clear differences between candidates Trump and Clinton and their messages in 2016 and even though the message is important, it is the **members** that matter, for they are the voters: the political base of democracy in America. It is this aspect of politics that is commonly referred to as *the grassroots*. This notion was borne of the idea that politics must be grounded in

everyday citizens who are rooted in their localities. In other words, in contrast to the **man** or **woman** who runs for office and the **message** that his or her political campaign promotes, the **members** are not controllable by the campaign. As much as political consultants focus on the framing of the message and capitalizing on an exceptionally charismatic candidate, it is still the opinions of the citizen base that decide elections.<sup>21</sup>

Barack Obama's 2008 campaign was renowned for its mobilization of grassroots supporters around the country. The campaign "trained some 3000 full time organizers, most of them in their 20's; it organized thousands of local leadership teams...; and it engaged some 1.5 million people in coordinated volunteer activity."<sup>22</sup> It employed an organizing strategy that cultivated the use of information communication technologies in innovative ways.<sup>23</sup> As Melber puts it, the Obama campaign was "the most wired supporter network in American history."<sup>24</sup> In fact, the 2008 campaign to elect Barack Obama President of the United States has been described by many, as a *movement* and proof that the "bottom could prevail over the top."<sup>25</sup>

Even though many people, including me, interpreted the outcome of the 2008 election and the way the campaign connected with its members as a turning point for the Democratic Party,<sup>26</sup> no one predicted that the Party would turn away from this model in future campaigns, relying on easier and less time-intensive options. In the introduction to their book on the Tea Party, in fact, Skocpol and Williamson discuss their attempt to compare Organizing for America<sup>27</sup> to the Tea Party movement after the 2008 election. After the election, "[Organizing for America] was essentially dormant at the grass roots, with phone banking and email alerts proceeding in ways typical of routine party politics."<sup>28</sup> More recently, Sifry has noted how Obama's grassroots army was consolidated inside the Democratic Party.<sup>29</sup> The implications of the decision to embed Organizing for America, which had access to the Obama campaign's 2.2 million members and 13 million email addresses, in the Democratic Party's infrastructure and entrust it to mainstream democratic party

operatives have been extensive. Sifry calls it the “seminal mistake” of the Obama presidency “one that set the tone for the next eight years of dashed hopes, and helped pave the way for Donald Trump to harness the pent-up demand for change Obama had unleashed.”<sup>30</sup>

The immersion of the Obama grassroots efforts inside the Democratic Party also contributed directly to the clash between the Clinton and Sanders’ campaigns that was one of the hallmarks of the 2016 election. In the aftermath of the 2016 election, schisms within the party continued to be visible as the DNC struggled to name its new chair.<sup>31</sup> In many ways, the distinction between the candidates to head the Party were similar to the distinctions between Bernie Sanders and Hillary Clinton during the Presidential elections. One of the main points of contention was the ways that the Party capitalized on the charisma of Barack Obama instead of working to engage its members who had been empowered and engaged during the 2008 campaign. One of the candidates for Party chair—Keith Ellison—noted the overreliance of the Democratic Party on President Obama (the man) and his message: “The tremendous popularity of Barack Obama, his amazing rhetorical skills, his just unparalleled ability to explain things and to inspire people really is the fuel that we lived on. Because of that, we lost a lot.”<sup>32</sup>

Ellison’s candidacy was supported by the more progressive leaders of the Party, including Bernie Sanders, Elizabeth Warren, Chuck Schumer and John Lewis. Nevertheless, he lost his bid to lead the Democratic Party to former Secretary of Labor Tom Perez, who some saw as representing the Party establishment. Overall, the whole process was interpreted as a swipe at the more progressive side of the Party.<sup>33</sup> The outcome of the race to lead the Democratic Party and the friction that has ensued provides clear evidence that the battle within the Party, which includes decisions about how to engage its members, is far from over.<sup>34</sup>

The Resistance was born, in part, to fill the gap left by this fragmented and ineffective Democratic Party. While the Party continues to fight over its future, the Resistance has grown

outside of it.<sup>35</sup> At the same time, the Democratic Party has tried to capitalize on the spirit and momentum of the Resistance to energize itself. In summer 2017, the Democratic Party coordinated *Resistance Summer* to “harness resistance to President Trump in a national effort aimed at building out state and local party ranks.”<sup>36</sup> Given the Democratic Party’s longstanding **member** problem, it makes sense that they would try to build on the Resistance’s momentum. How this process plays out in practice, however, is still unclear. As an article in *Newsweek* reflected, “Party leaders may want to stick to the organizing nuts and bolts—and leave the splashy activism to Resistance groups.”<sup>37</sup>

### *How an Unyielding President Trump Fans the Flames of the Resistance*

While the Resistance builds on some strong progressive social movements, it has also benefited from the moral outrage of Americans who were not previously politically engaged or connected. Since the inauguration of Donald Trump, many have noted how the new President has been a veritable shot in the arm for American democracy.<sup>38</sup> This shift in engagement is quite remarkable particularly given the lull of the eight years of the Obama presidency, which asked very little of Left-leaning Americans beyond voting.<sup>39</sup> Since the election, however, progressives of all stripes have had much to yell about. And they have come out in droves: marching, chanting, and calling their elected officials regarding efforts made by the Trump Administration around a range of progressive issues, including education, the environment, immigration, and healthcare. These high levels of civic engagement are in stark contrast to the disconnect observed in the recent past,<sup>40</sup> but harken back to the good-ole-days noted in earlier observations of the vibrant civic life of Americans.<sup>41</sup>

Among scholars of civic participation and social movements, there is a general level of consensus that social networks—connections to the people you know and organizations with whom you are affiliated—play an important role in mobilizing individuals to participate in all forms of civic activities, from voting to protesting, to participating in organizations.<sup>42</sup> In other words, social

networks between friends and family play a huge role in mobilizing people to participate civically, through social movements or political campaigns; it is the social glue that connects many of us.<sup>43</sup> Although there is agreement that social ties provide much of the impetus to get us to participate, research has found these social ties to be slipping and, as Putnam so famously said, people now bowl alone, not in groups.<sup>44</sup>

To understand the growth of the Resistance, it is important to look also at the ways that disconnected individuals have been found to mobilize. In other words, what gets disconnected non-joiners off their sofas and onto the streets and into town hall meetings? Individuals who are not already connected through social ties to social movements have been found to mobilize when they experience what has come to be known as *moral shocks*: “when an event or situation raises such a sense of outrage in people that they become inclined toward political action, even in the absence of a network of contacts.”<sup>45</sup> President’s Trump utilization of the Congressional Review Act to undo the Obama legacy,<sup>46</sup> his administration of executive orders that include efforts to implement a travel ban, a ban of Transgender people from serving in the US military, and withdrawal of the US from the Paris Agreement on climate change, along with his personal attacks via social media have continually outraged a large proportion of the American public. As a result of these repeated moral shocks, the Resistance has been able to grow through people who were already engaged in progressive politics, as well as those who are new to it.

### *How Dark Money Has Led to the Resistance*

At the same time that the Democratic Party struggles and the President stokes outrage, there is a growing pull of Dark Money in American politics that has contributed to the current political situation in numerous ways. Thanks to the *Citizens United* decision in 2010,<sup>47</sup> companies and individuals can advocate for or against candidates and issues through donations to tax-exempt social

welfare groups [501(c)4s] and, in some cases, super PACs.<sup>48</sup> Donations to these groups fall outside the spotlight of strict disclosure requirements regarding who gives them money and how they spend it, hence the name Dark Money.<sup>49</sup> Although Dark Money donations span the political spectrum—including trade associations, social welfare groups, and unions—the term appears to have narrowed to focus on those funds from individual philanthropists and corporations supporting conservative causes and candidates. In fact, *The New York Times*' editorial board made a direct connection between these funds and the Republican Party's success in the 2014 Mid-term elections with the title of their November 2014 Op-Ed: "Dark Money Helped [the Republicans] Win the Senate."<sup>50</sup>

Since the publication of the book *Dark Money* in January 2016,<sup>51</sup> discussion has narrowed even further to focus on coordinated efforts led by the Koch Brothers in specific federal, state, and local elections and campaigns. One of the most well-known organizations that benefits from these funds—Americans for Prosperity—has been credited with supporting conservative political candidates and blocking numerous progressive initiatives around health care, Medicaid, and climate change. One strategy they employ is to support primary race opponents against incumbents who hold moderate positions on issues related to healthcare and the environment.<sup>52</sup> As the author of the book noted in an interview on NPR, Dark Money is "not just campaign money. It's a full-service operation."<sup>53</sup> Americans for Prosperity, along with a number of other groups actively connected to the Tea Party benefited directly from resources made available through Dark Money.<sup>54</sup> As Williamson and colleagues note, Dark Money has "been crucial to the funding of the Tea Party phenomenon at the national level."<sup>55</sup>

Although most of the critiques of Dark Money have been directed toward the political Right, Dark Money is increasingly common on the Left. One of the most well-known Dark Money contributors on the political Left is Tom Steyer, who has spent millions through Next Gen Climate Action.<sup>56</sup> In the summer before the 2016 election, this organization hired staffers from the Bernie

Sanders Presidential campaign to work on its 2016 efforts.<sup>57</sup> And Steyer is not alone. Many liberal donors, including George Soros and Michael Bloomberg, contributed Dark Money to Super PACs and social welfare groups in attempts to sway the outcome of the 2016 election, although it did not work. In fall 2017, Steyer spent over \$10 million to advertise a campaign to impeach President Trump.<sup>58</sup> These efforts on the political Left *and* Right give a small number of wealthy individuals even more power in the political system; thereby consigning much of the power in our democracy to darkness and shadow.

### *Looking at the American Resistance*

It is within this context—of an out-of-touch Democratic Party, a President who shows no interest in compromise, and the reach of conservative donors' usage of Dark Money—that the Resistance emerged. In the wake of the 2017 election, which was described as a “tsunami” for Democrats,<sup>59</sup> the Resistance must figure out how to keep *individuals*—many of whom are completely new to activism—engaged. To restate the well known and potentially trite adage: this movement is a marathon and not a sprint. For the Resistance to achieve its policy goals, individuals who have participated in protests in the streets must also participate in more sustained activism that employs a diversity of tactics. As we have learned from the Civil Rights Movement,<sup>60</sup> marching in the street on one Saturday (or even one Saturday a month) is not enough to create social change. Diversifying tactics is particularly important given the level of protest that we have seen since the inauguration.<sup>61</sup> As a long-term organizer who has planned large-scale protests in the US since well before the 2016 election said to me in September 2017: “People are sick of marching on Washington.”<sup>62</sup>

At the same time, there are numerous challenges facing the *organizations* that are working to coordinate the efforts of the individuals participating in the Resistance. As we can see by the lists of co-sponsors at some of the biggest marches to date, these events were supported by coalitions of

organizations that run the gamut in terms of their levels of professionalization<sup>63</sup> and the issues that are their main area of focus. The Women's March, for example, included "partners" like the Pussyhat Project, which shared knitting patterns for the infamous pink pussyhats; advocacy groups including the National Organization for Women, Sierra Club, and National Bar Association; as well as unions including the AFL-CIO and SEIU.<sup>64</sup> It is my contention that these groups, which include some unlikely bedfellows with long histories of competition,<sup>65</sup> will need to figure out ways to continue to work together if the Resistance is to be successful. In the Chapters that follow I document the Resistance, focusing on the individuals and organizations that make up this unique movement.

Protests and street demonstrations have been a well-known tactic of progressive political groups in America since the Civil Rights Movement. Although research on social movements has looked at movement-to-movement transmission, research has yet to explore the potentially overlapping motivations of participants who join social protests that are concentrated on one specific issue. **Chapter 2** presents the overlapping motivations of the Resistance in the streets by presenting data collected from surveys of participants at some of the largest protests that have taken place since the inauguration of Donald Trump. It focuses on who is in the streets, what mobilized them, how they are connected, what unifies them, and what threatens to break them apart.

Right after Donald Trump won the 2016 election without winning the popular vote, two former Congressional staffers got together to write a handbook to empower citizens in their communication with their elected officials.<sup>66</sup> The Indivisible Guide, which initially was shared as a GoogleDoc via social media, outlined what its creators called a "Tea Party-Inspired Strategy" for targeting Congresspeople in their districts. Since its release in December 2016, the guide has been rebranded as a movement and its website helps coordinate local groups in every Congressional district in the US. **Chapter 3** documents this Resistance in the districts, focusing on the tactics

outlined in the Indivisible Guide and similar guides that have gained traction in its wake. Since the inauguration, town hall meetings with elected officials have been flooded by constituents around the United States. Constituents have turned out en masse to discuss immigration policy and healthcare reform, among many other issues. In a number of cases, these meetings have overflowed onto the streets and elected officials have even refused to attend.

At the same time that the Resistance has been mobilizing people to march in the streets and yell at their elected officials in town hall meetings, the Resistance has also spread within the US government itself. **Chapter 4** looks at the Resistance from within the government and the many forms it has taken. Amid fears that the Trump Administration would wipe climate-related information from its Websites, scientists working both within and outside the government began guerrilla archiving the environmental data that had been stored on government servers.<sup>67</sup> Right after the inauguration, in response to threats that the Trump Administration would limit information diffusion by its agencies via social media, rogue social media accounts have sprung up, ostensibly representing government employees that disagree with the Trump Administration's agenda. At this point, well over 100 accounts have been created on Twitter to present alternative views from inside the US government. In addition, sub-national entities—including cities and states—have challenged various Trump Administration policies, such as the travel ban and the decision to remove the US from the Paris climate agreement. This chapter documents these various forms of Resistance from within the US government.

The book ends with **Chapter 5**, which discusses the overall effectiveness of the Resistance, synthesizing my discussion of the Resistance in the Streets, Resistance in the Districts, and Resistance from Within. It explores where the Resistance is going and the challenges it will face along the way. In particular, the chapter will consider the tensions among factions of the progressive coalition that I have already outlined in this chapter. The chapter ends by outlining what

to expect in the 2018 election and what the outcome of the election will mean for the Resistance and this resurgence of democratic participation in America.

## Endnotes

<sup>1</sup> For a discussion of challenges stemming from the merging of movements, see Dana R. Fisher, “COP-15 in Copenhagen: How the Merging of Movements Left Civil Society out in the Cold,” *Global Environmental Politics* 10, no. 2 (2010): 11–17.

<sup>2</sup> These examples are not meant to be exhaustive.

<sup>3</sup> See <https://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2017/8/10/16107458/obamacare-repeal-fight-left> and <https://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2017/7/20/16000752/health-resistance-gop-senators> (accessed 16 October 2017).

<sup>4</sup> Brent Budowsky, “Trump Resistance Wins Tsunami Elections in 2017,” *The Hill*, November 8, 2017, <http://thehill.com/opinion/campaign/359344-trump-resistance-wins-tsunami-elections-in-2017>.

<sup>5</sup> [https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2016/12/13/scientists-are-frantically-copying-u-s-climate-data-fearing-it-might-vanish-under-trump/?utm\\_term=.855dde10750a](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2016/12/13/scientists-are-frantically-copying-u-s-climate-data-fearing-it-might-vanish-under-trump/?utm_term=.855dde10750a)

<sup>6</sup> Aja Romano, “The President’s Committee on the Arts and Humanities Resigns, Urging Resistance against Trump,” *Vox*, August 18, 2017, <https://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2017/8/18/16169980/arts-and-humanities-committee-resigns-trump-resist>.

<sup>7</sup> Amy B. Wang, “Trump’s Science Envoy Quits in Scathing Letter with an Embedded Message: I-M-P-E-A-C-H,” *Washington Post*, August 23, 2017, sec. Speaking of Science, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/speaking-of-science/wp/2017/08/23/trumps-science-envoy-quits-with-scathing-letter-with-an-embedded-message-i-m-p-e-a-c-h/>.

<sup>8</sup> Robert D. Putnam, *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*, 1st edition (New York, NY: Touchstone Books by Simon & Schuster, 2001).

<sup>9</sup> But see Dana R. Fisher, Dawn M. Dow, and Rashawn Ray, “Intersectionality Takes It to the Streets: Mobilizing across Diverse Interests for the Women’s March,” *Science Advances* 3, no. 9 (September 1, 2017): eaao1390, <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aao1390>; Michael T. Heaney, “Activism in an Era of Partisan Polarization,” *PS: Political Science & Politics* 50, no. 4 (October 2017): 1000–1003, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096517001159>.

<sup>10</sup> For overviews, see Vanessa Williamson and Carly Knight, “Choose Your Own Election Post-Mortem: Part 1,” *Brookings* (blog), November 16, 2016, <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/fixgov/2016/11/16/choose-your-own-post-mortem-part-1/>; Nate Silver, “The Real Story Of 2016,” *FiveThirtyEight* (blog), January 19, 2017, <https://fivethirtyeight.com/features/the-real-story-of-2016/>; Zeke J. Miller and Philip Elliott, “Clinton and Trump Aides Clash at Campaign Manager Conference,” *Time*, December 2, 2016, <http://time.com/4588449/campaign-managers-conference-2016-election/>.

<sup>11</sup> Dana R. Fisher, *Activism, Inc.: How the Outsourcing of Grassroots Campaigns Is Strangling Progressive Politics in America*, 1 edition (Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press, 2006).

<sup>12</sup> For a review, see Williamson and Knight, “Choose Your Own Election Post-Mortem.”

<sup>13</sup> See for example Drake Baer, “What Is ‘Presidential Temperament,’ Anyway?,” *Science of Us*, August 2, 2016, <http://nymag.com/scienceofus/2016/10/what-presidential-temperament-really-is.html>.

<sup>14</sup> Fisher, *Activism, Inc.* pp 15-16.

<sup>15</sup> See discussion in Lester Spence, “Make Sure It Includes Everyone,” *Democracy Journal* spring, no. 44 (April 1, 2017), <https://democracyjournal.org/magazine/44/make-sure-it-includes-everyone/>.

<sup>16</sup> For details, see <http://www.ncsl.org/research/about-state-legislatures/partisan-composition.aspx> (Accessed 17 October 2017).

- 
- <sup>17</sup> Tim Dickinson, “Can Democrats Fix the Party?,” *Rolling Stone*, June 12, 2017, <http://www.rollingstone.com/politics/features/can-democrats-fix-the-party-w487160>; See also Michael Tomasky, “The Resistance So Far,” *The New York Review of Books*, November 9, 2017, <http://www.nybooks.com/articles/2017/11/09/the-resistance-so-far/>; For a discussion of the 2017 elections, see Matthew Bloch and Jasmine Lee, “Election Results: Murphy Wins New Jersey Governor Race,” *The New York Times*, sec. U.S., accessed November 8, 2017, <https://www.nytimes.com/elections/results/new-jersey-general-elections>.
- <sup>18</sup> Clio Chang, “The Case for Tom Perez Makes No Sense,” *The New Republic*, February 23, 2017, <https://newrepublic.com/article/140847/case-tom-perez-makes-no-sense>.
- <sup>19</sup> Daniel Cox, Rachel Lienesch, and Robert P Jones, “Beyond Economics: Fears of Cultural Displacement Pushed the White Working Class to Trump | PRRI/The Atlantic Report,” PRRI/The Atlantic Report, May 9, 2017, <https://www.prrri.org/research/white-working-class-attitudes-economy-trade-immigration-election-donald-trump/>.
- <sup>20</sup> Jonathan Capehart, “Opinion | Tom Perez on Why the Democratic Party Needs a Dramatic Culture Shift,” *Washington Post*, February 14, 2017, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/post-partisan/wp/2017/02/14/tom-perez-on-why-the-democratic-party-needs-a-dramatic-culture-shift/>.
- <sup>21</sup> But see Ari Berman, “Yes, the Election Was Rigged. Here’s the Proof.,” *Mother Jones*, December 2017, <http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2017/10/voter-suppression-wisconsin-election-2016/> for an overview of voter suppression in the 2016 election.
- <sup>22</sup> Marshall Ganz, “Organizing Obama: Campaign, Organizing, Movement.” (Meetings of the American Sociological Association, San Francisco, CA., 2009), 1; See also Elizabeth McKenna, Hahrie Han, and Jeremy Bird, *Groundbreakers: How Obama’s 2.2 Million Volunteers Transformed Campaigning in America*, 1 edition (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2015).
- <sup>23</sup> Hindman M. 2008. Not the Digital Democracy We Ordered. Paper prepared for Harvard Berkman Center Conference on Internet and Politics 2008: Moving People, Moving Ideas. December. Available at: <http://publius.cc/2008/12/09/not-the-digital-democracy-we-ordered> (Accessed 16 October 2017).
- <sup>24</sup> Ari Melber. 2010. “Year One of Organizing for America: The Permanent Field Campaign in a Digital Age.” *techPresident Special Report*. January. Available at: [www.techpresident.com/ofayear1](http://www.techpresident.com/ofayear1); page 4.
- <sup>25</sup> Ari Berman, *Herding Donkeys: The Fight to Rebuild the Democratic Party and Reshape American Politics*, Reprint edition (New York: Picador, 2012), 8; see also Ganz, “Organizing Obama: Campaign, Organizing, Movement.”; McKenna, Han, and Bird, *Groundbreakers*; Micah L. Sifry, “Obama’s Lost Army,” *The New Republic*, February 9, 2017, <https://newrepublic.com/article/140245/obamas-lost-army-inside-fall-grassroots-machine>.
- <sup>26</sup> Dana R. Fisher, “Youth Political Participation: Bridging Activism and Electoral Politics,” *Annual Review of Sociology* 38 (2012): 119–137; McKenna, Han, and Bird, *Groundbreakers*; Berman, *Herding Donkeys*.
- <sup>27</sup> Organizing for America was renamed Organizing for Action after the 2012 election. For a discussion, see “Grass-Roots Group Born Of Obama Campaign Now Helps Push His Causes,” *NPR.Org*, accessed October 19, 2017, <http://www.npr.org/2016/04/15/474303205/grassroots-group-born-of-obama-campaign-now-helps-push-his-causes>.
- <sup>28</sup> Theda Skocpol and Vanessa Williamson, *The Tea Party and the Remaking of Republican Conservatism* (Oxford University Press, USA, 2012) page X.
- <sup>29</sup> Sifry, “Obama’s Lost Army”; see also Tim Dickinson, “No We Can’t,” *Rolling Stone*, February 2, 2010, <http://www.rollingstone.com/politics/news/no-we-cant-20100202>; Skocpol and Williamson, *The Tea Party and the Remaking of Republican Conservatism*.

- 
- <sup>30</sup> Sifry, “Obama’s Lost Army”; It is likely that issues raised by Donna Brazile, *Hacks: The Inside Story of the Break-Ins and Breakdowns That Put Donald Trump in the White House*, Unabridged edition (New York, NY: Hachette Books, 2017) also contributed to the outcome of the 2016 election.
- <sup>31</sup> David Weigel, “Thomas Perez Elected the First Latino Leader of Democratic Party,” *Washington Post*, February 25, 2017, [https://www.washingtonpost.com/powerpost/tom-perez-elected-as-first-latino-leader-of-democratic-party/2017/02/25/1fd76f52-fad7-11e6-9845-576c69081518\\_story.html](https://www.washingtonpost.com/powerpost/tom-perez-elected-as-first-latino-leader-of-democratic-party/2017/02/25/1fd76f52-fad7-11e6-9845-576c69081518_story.html).
- <sup>32</sup> Ezra Klein, “Keith Ellison on His DNC Vision, the Democrats’ down-Ballot Collapse, and Identity Politics,” *Vox*, January 19, 2017, <https://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2017/1/19/14322998/keith-ellison-dnc-ezra-klein>.
- <sup>33</sup> Chang, “The Case for Tom Perez Makes No Sense.”
- <sup>34</sup> For an account of recent incarnations, see e.g. Olivia Beavers, “Longtime DNC Officials Frustrated with Delegate Shake-Up,” *TheHill*, October 19, 2017, <http://thehill.com/blogs/blog-briefing-room/news/356176-longtime-dnc-officials-ousted-in-shakeup>; see also Brazile, *Hacks*.
- <sup>35</sup> Tim Dickinson, “How Progressive Activists Are Leading the Trump Resistance,” *Rolling Stone*, August 24, 2017, <http://www.rollingstone.com/politics/features/how-progressive-activists-are-leading-the-trump-resistance-w499221>.
- <sup>36</sup> Ben Kamisar, “Dems Launch ‘Resistance Summer,’” *TheHill*, May 16, 2017, <http://thehill.com/homenews/campaign/333682-dems-launch-resistance-summer>.
- <sup>37</sup> Emily Cadei, “The DNC Is Trying to Join the #Resistance. Will Activists Allow It?,” *Newsweek*, June 3, 2017, <http://www.newsweek.com/dnc-democrats-trump-resistance-620173>.
- <sup>38</sup> Dana R Fisher, Dawn M. Dow, and Rashawn Ray, “The Demographics of the #resistance,” *Salon*, June 3, 2017, [https://www.salon.com/2017/06/03/the-demographics-of-the-resistance\\_partner/](https://www.salon.com/2017/06/03/the-demographics-of-the-resistance_partner/); Eric Liu, “How Donald Trump Is Reviving American Democracy,” *The Atlantic*, March 8, 2017, <https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2017/03/how-donald-trump-is-reviving-our-democracy/518928/>.
- <sup>39</sup> Skocpol and Williamson, *The Tea Party and the Remaking of Republican Conservatism*.
- <sup>40</sup> Bellah, Robert N., Richard Madsen, William M. Sullivan, Ann Swidler, and Steven M. Tipton. 1996. *Habits of the heart : individualism and commitment in American life : updated edition with a new introduction*. Berkeley: University of California Press. Putnam, *Bowling Alone*. Theda Skocpol, *Diminished Democracy: From Membership to Management in American Civic Life* (University of Oklahoma Press, 2013).
- <sup>41</sup> See particularly Tocqueville, Alexis de. 1966. *Democracy in America*. New Rochelle, N.Y.: Arlington House. Almond, Gabriel Abraham and Sidney Verba. 1963. *The civic culture; political attitudes and democracy in five nations*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press. For more recent comparisons, see Ladd, Everett Carl. 1999. *The Ladd report*. New York: Free Press, Schofer, E. and M. Fourcade-Gourinchas. 2001. "The structural contexts of civic engagement: Voluntary association membership in comparative perspective." *American Sociological Review* 66:806-828, Schofer, Evan and Wesley Longhofer. 2011. "The Structural Sources of Association." *American Journal of Sociology* 117(2):539–85.
- <sup>42</sup> Yongren Shi et al., “A Member Saved Is a Member Earned? The Recruitment-Retention Trade-Off and Organizational Strategies for Membership Growth,” *American Sociological Review* 82, no. 2 (April 1, 2017): 407–34, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122417693616>; Doug McAdam and Ronnelle Paulsen, “Specifying the Relationship Between Social Ties and Activism,” *American Journal of Sociology* 99, no. 3 (1993): 640–67; Hahrie Han, “The Organizational Roots of Political Activism: Field Experiments on Creating a Relational Context,” *American Political Science Review* 110, no. 2 (May 2016): 296–307, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S000305541600006X>; Sidney Verba, Kay Lehman Schlozman, and Henry E. Brady, *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics* (Harvard University Press, 1995).

---

<sup>43</sup> Mario Luis Small, *Someone to Talk To* (Oxford University Press, 2017); For a discussion of diversity and social capital, see Maria Abascal and Delia Baldassarri, “Love Thy Neighbor? Ethnoracial Diversity and Trust Reexamined,” *American Journal of Sociology* 121, no. 3 (2015): 722–82, <https://doi.org/10.1086/683144>.

<sup>44</sup> Putnam, *Bowling Alone*; see also Miller McPherson, Lynn Smith-Lovin, and Matthew E. Brashears, “Social Isolation in America: Changes in Core Discussion Networks over Two Decades,” *American Sociological Review* 71, no. 3 (June 1, 2006): 353–75, <https://doi.org/10.1177/000312240607100301>.

<sup>45</sup> James M. Jasper and Jane D. Poulsen, “Recruiting Strangers and Friends: Moral Shocks and Social Networks in Animal Rights and Anti-Nuclear Protests,” *Social Problems* 42, no. 4 (1995): 498, <https://doi.org/10.2307/3097043>; see also James M. Jasper, *The Art of Moral Protest: Culture, Biography, and Creativity in Social Movements* (University of Chicago Press, 1997).

<sup>46</sup> Michael Grunwald, “Trump’s Secret Weapon Against Obama’s Legacy - POLITICO Magazine,” *Politico*, April 10, 2017, <https://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2017/04/donald-trump-obama-legacy-215009>.

<sup>47</sup> “Citizens United v. Federal Election Comm’n 558 U.S. 310 (2010),” Justia Law, accessed October 18, 2017, <https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/558/310/>.

<sup>48</sup> <https://www.opensecrets.org/dark-money/dark-money-basics.php>

<sup>49</sup> <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-fix/wp/2015/01/21/how-citizens-united-is-and-isnt-to-blame-for-the-dark-money-president-obama-hates-so-much/>

<sup>50</sup> [http://www.nytimes.com/2014/11/09/opinion/sunday/dark-money-helped-win-the-senate.html?\\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2014/11/09/opinion/sunday/dark-money-helped-win-the-senate.html?_r=0)

<sup>51</sup> <http://www.penguinrandomhouse.com/books/215462/dark-money-by-jane-mayer/9780385535595/>

<sup>52</sup> This list is not meant to be exhaustive; Elena Schneider, “Koch-Backed Group Targets First GOP Incumbent in Primary,” *POLITICO*, May 12, 2016, <https://www.politico.com/story/2016/05/koch-group-targets-renee-ellmers-223124>.

<sup>53</sup> <http://www.npr.org/2016/01/19/463551038/dark-money-delves-into-how-koch-brothers-donations-push-their-political-agenda>

<sup>54</sup> Vanessa Williamson, Theda Skocpol, and John Coggin, “The Tea Party and the Remaking of Republican Conservatism,” *Perspectives on Politics* 9, no. 1 (2011): 25–43.

<sup>55</sup> Williamson, Skocpol, and Coggin, 29.

<sup>56</sup>

<http://www.opensecrets.org/outsidespending/summ.php?cycle=2016&disp=D&type=V&superonly=N>

<sup>57</sup> <http://www.politico.com/story/2016/06/hillary-clinton-millennials-young-voters-224507>

<sup>58</sup> Katy Steinmetz, “This California Billionaire Is Spending Millions to Impeach Trump,” *Time*, October 27, 2017, <http://time.com/5001180/donald-trump-impeachment-tom-steyer/>.

<sup>59</sup> Budowsky, “Trump Resistance Wins Tsunami Elections in 2017.”

<sup>60</sup> See particularly Aldon D. Morris, *The Origins of the Civil Rights Movement: Black Communities Organizing for Change*, 1st Free Press Pbk. Ed edition (New York: Free Press, 1986); Doug McAdam, *Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency, 1930-1970, 2nd Edition*, 2nd edition (Chicago: The University Of Chicago Press, 1999).

<sup>61</sup> Wikipedia maintains a growing list of events at:

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Protests\\_against\\_Donald\\_Trump](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Protests_against_Donald_Trump) (accessed 18 October 2017).

<sup>62</sup> Personal communication with author, 27 September 2017.

<sup>63</sup> For a full discussion, see Suzanne Staggenborg, “The Consequences of Professionalization and Formalization in the Pro-Choice Movement,” *American Sociological Review* 53, no. 4 (1988): 585–605, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2095851>.

---

<sup>64</sup> For a full list, see <https://www.womensmarch.com/partners> (Accessed 18 October 2017).

<sup>65</sup> See Kenneth P. Vogel, “The ‘Resistance,’ Raising Big Money, Upends Liberal Politics,” *The New York Times*, October 7, 2017, sec. Politics, <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/10/07/us/politics/democrats-resistance-fundraising.html> for discussion of these tensions within the Resistance.

<sup>66</sup> For a full discussion, see <https://www.indivisibleguide.com/about-us/>

<sup>67</sup> [https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2016/12/13/scientists-are-frantically-copying-u-s-climate-data-fearing-it-might-vanish-under-trump/?utm\\_term=.855dde10750a](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2016/12/13/scientists-are-frantically-copying-u-s-climate-data-fearing-it-might-vanish-under-trump/?utm_term=.855dde10750a)