

Election 2024

written by Michael Albert, Stephen R. Shalom | October 1, 2024



xr:d:DAFTPtsqDI8:13,j:80922521262604176
10,t:23111715

As the U.S. election nears, there is considerable controversy, confusion, consternation, and sometimes recrimination on the left. But most of all, there is a lot of anguish over the terrible choices we have. Here we offer our take on the situation. Our basic view is that in swing states—where the outcome is not a foregone conclusion—it is crucial to cast ballots for Kamala Harris as a means of defeating Donald Trump. A Trump victory would be catastrophic in terms of the future of democracy, climate change, reproductive and LGBTQ rights, racial justice, immigration, labor rights, and a host of other issues. A Trump victory would also empower rightwing zealots on the state and local level, who want to do such things as monitor menstrual cycles and mandate the incorporation of the Bible into school lesson plans.

1. **Why is Trump's threat to democracy so worrying? We had four years of him before, amid dire warnings, and we survived that.**

Last time around Trump was blocked from carrying out many of the policies that he and his most aggressive acolytes favored. The blocking came from courts, from his own vice president and top officials, and from the government bureaucracy. But this time, Trump faces a judiciary headed by a Supreme Court with a rightwing majority (half chosen by him) that has already given him “presumptive immunity” for any official acts he might carry out as president. He has learned from his mistake of choosing a vice president who was not 100% submissive, this time choosing the supine JD Vance as his running mate. And one can be sure that this time he will not appoint “adults in the room” as his cabinet officers and leading officials. More, Project 2025, which advances a thoroughly reactionary and even fascist agenda, includes, for example, a plan to remove government officials from civil service protections and hire in their place thousands of MAGA advocates to staff his administration. (Trump claims no knowledge of Project 2025, despite having declared at the Heritage Foundation’s kick off of the project, “this is a great group. And they’re going to lay the groundwork and detail plans for exactly what our movement will do and what your movement will do when the American people give us a colossal mandate to save America....”) So when Trump says that he will be a dictator (“on day one”) and emphasizes retribution, we should believe him.

2. But hasn't Harris been retreating from one progressive position after another?

She has. Distressingly, she has been running to the center, trying to secure wavering moderate voters rather than addressing the real needs of the American people. Nevertheless, even in their most centrist incarnation, her positions are qualitatively better than Trump's. She has reversed herself on fracking, but her commitment to the environment—which activists have rightly warned is on a precipice—is light years ahead of Trump's, who considers climate change a hoax, believes in "drill, baby, drill," and withdrew the United States from the Paris Climate Agreement (reversed by Biden). Does anyone doubt that immigrants will be treated more humanely under Harris than under those who are trying to fan race war in Springfield, Ohio? Which candidate will better champion reproductive rights? Or protect transgender rights? Or labor rights? It is no surprise that the overwhelming majority of organizations advocating for the environment, immigration rights, labor unions, reproductive rights, racial justice, and gun control are supporting Harris. And as Harris supporters, these groups will be far better able to influence Harris in a positive direction on any of these issues than to influence Trump.

3. What about post-election activism? Does it matter whether Harris or Trump becomes President?

Yes, in two main ways. First, Trump would be far more aggressive than Harris in reacting to protests and would encourage local police to be far more repressive. Trump would implicitly, and maybe even explicitly, welcome citizen vigilantes to violently repress resistance in a throwback to the days of the "hard hat riots" against anti-war protestors in 1970, or even to KKK tactics against anti-racist organizers—or worse.

For example: In 2020, one week after the start of the Black Lives Matter protests, Trump "strongly recommended" that every governor deploy the National Guard to "dominate the streets." If states or cities refuse to act, he said, "then I will deploy the U.S. military and quickly solve the problem for them." Trump declared, "when the looting starts, the shooting starts." And when demonstrators were protesting around the White House, Trump said to his Secretary of Defense: "Can't you just shoot them? Just shoot them in the legs or something?" To be sure, he didn't carry this out, but after Trump removes the obstacles to his will, what happens next time?

In November 2023, Trump said about immigrant rights activists: "For any radical left charity, non-profit, or so called aid organizations supporting these caravans and illegal aliens, we will prosecute them for their participation in human trafficking, child smuggling, and every other crime we can find."

Trump called pro-Palestine activists "raging lunatics." "To every college president, I say remove the encampments immediately." After police were called onto the Columbia campus and protesters were roughly cleared out of a building, Trump said "It was a beautiful thing to watch. New York's finest." "Any student that protests," he stated, "I throw them out of the country. You know, there are a lot of foreign students. As soon as they hear that, they're going to behave." Trump assured wealthy donors, "if you get me reelected, we're going to set that movement back 25 or 30 years." In the meantime, Trump allies in Congress have called on the IRS to revoke the tax-exempt status of many organizations, including American Muslims for Palestine, Students for Justice in Palestine, Jewish Voice for Peace, the Adalah Justice Project, and the Palestinian Youth Movement.

There's a second reason that the election matters for activism. Imagine it is Election Day plus one. You wake up. Harris has won. Movements are eager to pursue positive aims they have been elaborating. There is no honeymoon for Harris, there is activism for society. The focus of protest is government, the two parties, racism, sexism, corporations, international relations, Israel's widening

war and attacks on Palestinians, and global warming. The overriding concern is attaining progressive gains and moving toward implementing still more progressive gains, and then more.

Compare that with waking up after Election Day and finding that Trump has won. Racism surges. Sexism explodes. People of good will are shell-shocked. Movements scramble to find voices to oppose a drastic shift rightward. Activists battle to preserve what, with Harris in office, they would have tried to go beyond. The focus of protest is Trump, his policies, and repression. Positive aspirations are back-burnered by the urgency to prevent gruesome reaction and even fascist violence. The overriding concern is survival, repelling reaction, and getting back to what is remembered as the relative sanity, albeit objective criminality, of Biden/Harris.

Under a Trump presidency, we will be fighting from day one to prevent the loss of our rights. Under a Harris presidency, we will be fighting from day one to expand our rights.

4. If we assume that Trump is a hell of a lot more evil than Harris, what should we do: try to stop the greater evil or avoid supporting the lesser evil?

Here is how this concern is generally broached: We have to do one or the other but not both. But why can't we work to stop the greater evil without uncritically supporting the lesser evil? Is there fear that we will jettison our broader beliefs and commitments to be, what, loyal? Can't one want Trump to lose and so vote for Harris to win (because if she doesn't win, Trump will), but, at the same time, understand that Harris and the Democratic Party are not tribunes of the people, but huge obstacles to justice, equity, peace, and all that we favor? And if Democrats win, can't we remember that our job is not to cozy up to them, but to critique and oppose them, to force them into choices they would not otherwise make? We believe we can. We think everyone who puts forth this concern can. Why do some doubt that?

5. But how can one vote for Harris given the Biden-Harris complicity in Israel's genocidal violence against Palestinians?

The Biden-Harris policy on Palestine is indeed vile. The U.S. government is financing, arming, providing intelligence to, cheerleading, providing diplomatic support for, and otherwise abetting the spreading slaughter. For many leftists this is a bridge too far. One can talk all one wants about lesser and greater evils, but how can one be asked to vote for genocide? What is more evil than that?

But we are not being asked to participate in a referendum on genocide. ("Raise your hand if you are in favor of genocide.") Rather we are asked to determine the occupant of the White House, which may offer different degrees of horrors for Palestinians (and Lebanon and the world). By refusing to choose, we may help consign Palestinians to their worst possible fate rather than their second worst possible fate. One might sneer at the difference, but to those living through it, the difference is rather significant.

On every aspect of the Palestine conflict, Trump is at least as vile as Biden-Harris, and often much worse. Yes, Harris's expressed sympathy for Palestinians is just words in the absence of real actions to stop their being slaughtered. But Trump uses the word "Palestinian" as a slur. Yes, the Biden-Harris one-time suspension of 2000-pound bomb deliveries was meaningless in the face of the otherwise uninterrupted flow of arms. But Trump denounced the suspension as a betrayal and vowed to give Israel what it needed. Yes, Harris's call for a two-state solution, with dignity and self-determination for Palestinians, bears tenuous connection to reality, but Trump rejects the two-state solution—and not because he favors a single democratic state. He recognized Israel's annexation of the Golan, moved the US Embassy to Jerusalem, and declared Israeli settlements legal. We can compare the likely impacts of Harris and Trump by noting that Itamar Ben-Gvir, Israel's fascist

minister of national security, has endorsed Donald Trump. We note as well that the “Uncommitted” campaign declined to endorse Harris because of her Gaza position, but it also stated, “We must block Donald Trump, which is why we urge Uncommitted voters to vote against him and avoid third-party candidates that could inadvertently boost his chances.”

But even if none of these differences mattered, there is another question. Would uncompromising pro-Palestinian activism be more likely to have an impact on policy with Harris as president or with Trump? The argument that support for Palestine would be less effective with Harris as President rests on the idea that critics would be less willing to make demands of and demonstrate against Harris than they would against Trump. But pro-Palestine advocates have not been shy in the past year. Why would joy over stopping Trump morph into passivity regarding Harris? As you read this, do you think that would happen for you?

Yes, there are many wealthy Zionists backing Harris. But the wealthy Zionists backing Trump are even more reactionary. Harris will be presiding over a party 83% of whose supporters want a ceasefire, compared to 56% for Trump; only 47% of Democrats have a favorable view of Israel compared to 77% of Republicans. So, there is a greater potential to sway Harris than Trump.

6. But couldn't a victory of the greater evil hasten progressive change?

Going backward to go forward can make sense when retreat is a shortcut that leaps ahead. But a path forward from a Trump-led society would—at best—lead right back to some Democrat, maybe even Harris herself. It would entail postponing progress for four or more years, and also the massive pain that a Trump administration would impose on many people, not to mention the delay in addressing global warming and all the consequences of that.

Has any labor organizer ever wished owners would cut salaries or worsen conditions so that labor can leap forward? Has any anti-war organizer, feminist organizer, anti-racist organizer, climate organizer, or other organizer called upon the establishment to make things much worse in order to arrive at much better? Of course not, and for good reason.

7. But didn't the neoliberal Democratic Party pave the way for Trump, and wouldn't having more liberals in office due to electing Harris lead to more “Trump” later?

Yes, Democratic Party policies, particularly paying little attention to the declining income, increasing alienation, worsening health care, and even the plummeting lifespan of white working people have aided Trump's rise, as has the Democrat's unwillingness to comprehend and relate to working class issues in a sincere fashion. (Though, truth be told, leftists too have been comparably unsuccessful at reaching out to alienated angry white working-class constituencies, contributing to Trump's rise.)

And yes, having Harris in office with no effective opposition to force better policies and develop lasting movements, could lead to a still worse and still more effective “Trump” running in the future, particularly if Harris in office were to effectively ignore or denigrate working class people, leaving them feeling even more estranged and angry than now.

But who proposes that scenario? And why should we expect it? If Harris wins, she will immediately confront an electorate and especially an activist community that will fight for change. Inside her own Party she will face a seriously divided base in which many, if not most, lean somewhat left and favor developing programs that benefit the working class.

On the other hand, if Trump wins, he will operate in a Party that backs his most aggressive choices, is utterly disdainful of all opposition, and is also hell-bent on delivering a worse “Trump” later.

It is relevant to note that Hitler surely arose from the terrible failures of the German capitalist and social democratic parties to deal with the Depression, but that doesn't mean it was sensible for leftists to refuse an alliance with the social democrats to stop Hitler.

8. So what approach to voting do you recommend?

We recommend strategic lesser-evil voting. This means you vote in light of the implications of your choice for the future. It means, also, that you look not only at the short and long-term consequences for human well-being of each candidate winning, but also at the likelihood of each candidate winning. It means you consider, as well, the impact on yourself, not on how you feel at the moment, but on your ongoing capacities and inclinations.

Strategic lesser-evil voting means looking at the likely overall benefit and harms of casting your vote in a particular state for Harris versus the overall benefit and harm of abstaining or casting your vote in that state for a third-party candidate with no chance of winning. If polling in a state shows a close race between Harris and Trump, then a really small number of additional votes could determine which of the two candidates gets all the state's electoral votes. On the other hand, if polls show that the race is not close, then a strategic lesser-evil voter can vote for the Greens or any other third party or abstain without impacting the Presidential outcome.

What is the impact *on the Green Party* of Green supporters voting for Harris or for Jill Stein in contested states? Suppose the Greens were to put all their energies into safe-state campaigning; they could win nearly as many and perhaps even many more overall votes, especially since they wouldn't lose the support of safe-state voters who considered an all-states campaign irresponsible. But even if the Greens lost some votes by declining to campaign for presidential votes in contested states, the impact of these lost presidential votes on future Green prospects would be quite modest. And why wouldn't Greens who vote for Harris emerge from the voting booth with the same views they would have had if their state had been safe and they had voted for Stein? Why wouldn't they work just as hard for Green policy positions in either case? And if Trump went on to lose, great—but, in the horrible event that Trump won, Greens would not be called the cause of it, with disastrous results for the Party.

So even ignoring implications of a Trump victory for the country and the world, Greens would at most be marginally hurt by promoting a safe state strategy, and they might even benefit from doing so. And, of course, we should never ignore implications for others.

Some will argue further that there are three reasons why it also makes sense to vote for Harris in safe states: 1. To increase her popular vote, which may be a factor in deterring and resisting post-election challenges and even coups. 2. To communicate to the Greens and others that they will alienate safe state voters if they continue to campaign in swing states. 3. In the event of a Trump Electoral College victory, the biggest Harris popular vote margin would aid the campaign for a National Popular Vote. Our own mixed reaction to this argument reflects the difficulty of assessing the relevant costs and benefits. What is not difficult to assess, however, is that for Jill Stein or Cornel West to seek votes in contested states is not a good way to build the left. It won't build the left any more now than it has in the past, and it may have horribly harmful consequences.

9. But if we're always committed to lesser-evil voting, won't that mean we're always going to be voting for a reactionary capitalist party and therefore the development of an alternative will be impossible?

If all we do is vote every four years, then no matter how we vote, we will never get major change. What is crucial is whether we build effective movements to generate sufficient support for change

throughout society to not only win changes in many realms but to carry a really worthy candidate into contention, and then to victory, whether in a mainstream party, as Sanders attempted, or in a third party. And what determines that is overwhelmingly what we are doing other than voting, like the work of Occupy, Black Lives Matter, MeToo, the poor people's campaigns, pro-Palestine activism, climate organizing, labor organizing, and so many other projects. But it depends as well on whether our periodic voting creates conditions conducive to activist progress, and on whether our third-party work locally creates a steadily enlarging base.

Consider progressives and leftists in safe states who generally support strategic lesser-evil voting and who think the gain from more Harris votes is smaller than the benefit of more votes for Stein in those safe states. These progressives and leftists can vote their preference without concern that they will aid Trump. In contested states, however, lesser-evil votes for Harris will further the prospects for Greens by contributing to stopping Trump. In contrast, if progressives in contested states reject voting for Harris and it turns out that Trump wins, they would have helped consign people to four years of Trump and also impeded prospects for Green gains under the ensuing Trump administration.

10. But doesn't advocating lesser-evil voting mean one doesn't care about the long term and that one has, as some commentators suggest, abandoned one's left values?

It *can* mean or lead to that, *but* we very explicitly propose and favor full revolutionary alternatives to existing political, economic, and social systems. Nonetheless, and even because of that, we also think voting for Harris in contested states will help block Trump's horrible agenda and, in that way, simultaneously improve the prospects for greater activism to come.

We have the lesser-evil inclination in this election not because we are suddenly inexplicably beholden to the powers and institutions we have fought against for decades, nor because we have lost our nerve, nor our way, nor because we have disavowed our clear and fundamental desires for new institutions, but because we have for all our adult lives sought and will keep on seeking long term transformation of our society. We simply are convinced that in our country's current circumstance, lesser-evil voting in contested states aids the struggle against wealth, power, racism, and misogyny at home and support of unjust war and oppression abroad.

11. Does refusing to vote for Harris even in contested states mean one doesn't care about the well-being of constituencies that will suffer more under Trump than under Harris?

Callousness or ignorance of consequences can play a role, but we don't assume that all or even most who refuse to vote for Harris even in contested states while agreeing that Trump is the far greater evil are callous or ignorant of consequences. Rather, we believe that many progressive and leftists, whom we respect, feel a tremendous urgency to transcend not just neoliberal policies, but the whole political, economic, and social system we currently endure, and that they just don't want to—and would indeed feel sick to the core to—pull a lever that seems to ratify all that they justifiably despise.

The problem is, even with all these fully warranted and admirable feelings causing their refusal, the refusal itself could elect Trump and unleash horrifically worse outcomes on many, many people, and arguably on the whole species.

Does anyone believe a progressive, leftist, or revolutionary who pulls the lever for Harris in a contested state must in any way suffer diminished ability to fight on? Why can't we hold our nose, cast our vote, and then go *right back to the struggle for a new society*? Why can't we stop Trump

and also build new political, organizational, and movement alternatives?

- 12. But isn't voting for Harris a slippery slope? First you resolve to vote for her, then you don't want to criticize her before the election (for fear you'll help the greater evil), then you tone down your criticism of her after the election (because you'll be helping some greater evil defeat her four years later)...**

We all like to feel good about ourselves and we all at times rationalize our choices. But even so, this trajectory is not inevitable. We can vote for Harris while indicating we do not support her and that we will oppose her, and we can then do just that.

Indeed, if the overwhelming message of leftists in talks and writing in the coming weeks is that we should vote strategically and also fight on, it is hard to see why pulling the lever for Harris in a contested state should interfere with that voter becoming one of Harris's most steadfast and effective opponents, or, for that matter, with that voter becoming one of the Green Party's most steadfast and effective supporters and participants.

- 13. But I want to vote my conscience.**

So should we all. But why isn't part of voting our consciences taking into account the impact of our choice on the well-being of others and on future organizing?

- 14. But isn't it harmful to vote based on fear rather than positive program?**

It would be great if we had nothing to fear and the only question before us was which of various progressive programs we most wanted to positively support. But how can we *not* be fearful of climate catastrophe or nuclear war or mass deportations or racist and fascist violence or misogynistic culture, or widening income disparities?

Regrettably, we need to focus on both offense and defense. We need to advance positive programs while, by our vote in swing states, we block our most feared outcomes.

- 15. Isn't it true that I don't owe my vote to anyone, that politicians are not entitled to it, they need to earn it?**

You are not voting as a favor or a reward to a candidate. You are not voting for a candidate because you think they are admirable; you may indeed abhor them. You are voting so as to benefit oppressed communities and enhance prospects for more benefits to come. A candidate may be totally unworthy of your support, but if voting for them lessens the dangers of climate catastrophe or mass deportations or the squelching of democracy, then it makes sense to vote for them. If voting for them provides the greatest opportunity for activism to win more positive change, then it makes sense to vote for them.

- 16. But Trump's not going to win...**

Pundits on the left and elsewhere have consistently underestimated Trump's prospects. Today the polls are very tight, and it would be reckless to assume that Harris's victory is a foregone conclusion. If, in early November, it is clear—taking into account the unreliability of the polls—that Trump has no chance of winning, then one can vote for a third party or abstain everywhere. If it is clear that some state that was previously considered up for grabs was now decisively in one column or another, voters there could likewise vote for a third party or abstain without concern.

A related claim is that it is unlikely that our votes will cause Trump to win. Obviously, the odds of

any one vote making the difference in the election are infinitesimally small. But when swing states have been carried by far fewer votes than those cast for the Greens, when polls show that third parties are getting more votes than the difference between Harris and Trump, the danger of affecting the outcome is very real.

17. Isn't it true that most of the people who vote for the Greens were not going to vote for a Democrat anyway?

Perhaps some would have voted for Trump though that seems highly unlikely, but some might have stayed home. In any case, isn't it the obligation of a progressive third party to encourage its supporters to do what will yield the greatest social benefit? Is the prospect of getting 1.1 percent rather than 1.0 percent of the popular vote for a third party more important in terms of social benefit than what could be the difference between Harris or Trump winning?

The bottom line is, if you agree that Harris is the lesser of the evils, then a vote for her in a contested state, rather than for a third party, could have a dramatic effect on human well-being now and into the future.

18. Why are the Democrats more hostile to the Greens than the Republicans are?

The Democrats have tried hard to restrict votes for the Greens. Republicans, on the other hand, have done what they can to help the Greens get on as many state ballots as possible. The reason isn't a mystery. It's because everyone understands that the Greens take more votes from Harris than from Trump. As Trump explained, "Jill Stein, I like her very much. You know why? She takes 100% from [Democrats]." And that's why we see reports such as the one in the Wall Street Journal that "some Republicans are supporting Green Party candidate Jill Stein's long-shot bid for the presidency, attempting to bolster a campaign that could siphon liberal voters from Vice President Kamala Harris." It is why right-wing lawyers have gone to work for Stein.

Needless to say, the GOP enthusiasm for Stein does not indicate a commitment to Green values or to third parties. They have worked hard to keep *rightwing* third parties off the ballot, while the Democrats have tried to help such parties.

19. Since the dilemma that voting for a third party might help your least favorite candidate win—the "spoiler" effect—could be solved by using ranked choice voting (RCV) or some such alternative, shouldn't the blame for third party votes causing a Trump victory be laid at the doorstep of the major parties (who insist on plurality voting) rather than on third party voters?

RCV doesn't necessarily solve the problem. Those who say they are voting for a third party because they can't in good conscience vote for the lesser evil may well refuse to indicate a second choice on their ballot, thus still leading to the spoiler effect. But, in any event, blame can be shared. That the major parties are in part responsible for the spoiler effect doesn't mean that those who vote for a third party in a swing state are not also morally responsible for the potentially awful outcome.

20. Even if one agrees that individually voting for Harris in a swing state is important, does that mean we should use scarce resources—time and money—to support Harris when these might be used instead for building the left?

The choice of either participating in the election or building the movement is a false dichotomy. For most people, participating in the election is just a question of taking an hour or so to go to the polling place to vote or to fill out a ballot and mail it. Even for those who decide to work for Harris,

this may not take you away from your movement building, because you may be working with people in your environmental, women's, LGBTQ, Black, or Latino movement or from your labor union. You may, through such a campaign, make new relationships and deepen the ones you have. But even if you gave up two months of putting time and energy into your movement work, it will still be there after November 5 when you return to it. Most of our movements are not so flimsy and feeble as to die in two months' time.

There are obvious tradeoffs here that will depend on how effective one believes their investment of time and money will be in achieving a Harris victory or achieving left advancement. To take the two extremes, if you could use all your time between now and election day to sway the opinion of two swing voters who would flip the election—that would be an incredibly productive use of your time even in terms of helping the left (given how much better the left will fare under Harris than Trump). On the other hand, a \$10 donation or really any donation from you to the Harris campaign that has already received gazillions of dollars will have no impact at all.

Every one of us is in a different situation, so there's no fixed answer. We are writing this article on the election, rather than on some other left topic, because we believe that our potential impact in swaying progressive voters in swing states where the polls are very tight is a worthwhile use of our time. Others will have to draw their own conclusions based on their specific circumstances.

Sometimes there are opportunities to use one's resources in a way that both builds the left and increases the chances of defeating Trump. For example, those with money to donate might consider Movement Voter PAC (<http://movement.vote>), which provides support to grassroots organizations engaged in local voter engagement. Similarly, those giving time to winning votes for Harris and/or removing votes from Trump, may seek to simultaneously raise broader issues.

21. What is most important, post election? Is it left unity? Is it who is president? Is it what new organizations and activism we have put in place to go forward? Is it successful outreach to wider and deeper constituencies?

All four are important. Efforts at progressive change in the United States cannot succeed, long or short term, unless all who favor these ends work together in a spirit of mutual aid. So we need left unity, and we have to be trying for it, not assaulting one another, even as we seek other gains as well.

Aside from affecting many people's lives today, who is president empowers various views, establishes context, and also affects government responses to dissent. Will activists have to primarily fight against policies that seek to move us back in time, or will activists be able to focus on positive aspirations linked to long-term aims?

Change depends on the levels of activism and organization we have in place and the width and depth of our support, and these in turn depend on the extent to which we develop organization and activism as opposed to only immersing ourselves in seeking vote tallies. So, while we work to generate unity, and to expand popular support including from those who most disagree with us, Trump's voters, and to prevent a Trump presidency, we need to also build new organizations that can sustain activism in the years ahead.

22. What is Trump's appeal to white working-class people? How might it best be addressed? Why address it?

Trump partly creates and appeals to illegitimate racist and sexist fears, but he also appeals to legitimate though misdirected concerns about severely worsening life conditions.

Republicans cater to business owners and try to win over workers with lies, posturing, fear of terrorism, and racism/sexism, and anti-immigrant hysteria. Democrats serve business owners, cater to what might be called empowered employees, and try to modestly accommodate workers within system limits to gain their votes.

Not believing campaign speeches, people often vote for whom they feel understands their situation better. But if many of Trump's working-class supporters are not supporting him because they want him and others like him to get even more disgustingly rich at working people's expense, if they are not supporting him because he is a real estate tycoon, if they are not supporting him because he is abominably racist and sexist, then perhaps they are supporting him because he appears to them unafraid to say what he thinks. He is not polished and academic. He seems to talk straight. He does not appear to be the kind of person who looks down on workers and who day to day constantly exerts direct power over them.

If so, progressives need to speak directly to Trump's supporters, to acknowledge their pain and respect their anger and to provide real but also believable policy answers to their concerns. This is both because it is right, and because future progress depends on enlarging progressive support. To stop Trump includes reaching out to his voters, roughly half the voting population.

23. What might a person seeking a comprehensive revolution in U.S. institutions do at a time like this? What ought such a person not do?

There are countless possible answers as to what one might usefully do in these times. Try to preserve and enlarge the momentum that has developed from past efforts to date, while we also ensure that Trump loses. Work to create new organizations. Work to develop and spread a revolutionary vision and consistent program feeding into that vision. Reach out to wider and wider circles of people, in particular those who do not yet support change. Support diverse movements and seek to mutually align them into larger endeavors.

As to what *not* to do, of course, that too has many answers, but the most germane might be—don't escalate time-bound differences into hostile disputes and then into dismissals of allies and potential allies.

This article has also been posted on ZNetwork.