

American Resistance
Chapter 3: From the Streets to the Districts
Dana R. Fisher

In July 2018, organizers from the March for Science held a summit in Chicago to advance their goals of “turning a March into a Movement.”¹ While the summit was filled with discussions of science advocacy, science communication, and community organizing, the opening remarks at the event literally began with a reminder from the organizers about the upcoming midterm elections. Stressing the importance of participating in the political system, the first plenary session began with one of the organizers encouraging everyone in the audience to register to vote. She directed them to an app designed specifically to register conference participants to vote with the hashtag #VoteForScience. The app which connects to a website that explains “Vote for Science is the next step for science advocacy: securing the long-term future of science policy by linking science support with civic behavior. It’s time to create a direct connection between science supporters and our policymakers to strengthen science’s voice in policy and politics.”² Although somewhat surprising for a conference focused on science and science activism to begin its event with a nonpartisan plug for engaging in electoral politics, such a focus is not unique to the organizers of the March for Science. In fact, across all of the groups that have organized marches since the inauguration of Donald Trump in January 2017, there is a clear focus on electoral politics generally and the 2018 midterm elections in particular.

Moreover, this glimpse into the meeting of organizers of the Resistance provides evidence that this movement has become a site of interaction between electoral politics and social movements. Although it is not specifically pushing the agenda of the Democratic Party, in the current political climate, most progressive Americans see no other option besides the Democrats (many recognize that choosing to opt out of elections did not accomplish the desired outcome in

2016). Although engaging in electoral politics is not common for social movements, research has highlighted recent examples and the varying successes of these efforts.³

This chapter focuses on how participants in the Resistance in the streets are taking aim at electoral politics with their activism extending back into the Congressional districts and communities where they live and work. As chapter 2 described, people who are participating in the Resistance—resisters—have marched for a range of progressive issues—from Women’s Rights to Gun Control. Across all events and issues, protesters have reported doing much more than just marching in the streets. The finding is particularly interesting given that almost a third (31%) of all of the participants in the Resistance in the streets reported being completely new to protest when they were surveyed at these protest events.

The rising number of new people participating in protest has also been chronicled by national surveys of the American population. For example, in the 2014 General Social Survey, less than 10% of the population reported participating in a rally or demonstration in the past year.⁴ Four years later in April 2018, a poll by the *Washington Post* found that 20% of Americans had participated in a protest in the past two years.⁵ This increase is consistent with the expectations of Caren and colleagues whose research looks at trends in political participation in what they call a “social movement generation.” The authors note that changes in more confrontational forms of political action, like protest, are “likely to happen suddenly during periods of political unrest.”⁶ In many ways, my findings from data collected in the streets show how President Trump and his administration have motivated a period of political unrest that has led to recurrent marching in the streets that is one of the hallmarks of the American Resistance.

Here, I present data about what participants in the Resistance were doing 6 months before the midterm elections, in terms of what they consider to be the top issues facing our country, how they believe these problems can be solved, and the ways they are working with organizations to

affect social change. This chapter is based on findings from a follow-up survey with the participants in the Resistance in the streets and is separated into three sections. First, I briefly describe the follow-up survey that serves as the basis for the findings presented here. Second, I discuss what respondents stated were the most important issues facing the US and what are the best solutions to these problems. Third, I look at how they were working with organizations that are aiming to harness the energy of the American Resistance to make change in communities and Congressional districts leading up to the midterm elections.

Following Up with the Resisters in the Streets

Fielded 6 months before the 2018 midterm elections, the survey was administered in May 2018 to everyone who had been surveyed in the streets up to that point (so, everyone who had been surveyed at the 2017 Women's March through the 2018 March for Our Lives). The survey was distributed to anyone who had indicated on the initial survey that they were willing to participate in a follow-up and provided contact information.⁷ Data were collected through the online survey system, *Qualtrics*.⁸ The follow-up survey was fielded for three weeks starting on May 7. During that time, multiple prompts and reminders were sent. In the end, 217 people participated in the follow-up survey, representing a 28.7% response rate.⁹

There was some variation in response rates based on when the respondent was initially surveyed, with the older marches yielding a lower response rate than the more recent events. Follow-up response rates ranged from 18% for people surveyed at the 2017 Women's March to 44% for people surveyed at the 2018 Women's March. These varying rates are consistent with my previous work that employs follow-up surveys with protesters. Response rates tend to be lower the longer the gap between initial contact and the follow-up request.¹⁰ Even with these differences in response rate, the follow-up sample is relatively similar to the full sample of participants in the

Resistance in the streets: there are no statistically significant differences in gender, race, or political ideology. In other words, just like the original data collected in the streets, the follow-up sample is more female, more white, and more politically progressive than the general population. However, the follow-up participants are more educated than the overall sample and are less likely to be first-time protesters. It is important to keep these differences in mind as I present the findings from this follow-up survey.

Table 3-1: Follow-Up Response Rates by March Where Initially Surveyed.

	Participated in Follow-ups (% of those who expressed willingness and shared their contact information)
Women’s March ’17	18%
March 4 Science	29%
People’s Climate March	25%
March 4 Racial Justice	32%
Women’s March ’18	44%
March 4 Our Lives	40%

What are the Top 3 Issues Facing America?

As I discussed in chapter 2, participants in the Resistance in the streets were motivated by diverse (and sometimes intersectional motivations) to march.¹¹ The follow-up survey asked these resisters to write in “what are the top three issues facing our nation today.” Overall, 602 individual answers were provided to this question (some people did not offer three issues). These data were manually coded into categories. The top 15 categories are listed in Table 3-2 with the percentage of the total mentions that each issue received. Like the diverse motivations that initially brought people out to participate in the various marches, opinions about the top issues ran the gamut.

The environment, including numerous mentions of climate change and roll-backs of environmental policies since the Trump Administration took office, received the most mentions by

far. The issue was written in 103 times, receiving 17% of all mentions. The fact that it received so many mentions is particularly notable because the environment was the main focus of only one of the marches—the People’s Climate March—although the March for Science also turned out people who were highly motivated by environmental issues. The issue that received the second highest mention was civil rights. This issue included mentions of bigotry, racism, concerns about white supremacy, and xenophobia. Civil Rights received 88 individual mentions, representing 15% of all issues. The third most mentioned category was the political system, which included a variety of critiques about the US political system—from dark money in politics to gerrymandering (President Trump and specific mentions of his presidency was coded into its own category that ranked ninth overall). The political system was mentioned 67 individual times representing 11% of all mentions. Welfare, which included references to economic inequality and poverty, was mentioned 62 times, representing 10% of all mentions. Guns, which included gun control and gun violence, as well as references to assault weapons and “bump stocks” ranked fifth with 35 mentions, representing 6% of all mentions.

Table 3-2: What are the Top-3 Issues Facing Our Country?

Issue	Count	Percent of Responses
1. Environment	103	17%
2. Civil Rights	88	15%
3. Political System	67	11%
4. Welfare	62	10%
5. Guns	35	6%
6. Health Care	34	6%
7. Gender	28	5%
8. Immigration	22	4%
9. Trump	20	3%
10. Education	16	3%
11. Equality	16	3%
12. Economy	15	2%
13. Criminal Justice	13	2%
14. Foreign Policy	12	2%
15. Alt-Facts/Science	11	2%

These priorities by participants in the Resistance have quite a bit of similarity to those of the general public. The week after I closed the follow-up survey, NBC News/Wall Street Journal (NBC/WSJ) released survey results based on data collected from a sample of registered voters.¹² In contrast to my follow-up survey, the question posed to respondents in the NBC/WSJ survey was which issues “you think will be the most important factor in deciding your vote.” Even though the questions were not identical (so respondents were “primed” to answer differently¹³) and the samples were different—registered voters versus participants in the Resistance in the streets—the overlap was significant. In fact, four of the top five issues in the NBC/WSJ survey ranked in the top 12 issues listed by the follow-up respondents in my survey: healthcare, the economy and jobs, guns, and immigration. Although the order of priorities was different for this sample of registered voters when asked what would determine their vote, the priorities overlapped substantially with participants in the Resistance.

How To Solve These Issues

No matter the issue, respondents overwhelmingly offered solutions that targeted institutional politics and specific changes from *inside* the political system in America. Of all the institutional political solutions, voting, the electoral process and the midterm elections were mentioned the most. Respondents wrote in solutions that specifically addressed the electoral system and the need for citizens to participate in the 2018 midterm elections. In many cases, these political solutions were offered to solve issues raised about the third most mentioned issue facing our country: the political system. Political solutions were also offered for the other issues mentioned listed on the survey, with many respondents writing in “same” or “see above,” referencing the solutions they offered to address the political system. Many respondents mentioned flipping the majority of the House of

Representatives and the Senate from Republican rule, with a number of responses explicitly stating the need to “Elect Democrats” and “Flip the House of Representatives.” Others just wrote in the term that has become popular as a reference to the Democratic Party gaining the majority in the Congress: “Blue Wave.”

Solutions did not just focus on the US Congress. Many also noted the need for a different Administration. In fact, of the 602 solutions to the issues raised by respondents, 18 solutions specifically stated that the main avenue for addressing the top issues facing the US was through the impeachment of President Trump. It is worth highlighting that this solution did not only come from participants at specific marches; it was offered by individuals who were surveyed at every single march in the Resistance.

In addition to focusing on the election and the Administration, a number of other political solutions were also offered. Twelve solutions referenced legislative options. A number of other solutions stressed the need to get big money out of politics, with five solutions explicitly referencing the *Citizens United* decision that had been handed down exactly seven years before the day the Women’s March 2017 was held on 21 January 2010.¹⁴ A percentage of solutions called for more outsider political tactics. For example, nine solutions called for more protest and activism to respond to the issues facing the US. Another nine solutions explicitly stated that there was a need to eliminate capitalism. These more radical solutions were the extreme minority of all perspectives shared, representing only 3% of the total solutions offered.

When providing solutions to the environmental issues raised in the follow-up survey, respondents provided a range of political avenues to solve environmental problems. For example, many people specifically stated that President Trump and his administration should be replaced, with a number of references to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency—Scott Pruitt—who stepped down in early July 2018 amid numerous ethics inquiries.¹⁵ As Elizabeth,¹⁶ a 27

year-old white woman from Washington County, Pennsylvania who was originally surveyed at the People's Climate March in April 2017 puts it, "Get Trump out of office, get Pruitt out of EPA, and keep pace with the rest of the world (ideally, we would lead) on sustainable energy."

Environmental issues were not only listed by participants who were surveyed at the People's Climate March or the March for Science, where the environment was the top motivation for attending the event. In the words of Jenny, a 50 year-old white woman from Alexandria, Virginia who was surveyed at the Women's March in 2018, her solution includes "ending subsidies for fossil fuels, increased investment in renewables, [and] stricter protections for the wilderness that is left." Like these two examples, many of the other solutions to environmental issues named clear political solutions that focused on energy use, clean and/or renewable energy, and climate change. In addition, there were numerous references to the need for the United States to rejoin the Paris Climate Agreement, which Donald Trump pulled out of in June 2017.¹⁷

In contrast to the various political avenues offered for solving environmental problems, most of the solutions mentioned to address civil rights challenges focused explicitly on electoral politics. For example, Florence, a 76 year-old white woman from Bethesda, Maryland who was surveyed at the Women's March in 2018, listed "our corrupt President," "the environment," and "civil rights and the rule of law" as the top three issues facing our country. All three of her responses focused on how electoral politics would solve the problem. With regard to the civil rights issue, her solution was to "elect people who understand the rule of law and respect [the] civil rights of all people." Similarly Alisa, a 41 year-old white woman from Shippensburg, Pennsylvania, who was originally surveyed at the March for Our Lives in March 2018, listed the "environment," "defunding education," and "racism" as her top three issues. To solve racism, she stated "We need to find all of the racist law enforcement officers and politicians and remove them from positions of

power. We need to better educate people on race issues.” In this solution, electoral politics are intertwined with more radical options to address civil rights issues.

Solutions to the issue of Welfare were much more varied—ranging from expansion of entitlements to strengthening public education. Marian, a 57 year-old multiracial woman from Pennington, New Jersey was surveyed at the People’s Climate March and reported that the 2017 Women’s March was her first experience protesting. To address challenges to Welfare, she offered the following solution: “appropriate pay, egalitarian and merit pay, education, and placement assistance.” Although Marian did not mention an electoral solution to welfare issues, here other issues included that the US has become an “international travesty.” To solve this problem, she wrote “Dump Trump” as the solution. Across the board, participants in the Resistance provided institutional political solutions—with many of them focusing on electoral politics and the midterm election—as the best way to address what they identified as the top challenges facing the country.

Working with Organizations

To get a better sense of the ways that participants in the follow-up survey were working through traditional institutional political and electoral political channels, they were also asked if they were currently working with specific organizations in May 2018. Although individuals who are relatively disconnected can turn out to participate in a demonstration, most scholars agree with the words of Andrews in his piece in the *New York Times*: “strong organizations make possible the sort of sustained participation that supports a protest’s agenda for the long haul.”¹⁸ In other words, without the infrastructure provided by an organization (which can be more or less formal and professionalized), sustained engagement in a social movement including the American Resistance is very difficult.

In my previous research on protests and marches, I found organizations to play a significant role in turning out big crowds of people.¹⁹ When studying the marches of the Resistance (which have been some of the largest demonstrations that have ever taken place in America²⁰), organizations played a smaller role in mobilizing protest participants. Across the different marches, the rates varied. Except for the People’s Climate March, which was the second large-scale mobilization of the climate movement in the United States in three years,²¹ the other marches in the Resistance were not directly connected to mobilizations before the election of Donald Trump. In fact, and as I note in chapter 2, many of these protest-events were originally called for by concerned people via social media who were not directly connected to organizations doing work on the issue.²² As a result, most protest participants did not report hearing about the different marches from an organization (the average across events was 20%). Slightly more protest participants reported being a member of a group that was part of the organizing coalition sponsoring each event (the average across events was 21%).

Table 3-3: Organizations in the Streets

	Women’s March 2017	March for Science	People’s Climate March	March for Racial Justice	Women’s March 2018	March for Our Lives	Families Belong Together
Heard about March from Org	13%	14%	38%	22%	20%	15%	32%
Member of Org Coalition	18%	20%	37%	16%	17%	16%	24%

Given the limited role that organizations played in the Resistance in the streets and their recognized importance in channeling interested people into political work,²³ the follow-up survey specifically asked how participants in the Resistance may have worked with organizations after

marching. Organizations listed on the survey were selected through a review of media coverage and discussions with groups working on the Resistance in the streets (more detail on their selection is available in Chapter 4). In addition to asking if respondents worked with a specific group, the survey also asked what exactly they did with these groups. It provided options to select representing the most common types of political activities coordinated by groups: donating money, signing a petition(s), attending a meeting(s), participating in lobby event(s), participating in a sponsored canvass, participating in a town hall meeting(s), or participating in a voter registration drive(s).

Overall, a little more than half (55%) of the participants in the follow-up survey reported that they were currently working with at least one of the listed groups in May 2018. Respondents reported working with these groups in diverse ways. The most common way that people got involved in these various groups was by signing a petition. 41% of respondents reported signing petitions as part of their work with specific groups. This finding is consistent with the research by Caren and colleagues who find a “robust increase” in the levels of petition signing between the 1970s and 2008 in the US, which they call “promising for non-electoral forms of participation.”²⁴ Donating money was the second most common way that respondents reported working with these groups. Over a third of all of the participants in the follow-up survey reported giving money to at least one organization. The third most popular activity was attending a meeting, with about a quarter of all respondents saying they attended a meeting of at least one of the groups listed on the survey.

The Democratic Party was the most common group that participants reported working with in May 2018—38% of all of the participants in the follow-up survey reported participating in activities or working with the Democratic Party. Of the 80 people who reported working with the Democratic Party, 71% of them reported donating money. Although most people donated money, respondents reported participating in a range of other activities with the Party: 69% reported

signing a petition, half (41 people) reported attending a meeting of the group, 30% reported attending a town hall meeting, and almost a quarter reported participating in a voter registration drive and a sponsored canvass for the group (23% for each). In other words, resisters who were working with the Democratic Party were actively participating in the group.

Beyond the Democratic Party, around a fifth of respondents mentioned working with MoveOn, the Women's March, and Indivisible. MoveOn, which rose to prominence during the public debate over the potential impeachment of President Clinton in 1998, has employed petitioning of its members as a common way that the group gets input. As a result of its focus on this specific activity, it is not surprising that 91% of the people who said they were working with MoveOn, reported signing a petition(s). A quarter of the people who reported working with MoveOn reported donating money to the group and 17% attended a meeting. The Women's March is a newer group formed to by the organizers of the 2017 Women's March to continue its work since the demonstration the day after the inauguration. Like MoveOn, most people who reported working with the Women's March reported participating by signing a petition (26%). In addition, participants reported donating money (16%), attending a meeting (14%), or lobbying (5%) with the Women's March.

Indivisible is, perhaps, the most well-known "Resistance Group." Formed by former Congressional staffers who released the *Indivisible Guide* that was shared with the public as a Google Doc, many of its chapters were formed on buses driving back home after the Women's March.²⁵ Similar to MoveOn and the Women's March, signing a petition was the most common way people reported participating with Indivisible. Two-thirds of the people who worked with Indivisible reported signing a petition. In addition, over half (59%) reported that they had attended a meeting with one of Indivisible's chapters. Around a quarter reported giving money (29%), participating in a Town Hall Meeting (27%), and participating in a lobby event (24%). People also reported

participating in voter registration drives (17%) and electoral canvassing events (17%) with Indivisible.

It is worth noting that, across all of these organizations, resisters report participating in numerous activities with these groups. In other words, they are not just donating money, they are participating in activities in their communities and Congressional Districts. This finding is in stark contrast to relatively recent critiques of American democracy that have found American civic life to be less directly connected to local efforts in communities and more focused on “mail-in membership.”²⁶ As the midterm election gets closer and there are many more opportunities to participate in Congressional Districts around the election, I expect the percentage of resisters participating in organizations around the country and the types of activities they do with these groups to rise.

Table 3-4: Organizing Resistance in the Districts

Are you participating in activities or working with...	Percentage
Democratic Party	38%
MoveOn	21%
Women’s March	21%
Indivisible	19%
ACLU	14%
Swing Left	8%
March On	6%

In addition to the groups named on the survey, respondents were also asked to write-in the names of other groups that they were working with in May 2018. Eight percent of the participants in the follow-up survey who had not reported working with any of the listed groups wrote in the names of additional groups. Eight people who reported working with additional groups specifically

wrote that they were working on individual candidates' electoral campaigns. In addition, 2% of respondents reported working with the Sierra Club, Mom's Demand Action for Gun Sense in America, or Planned Parenthood. In other words, beyond the general groups that had been identified as working on progressive issues in communities leading up to the midterm elections, a number of respondents were working with issue-based groups in their communities on environmental, gun control, and reproductive health issues six months prior to the midterm election.

Conclusion

Overall, the results of my follow-up survey with resisters provide clear evidence that the Resistance in the streets has redirected its attention to the Districts in the lead up to the 2018 midterm elections. Participants have identified electoral politics and the midterm elections as the main solution to what they consider to be the top challenges facing America.

Given the priorities of the members of the Resistance and their focus on mainstream institutional political solutions, political candidates and organizations that are looking for support from the Left would be wise to think about how to integrate these concerns into their work. With environmental issues, including climate change, dominating the list, candidates and groups that are looking for people who are willing to put in the time in the streets and in the districts should think about appealing directly to these concerns.

It is also noteworthy that almost two-thirds of participants in the follow-up survey (63%) reported working with at least one group 6 months before the midterm election. Although a number of organizations have gained substantial attention working to channel the Resistance into political action,²⁷ the majority of resisters who reported working with any organization in May 2018, were working directly with the Democratic Party. While these efforts have the potential to contribute substantially to electoral outcomes identified by participants as solutions to the top issues

facing the country, previous examples of what Heaney and Rojas have called a *Party in the Street* provide a cautionary tale for the Resistance beyond the midterm elections.²⁸ In particular, the authors find that the electoral successes of the Democratic party led the post-9/11 anti-war movement to lose momentum. If resisters continue to invest most of their time and energy directly into the Democratic Party, which is focusing its attention specifically on the midterm election rather than with other groups that have political goals beyond November 2018, it is likely that the American Resistance will meet a similar fate.

¹ March for Science S|GNS Summit 2018 Conference Guide

² <https://www.sciencevote.org/about> Accessed 25 July 2018.

³ Michael T. Heaney and Fabio Rojas, *Party in the Street: The Antirwar Movement and the Democratic Party after 9/11* (Cambridge University Press, 2015); Doug McAdam and Karina Kloos, *Deeply Divided: Racial Politics and Social Movements in Postwar America*, 1 edition (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2014); see also Dana R. Fisher, “Youth Political Participation: Bridging Activism and Electoral Politics,” *Annual Review of Sociology* 38 (2012): 119–137; Marshall Ganz, “Organizing Obama: Campaign, Organizing, Movement.” (Meetings of the American Sociological Association, San Francisco, CA., 2009).

⁴ Data extracted from the most recent General Social Survey, available at <https://gssdataexplorer.norc.umd.edu/projects> (Accessed 12 April 2018).

⁵ Mary Jordan and Scott Clement, “Echoes of Vietnam: Millions of Americans Are Taking to the Streets,” *Washington Post*, April 6, 2018, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/national/wp/2018/04/06/feature/in-reaction-to-trump-millions-of-americans-are-joining-protests-and-getting-political/>; For some historical context, see Russell J. Dalton, *The Good Citizen: How a Younger Generation Is Reshaping American Politics* (CQ Press, 2015).

⁶ Neal Caren, Raj Andrew Ghoshal, and Vanesa Ribas, “A Social Movement Generation: Cohort and Period Trends in Protest Attendance and Petition Signing,” *American Sociological Review* 76, no. 1 (February 1, 2011): 127, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122410395369>; For a broader discussion of “lifestyle politics,” see W. Lance Bennett, “The UnCivic Culture: Communication, Identity, and the Rise of Lifestyle Politics,” *PS: Political Science & Politics* 31, no. 4 (December 1998): 741–61, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096500053270>.

⁷ Although 841 people surveyed in the streets provided email contacts, only 777 of those email addresses worked in May 2018. In addition, 21 respondents chose to opt-out of the survey when they received it. The 756 people who provided working email addresses and were willing to participate represent not quite half (43.5%) of the people who participated in the first wave of data collection while they were marching in the streets.

⁸ Data were collected in accordance with University of Maryland-Collect Park Institutional Review Board Protocol #999342-2.

⁹ Response rates range from a low of 18% at the 2017 Women’s March to a high of 44% at the 2018 Women’s March.

¹⁰ See note 20 for discussion in Dana R. Fisher, “Taking Cover beneath the Anti-Bush Umbrella: Cycles of Protest and Movement-to-Movement Transmission in an Era of Repressive Politics,” *Research in Political Sociology* 15 (2006): 27–56.

¹¹ For a full discussion, 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): eaa01390, <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aao1390>.

¹² See <https://www.wsj.com/public/resources/documents/fulljunepoll.pdf> (Accessed 10 July 2018).

¹³ For a full discussion of priming effects, see Daniel C. Molden, ed., *Understanding Priming Effects in Social Psychology*, 1 edition (New York ; London: The Guilford Press, 2014).

¹⁴ “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/>.

¹⁵ Brady Dennis and Juliet Eilpern, “Scott Pruitt Steps down as EPA Head after Ethics, Management Scandals,” *Washington Post*, accessed July 18, 2018, https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/health-science/trump-epa-head-steps-down-after-wave-of-ethics-management-scandals/2018/07/05/39f4251a-6813-11e8-bea7-c8eb28bc52b1_story.html.

¹⁶ All names of respondents are pseudonyms.

¹⁷ For a full discussion, see “What Really Happened? Implications of President Trump’s Announcement on U.S. Withdrawal from the Paris Agreement and the Law of Unintended Consequences,” *The National Law Review*, accessed September 5, 2017, <https://www.natlawreview.com/article/what-really-happened-implications-president-trump-s-announcement-us-withdrawal-paris>.

¹⁸ Kenneth T. Andrews, “How Protest Works,” *The New York Times*, October 21, 2017, sec. Opinion, <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/10/21/opinion/sunday/how-protest-works.html>; see also Hahrie Han, *How Organizations Develop Activists: Civic Associations and Leadership in the 21st Century*, 1 edition (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2014).

¹⁹ Dana R. Fisher et al., “How Do Organizations Matter? Mobilization and Support for Participants at Five Globalization Protests,” *Social Problems* 52, no. 1 (February 1, 2005): 102–21, <https://doi.org/10.1525/sp.2005.52.1.102>; see also Dana R. Fisher, “Who Came out in the Brutal Heat to the ‘Families Belong Together’ March? Here’s Our Data.,” *Washington Post*, July 3, 2018, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2018/07/03/who-came-out-in-the-brutal-heat-to-the-families-belong-together-march-heres-our-data/>.

²⁰ Jenna Arnold et al., “These Are the Four Largest Protests since Trump Was Inaugurated,” *Washington Post*, May 31, 2018, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2018/05/31/these-are-the-four-largest-protests-since-trump-was-inaugurated/>.

²¹ For details, see Dana R. Fisher, “Climate of Resistance: How the Climate Movement Connects to the Resistance,” in *The Resistance: The Dawn of the Anti-Trump Opposition Movement*, ed. David S. Meyer and Sidney Tarrow (Oxford University Press, USA, 2018).

²² see e.g. Perry Stein and Sandhya Somashekhar, “It Started with a Retiree. Now the Women’s March Could Be the Biggest Inauguration Demonstration.,” *Washington Post*, January 3, 2017, sec. Local, https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/it-started-with-a-grandmother-in-hawaii-now-the-womens-march-on-washington-is-poised-to-be-the-biggest-inauguration-demonstration/2017/01/03/8af61686-c6e2-11e6-bf4b-2c064d32a4bf_story.html; Ben Guarino, “The March for Science Began with This Person’s ‘Throwaway Line’ on Reddit,” *Washington Post*, April 21, 2017, sec. Speaking of Science, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/speaking-of-science/wp/2017/04/21/the-march-for-science-began-with-this-persons-throwaway-line-on-reddit/>.

²³ See particularly Han, *How Organizations Develop Activists*; Andrews, “How Protest Works.”

²⁴ Caren, Ghoshal, and Ribas, “A Social Movement Generation,” 147.

²⁵ Personal correspondence author.

²⁶ See particularly Theda Skocpol, *Diminished Democracy: From Membership to Management in American Civic Life* (University of Oklahoma Press, 2013); Theda Skocpol, Marshall Ganz, and Ziad Munson, “A Nation of Organizers: The Institutional Origins of Civic Voluntarism in the United States,” *The American Political Science Review* 94, no. 3 (2000): 527–46, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2585829>; see also Jeffrey M. Berry and Clyde Wilcox, *Interest Group Society*, 5 edition (New York: Routledge, 2008).

²⁷ See, for example, 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; Joshua Holland, “Your Guide to the Sprawling New Anti-Trump Resistance Movement,” *The Nation*, February 6, 2017, <https://www.thenation.com/article/your-guide-to-the-sprawling-new-anti-trump-resistance-movement/>.

²⁸ Michael T. Heaney and Fabio Rojas, *Party in the Street: The Antiwar Movement and the Democratic Party after 9/11* (Cambridge University Press, 2015).