

# Progressive Pluralism in Social Movements: Preliminary Theory and Recommendations for Implementation

**Annie Reynolds**

The summer of Black Lives Matter protests, the rise of political content amongst teens on TikTok, and the bitterly contested presidential election made 2020 a confusing time to be a teenager interested in politics. I have always aspired to a career in advocacy, but the performative and exclusive activism of my peers made me both frustrated in the present and unsure about my future aspirations. I decided to channel these emotions into a research project that would help me explore how leaders in the field look beyond their base of supporters to build successful, wide-reaching progressive social movements, even if TikTokers and teenagers think that ideological purity trumps all, and anyone who disagrees with them has no place in progressive movements.

I refrain from labeling myself as progressive, mainly because of the frustrations I highlighted above. I am, however, a staunch believer in uplifting the power and voice of the people—this being the main reason I am drawn to studying social movements in the first place. This is why I recognize the importance and efficacy of progressive movements’ goals in looking to our country’s future. The policies supported by progressive organizations are some of the most widely supported among the electorate and deserve to have a voice amongst the political establishment. They are often hindered by messaging that is ideological and exclusive. This discrepancy piqued my interest and led me to research ways to improve the messaging tactics of progressive social movements with the goal of inclusivity.

This paper highlights my strategy for increasing the influence of progressive social movements in the United States through a shift in messaging, which I call “progressive pluralism.” I present this strategy in pursuit of the common good, not in pursuit of any personal partisan goals. I hope that this paper will give progressive leaders at the grassroots the push they need to embrace the idea of progressive pluralism and use it to their advantage.

## **Executive Summary**

Our country’s contemporary progressive movement is particularly vulnerable to “progressive performance.” This means that many leaders prioritize signaling dogmatic ideological adherence, only connecting with the narrow audience of those who share their intellectual and ideological convictions. These leaders lose sight of the ultimate goal of tangible policy change in the process of staying ideologically pure. Bret Stephens, a conservative columnist for the *New York Times*, calls this performance “wokeness,” saying “it is a prescription, not for genuine dialogue and reform, but for indoctrination and extirpation.”<sup>1</sup> Stephens emphasizes the exclusionary nature of a progressive performance that not only fails but flat-out refuses to acknowledge the validity of dissenting opinions or invite moderates into the progressive fight. This is no way to build a movement with broad influence and impact.

---

<sup>1</sup> Bret Stephens, “Why Wokeness Will Fail,” *New York Times*, last modified November 9, 2021, <https://www.nytimes.com/2021/11/09/opinion/social-justice-america.html>.

This contemporary vision of progressivism needs a pragmatic shift that emphasizes tangible policy gains and captures a wider swath of the electorate. In the quest to get rid of progressive performance, I instead advocate for an approach called “progressive pluralism.” Progressive pluralism means that progressive social movements invite moderates to engage with their grassroots action, not by co-opting them and swaying their ideological opinions, but by incorporating them and acknowledging their views. A member of the “moderate outreach” is taken to mean a Left-leaning citizen who deviates from the progressive base through a decreased ideological adherence to progressive or Leftist thought and a dampened desire for change.<sup>2</sup> This requires a personalized, values-based messaging approach that searches for common ground between the progressive base and moderate outreach even though they disagree in terms of policy opinions. The ultimate goal of progressive pluralism is not merely agreement, but action, requiring progressive social movement organizations (PSMOs) to take additional steps to mobilizing their new group of moderate supporters.<sup>3</sup>

The successes and failures of progressive movements of the past reveal the efficacy and necessity of progressive pluralism. Progressive-era and New Deal progressivism both embraced universally appealing class-based framings by using economic and power-oriented approaches. Making an economic argument for progressive solutions bolsters progressive credibility by assuaging the moderate fear of government overspending. Power-oriented appeals unite progressives and moderates as a single interconnected group aligned against the political powers that be. The purposefully wide nets cast by leaders during these periods allowed progressivism to enter the mainstream and influence American policy. The New Left of the 1960s fell prey to progressive performance and inward-focused messaging, framing their platform under deep ideological convictions and disseminating it only among core ideologues. These tactics led to the formation of an insular, ideologically homogeneous cadre of followers, allowing the movement to easily lose momentum and fade into the background once its initial mobilizing issues lost relevance among the general populace.<sup>4</sup>

Progressive pluralism is uniquely suited to the contemporary progressive movement for a number of reasons. Firstly, the current landscape of “identity politics” means that moderates are reachable on a level of identity. Bridging the social distance between political groups allows PSMOs to reach moderates without having to abandon their progressive policy goals. To use the landscape of identity politics to their advantage, it is crucial that PSMOs use messengers that moderates feel an affinity to and emphasize the shared identity of being “the people” fighting against the entrenched interests of the political elite.

---

<sup>2</sup> While personal ideology is not necessarily black and white and cannot be fully encapsulated by the strict division presented here, a clear line appears when examining ideology from a lens of PSMOs. There is a certain point on the ideological spectrum where the tension between personal views and that of a PSMO becomes too great for an individual to justify their participation. Since ideology is one factor, but not the only one, when deciding to participate (as shown by social-constructivist social movement theory explored in more depth later in the paper), a combination of loose ideological grouping and a strict line between participation and nonaction serve to group individuals into distinct and well-defined camps.

<sup>3</sup> Progressive social movement organizations are referred to as PSMOs throughout the paper. Note that in some instances, usually in the context of social movement theories, the term SMO is used to denote a social movement organization that is not necessarily progressive.

<sup>4</sup> It is important to distinguish a power-oriented approach from a populist one. Power-oriented organizing is genuine; it does not rely on constructed in-and out-groups. It distinguishes a clear interest to fight against (the powerful) without labeling the entire out-group (for example, those who disagree ideologically) as an “enemy.” Power-oriented organizing unites a natural coalition, rather than manufacturing a new base, and fights with targeted conviction rather than general animosity.

In the current climate, progressive movements should also be able to incorporate progressive pluralism without much headache or disarray. The intersectional nature of the progressive base makes ideological diversity easy to incorporate. PSMOs are used to commanding a complex coalition that transcends race, class, and gender by finding strength in heterogeneity and facilitating solidarity. In order to foster community among an ideologically diverse coalition, PSMOs must use universally understood and respected language and facilitate full acceptance and respect for moderate participants among their base. At the same time, these organizations must retain their progressive nature by establishing a clear set of progressive policy goals that they will stick to.

Progressive pluralism requires a clear path to participation for moderates. This means helping them accept the need to take action for societal change and providing low-cost ways to get involved. Gateway actions, which are low in personal and social costs, allow moderates to dip their toes in participating with progressive movements without losing a lot of time or fearing retribution from their moderate social circles. At the same time, maintaining the organization's collective grassroots feel by providing more direct participation opportunities like meetings and protests remains important. Progressive organizations should encourage these gateway actions as ways to get involved while still pushing people who have come through the gateway to slowly participate more openly and actively. Celebrating key wins keeps morale up and further encourages involvement as the prospect of eventual success becomes more tangible, helping facilitate this sustained engagement.

Following the theoretical exploration and defense of progressive pluralism, three case study PSMOs, analyzed through a lens of progressive pluralism, show the current landscape of this ideal. The case studies explored are End Citizens United, the Sunrise Movement, and Jobs to Move America. These case study PSMOs provide key insights into the ways that progressive pluralism is already being prioritized in social movement organizations and the areas that still need work in order to embrace a fully progressive pluralist model.

Progressive pluralism represents the future of progressive social movements: representative of the wider electorate, widely accepted and influential, and, overall, successful in their tangible policy agendas. The recommendations put forth in this paper are crucial to the sustained survival of the progressive movement in an increasingly polarized and hostile environment and should be prioritized as the best path forward for progressivism.

### **Background: Existing Social Movement Theory**

In order to analyze the efficacy of messaging tactics as the argument for progressive pluralism requires, it is important to understand the methods that academics have used to do so. The theoretical research summarized in this section provides a foundation for understanding why social movement organizations (SMOs) make the strategic decisions they do, and how each decision affects the organization's chances of success.

The first theories of social movements regarded protest as a deviant, irrational, and impatient expression of grievances. This view emerged with Le Bon's *The Crowd* in the 1890s and

persisted through much of the 20th century.<sup>5</sup> However, it lost its luster when scholars began to notice that protests and social movements emerged not only in times of great grievance, but in times of expanding welfare as well.<sup>6</sup> This development led to the swift and thorough repudiation of the “irrational” theory in the 1970s and 80s, when structural theories of social movements were first presented and became the dominating idea in the literature. This revolution was set in motion by McCarthy and Zald’s “Resource Mobilization Theory and Social Movements: A Partial Theory.”

Resource mobilization theory was developed in the sole context of American left leaning social movements, making it particularly relevant to the study of the contemporary American progressive movement. In the lens of resource mobilization theory, SMOs have concrete goals and choose tactics that will best achieve those goals given the societal “infrastructure” in which they operate. Social movements sprout up when the environment is best for maximizing these resources, making their founding and survival a function of many more tactical factors beyond just capitalizing on popular grievances. The best tactics are those that maximize an organization’s ability to mobilize tangible and intangible resources (including money, labor, facilities, or legitimacy). Some SMOs aim to convert adherents (uninvolved but ideologically aligned people) into constituents (participants), and others aim to convert non-adherents into adherents. Some SMOs rely on collecting resources solely from potential beneficiaries (those who stand to benefit from the organization’s goals) and others appeal to conscience adherents (supporters who do not personally stand to benefit), who often have larger amounts of resources to offer. For example, a benefactor who believes in the importance of worker-friendly jobs likely has a lot more time and money to offer a worker’s rights movement than a laborer. In all, resource mobilization theory asserts that organization leaders choose the path of least resistance to achieve their goals, organizing constituents accordingly.<sup>7</sup>

While the theory of progressive pluralism is mainly guided by resource mobilization theory, various other empirical studies support the argument for progressive pluralism and are thus explored throughout the paper. These studies are part of the “social constructivist” branch of the social movement theory literature, which finds middle ground between classical and structural theories by reconciling the calculative, rational approach of resource mobilization theory with social-psychological analysis of the irrational individual participant.

### **Progressive Pluralism**

As resource mobilization theory emphasizes, a central goal of all social movements is to constantly reach more people in order to maximize resources and therefore chances of success.<sup>8</sup> Finding access to this large pool of people when a movement seems fringe can be a struggle. Progressive pluralism addresses this need by bringing the *progressive base* and *moderate outreach* together within PSMOs to maximize the progressive movement’s ability to influence tangible policy change. The moderate outreach should be thought of as those who differ from the

---

<sup>5</sup> Jacqueliën van Stekelenburg and Bert Klandermans, "Social Movement Theory: Past, Present, and Prospect," in *Movers and Shakers: Social Movements in Africa*, ed. Stephen Ellis and Ineke van Kessel, African Dynamics 8 (Brill, 2009), 5-6.

<sup>6</sup> van Stekelenburg and Klandermans, "Social Movement," 2.

<sup>7</sup> John D. McCarthy and Mayer N. Zald, "Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory," *American Journal of Sociology* 82, no. 6 (May 1977), JSTOR.

<sup>8</sup> Expanding participants directly maximizes resources by increasing the number of volunteers, and it also indirectly boosts fundraising capabilities, legitimacy among lawmakers, and countless other intangible resources.

progressive base through a decreased ideological adherence to progressive or Leftist thought and a dampened desire for change. Since individual political ideals can not be boiled down to a binary, the division in this paper is mainly focused on current participation—whether people are choosing to publicly attach themselves to progressive causes through PSMO participation or not.

The idea of a moderate outreach—and the idea of catering to them—is not revolutionary in and of itself. Research reports on messaging commissioned by PSMOs often categorize and focus on an independent or “persuadable” category, testing what framing most convinces them to align with progressive ideals.<sup>9</sup> Progressive pluralism differs from current outreach efforts by rejecting the idea that the moderate outreach is a group for PSMOs to “persuade” and absorb, converting them into more progressive ideologues. It instead emphasizes that appealing to the moderate outreach should be seen as pluralism—creating a movement with diverse, equally valuable voices. Another differentiating factor of progressive pluralism is its emphasis on action, not merely agreement, amongst the moderate outreach.

Sharing a straightforward policy opinion with a PSMO is not reason enough for the moderate outreach to take action. Many PSMOs are organizing around solutions with vast popular support, yet they find themselves fighting a tough battle to make progress on their agenda.<sup>10</sup> The identity politics of the current sociopolitical environment make political participation more motivated by affinity than rational policy opinions.<sup>11</sup> Even if the moderate outreach agrees with the policies of a PSMO, they will not be compelled to participate unless they are able to consider the people comprising that organization their “team” on the basis of identity.

Given the goals of progressive pluralism and the environment in which PSMOs are operating, outreach by PSMOs becomes less about convincing people to agree with the organization on a policy level and more about *messaging*, convincing the moderate outreach that they have a place in the organization, and *mobilizing*, convincing them to align publicly with the organization by taking action on its behalf. The former requires messaging around the values and priorities of the moderate outreach, not “talking about what you want to talk about,” as Tom Steyer puts it.<sup>12</sup> The latter is a difficult goal when targeting a group that is not particularly compelled to advocate for sweeping change in the first place. Convincing moderates of the importance of the problem a movement is trying to address becomes just as important as advocating for a specific solution when mobilizing the moderate outreach.

The inclusion of the moderate outreach through progressive pluralism provides specific strategic benefits to PSMOs. Firstly, a movement that embraces progressive pluralism will emphasize reaching more people, and thus maximize resources in the form of volunteers. Following resource mobilization theory, this strategy will increase the organization’s chances of success through tangible policy change.<sup>13</sup> Organizations should be more focused on tangible success than voicing ideological convictions, and progressive pluralism by nature helps them to do that. In

---

<sup>9</sup> Such reports include Pollux Group’s “Messaging the Green New Deal” and ALG Research’s “Senate Battleground Poll” for End Citizens United, both explored in the case studies.

<sup>10</sup> The idea of broad popular support is discussed at length in the case study organizations, including relevant evidence.

<sup>11</sup> This idea is discussed at length under the subsection “The Relevance of Progressive Pluralism: Progressive Pluralism & Identity Politics.”

<sup>12</sup> Tom Steyer, interview by the author, San Francisco, CA, September 20, 2021.

<sup>13</sup> McCarthy and Zald, “Resource Mobilization”

addition, the ability to make the “constituents argument”—telling lawmakers that aligning with PSMOs on policy will improve the lives of their constituents and increase their popularity—becomes significantly more credible when these PSMOs have a representative group of constituents behind them, rather than a narrow group of ideologues.

Pluralism should be a strength of progressivism, not a liability or shortcoming. There is no reason to believe that PSMOs are unable to assemble and take charge of an ideologically diverse coalition. Diversity and intersectionality are baked into the issues PSMOs confront, so PSMOs already tackle intersectionality when organizing across lines of race, gender, and class. The addition of ideological pluralism to this already wide-reaching collection of “lived experiences” should come naturally in strategic terms.<sup>14</sup> The main hurdle is not ability, but willingness to accept and prioritize ideological diversity over progressive performance, getting past the viewpoint of progressive pluralism as a burden. The following sections detail exactly why and how PSMOs should prioritize progressive pluralism, the invitation of the moderate outreach into the folds of the progressive base’s grassroots action.

### **The Historical Argument for Progressive Pluralism**

Understanding the origins and evolution of American progressivism helps contextualize the contemporary American progressive movement and its key characteristics. In order to analyze this movement as a whole and successfully mold it to the principles of progressive pluralism, this robust, historically informed background is necessary.

American progressive thought originated as the nation underwent the massive economic and social changes of industrialization. A cadre of intellectuals advocated for a more democratic society and a return to the founding principles of America.<sup>15</sup> They feared that the free market, as an economic misinterpretation of “liberty” that weighed “negative freedom” or protection from government coercion too heavily, was taking away the “positive liberty” of American people, the freedom to “live a fulfilling and economically secure life.”<sup>16</sup> These intellectuals also emphasized principles of equality and social justice, expanding their philosophy beyond the economic realm. Resurgences of progressivism since this period have been tied to equally massive social upheavals, like the Vietnam War draft in the 1960s or the current economic plight of the American millennial.<sup>17</sup>

The incorporation of progressive ideals into social movements can be traced to a majority of the sweeping social and economic justice movements throughout American history. Early examples include the movements for abolition of slavery and women’s suffrage, as well as the Gilded Age labor movements.<sup>18</sup> The “identity factor” of these movements rings true in contemporary progressivism, as race, class, and gender issues continue to be central to the progressive

---

<sup>14</sup> Alicia Garza, *The Purpose of Power: How We Come Together When We Fall Apart* (New York: One World, 2020); Javier Matta, telephone interview by the author, Atherton, CA, October 26, 2021.

<sup>15</sup> John Halpin and Conor P. Williams, “The Progressive Intellectual Tradition in America,” Center for American Progress, last modified April 2010, <https://www.americanprogress.org/article/the-progressive-intellectual-tradition-in-america/>.

<sup>16</sup> Halpin and Williams, “The Progressive,” Center for American Progress.

<sup>17</sup> John B. Judis, “A Warning from the ‘60s Generation,” *Washington Post*, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/magazine/2020/01/21/i-was-60s-socialist-todays-progressives-are-danger-repeating-my-generations-mistakes/>.

<sup>18</sup> John Halpin and Marta Cook, “Social Movements and Progressivism,” Center for American Progress, last modified April 2010, <https://www.americanprogress.org/article/social-movements-and-progressivism/>.

platform. Progressive social movements in the United States have always relied on a core coalition of socially and economically marginalized peoples to make up their bases.

As the American Left evolved and became a tighter self-defined community through political entities like the Socialist and Communist parties, the movement adopted a tighter and more holistic ideology, congregating around a common political identity. Despite these emerging entities with chiefly electoral goals, the Left stayed centered around social movements and refrained from putting all their eggs in the basket of third-party electoral politics. The social-movement-focused approach of American progressivism benefited from elasticity, as, unlike institutionalized political parties, it was able to change with the times without any bureaucratic slowdown.<sup>19</sup> This helps to explain why many of the policies that contemporary PSMOs advocate for have popular support among voters, but little representation among lawmakers.

Turning to the past gives examples of progressive movements that both embraced and shunned progressive pluralism. Since academics are able to give more robust analysis of successes and failures of past movements than those unfolding before our eyes, looking at these movements provides a strong argument for the efficacy of progressive pluralism and gives insight into how to best structure the contemporary interpretation of this ideal.

### **Pluralistic Movements of the Past**

The American progressive movement has previously embraced ideas of progressive pluralism, both in the progressive era (1897-1920) and New Deal era (1933-1939). The progressivism of the “progressive era” was marked by pushes for a more direct democracy and workers’ protections against big business.<sup>20</sup> 1930s “New Deal” progressivism also embraced the role of government in citizens’ economic well being.<sup>21</sup> These policy goals lined up with the philosophy of the original progressive intellectuals by embracing positive freedom through economic equality.

In both of these eras, progressive leaders tried their hold on local and national electoral politics and courted partnerships with the liberal political establishment. During the progressive era, third-party progressive candidates for president gained notable popularity, with Socialist Party candidate Eugene Debs gaining over 900,000 votes in 1912, and Robert LaFollette gaining nearly five million votes and winning his home state of Wisconsin while running under his own Progressive Party in 1924.<sup>22</sup> Beyond this, both of the major parties nominated and won with presidential candidates from the progressive camps in the progressive and New Deal eras. In the progressive era, state-level progressive policies such as initiative, referendum, and recall passed with great popular support. The Center for American Progress states that “the real progressive action in this period was in the states,” reinforcing the success of such initiatives.<sup>23</sup> In the New Deal era, gubernatorial candidates such as Huey Long in Louisiana and Floyd Olsen in

---

<sup>19</sup> James N. Gregory, "Remapping the American Left: A History of Radical Discontinuity," *Labor: Studies in Working-Class History* 17, no. 2 (May 2020): 12-13.

<sup>20</sup> Ruy Teixeira and John Halpin, "The Progressive Tradition in American Politics," Center for American Progress, last modified April 2010, <https://www.americanprogress.org/article/the-progressive-tradition-in-american-politics/>.

<sup>21</sup> Teixeira and Halpin, "The Progressive," Center for American Progress.

<sup>22</sup> Gregory, "Remapping the American," 15, 21.

<sup>23</sup> Teixeira and Halpin, "The Progressive," Center for American Progress.

Minnesota campaigned and won with radical progressive platforms that conformed tightly to FDR's philosophy at the federal level.<sup>24</sup>

Both progressive era and New Deal progressivism framed common struggles in economic and power-oriented terms, leading to their ultimate mainstream status and political influence. These approaches proved successful in reaching moderates at the time and their effectiveness continues today.

Framing arguments in an economic lens is a key messaging tactic to capture moderates because it combats the central narrative they often leverage against progressive solutions: overspending. Showing awareness and understanding of possible economic implications of progressive policy, both by displaying the positive and mitigating the negative, boosts the credibility of progressive movements and promotes the necessity of their causes. Franklin D. Roosevelt boosted the economic credibility of his expensive agenda by incorporating fiscal conservatives, such as Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau, into his New Deal coalition.<sup>25</sup>

Current campaigns also show the power of economic arguments in marketing progressive causes to moderates. When working against an Alabama bill that would expand incarcerated populations, the Southern Poverty Law Center's (SPLC) policy team used an "equity lens" for more progressive lawmakers and a "fiscal lens" for moderates and conservatives.<sup>26</sup> When the bill ultimately failed, it only served to bolster progressive economic legitimacy, because republicans and moderates were caught in their hypocrisy over "fiscal responsibility." Tom Steyer sees a similar pattern between a strong economic argument and wider engagement, citing his economic credibility as a businessman as one of his key strengths when reaching out to moderates.<sup>27</sup> These arguments frame progressive causes in terms that moderates care about and demonstrate the effectiveness of progressive solutions on an economic level.

Van Stekelenburg et al. use social-constructivist social movement theory to explore the different individuals that are attracted to movements that mobilize around power versus values.<sup>28</sup> Power-oriented mobilizing context emphasizes exerting the influence of the people against the entrenched interests of the political elite. Values-oriented mobilizing context focuses on the central beliefs of an organization, especially as they relate to a certain ideology. The results show that values-oriented protest relies on ideologically motivated constituents alone, whereas power-oriented protest appeals to both ideologically and instrumentally (self-interest) motivated constituents.<sup>29</sup> Thus, a movement that embraces power-oriented calls to action will naturally produce an ideologically diverse following and a focus on tangible policy gains—textbook progressive pluralism. The Progressive Era and New Deal progressives achieved this through their lenses of economic marginalization. The power-oriented appeal of the Progressive and New

---

<sup>24</sup> Teixeira and Halpin, "The Progressive," Center for American Progress.

<sup>25</sup> Julian E. Zelizer, "The Forgotten Legacy of the New Deal: Fiscal Conservatism and the Roosevelt Administration, 1933-1938," *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 30, no. 2 (2000): 331, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27552097>.

<sup>26</sup> Shay Farley and Katie Glenn, videoconference interview by the author, Atherton, CA, October 22, 2021.

<sup>27</sup> Steyer, interview by the author.

<sup>28</sup> Social-constructivist theory of social movements is a school of thought that emphasizes the individual psychology of each participant, attempting to reconcile what these scholars see as an over-correction towards rational and collective explanation in the transition from classical theory to resource mobilization theory.

<sup>29</sup> Jacquelin van Stekelenburg, Bert Klandermans, and Wilco W. van Dijk, "Context Matters: Explaining How and Why Mobilizing Context Influences Motivational Dynamics," *Journal of Social Issues* 65, no. 4 (December 2009).



Deal eras naturally led to a pluralistic coalition. Both movements framed their causes as working on behalf of the people, and galvanized their supporters under this common identity.

It is important to note that both Progressive Era and New Deal progressivism existed in a “Bernie Sanders”-type reality, with class eclipsing race as the chief division in their visions of society. Yet even Sanders himself has had to transition to a more race-conscious approach to retain his credibility amongst an “a-woke-ning” contemporary left-wing populace with deep notions of racial justice in our society.<sup>30</sup> In this environment, it is important to supplement the universal approach of organizing around economic class and power by engaging ideas of racial justice. Yet this work must be done without evoking the white fear of demographic change. While white liberals are becoming increasingly supportive of the need to address racial justice and the growing diversity of America, terms like “majority-minority America” are best to avoid because they evoke the subconscious white fear of losing their historical political and economic agency.<sup>31</sup> Progressives cannot tiptoe around white fragility forever, but a gentler transition to a more equitable future ensures they can get them on board.

Today, mirroring the electoral aims of past pluralist movements, the Congressional Progressive Caucus is a sizable group exerting progressive legislative power, mainly in the House of Representatives, the legislative body intended to feel closer to the people. These lawmakers play an instrumental role in the propagation and success of PSMOs and their ultimate policy goals. For example, Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez’s partnership with the Sunrise Movement has elevated their national status and recognition as well as given their issue of climate change major legislative attention. However, given the rapid change in sociopolitical environment that comes with our internet-fueled information society, today’s progressive pluralism makes the elasticity of social movements a key strength, calling for them to play a central role in the progressive community beyond that of supporting progressive legislators. For this reason, my call for progressive pluralism in the present deviates from the past examples that achieved their key wins in the electoral politics and legislative spheres.

### **Progressive Performance of the Past**

While widely celebrated as a movement with sweeping influence, the New Left of the 1960s mirrors today’s progressive performance because of its dogmatic and intellectual core and its inward-focused messaging.

In the New Left, student leader Tom Hayden emphasized the “existential” appeal of politics and the goal of “personal liberation.”<sup>32</sup> The idea that political expression was a personal phenomenon and stemmed from deep intellectual and ideological convictions kept Hayden’s movement to an insular core group that was homogenous in thought. One of Hayden’s intellectual inspirations, C. Wright Mills, believed that the role of progressive intellectuals was “enlightening and mobilizing the public.”<sup>33</sup> The idea that the public needed to be enlightened to agree with Leftist intellectuals in order to participate also quashed any notion of pluralism in the New Left student movement.

---

<sup>30</sup> Garza, *The Purpose of Power*, 173.

<sup>31</sup> Ezra Klein, *Why We're Polarized* (New York: Avid Reader Press, 2021), 132.

<sup>32</sup> Louis Menand, “The Making of the New Left,” *The New Yorker*, March 2021, <https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2021/03/22/the-making-of-the-new-left>.

<sup>33</sup> Menand, “The Making.”

In addition, the New Left got stuck on an inward-focused communications strategy. Even before the New Left, PSMO messaging focused on underground socialist newspapers and academic publications, both attracting a core readership of ideologues alone.<sup>34</sup> In a crescendo of this strategy, the New Left deployed “thousands of underground periodicals” to disseminate its message—reaching only those predisposed to hearing it.<sup>35</sup> This “echo-chamber engagement” with movement ideas contributed to the formation of a homogenous and insular cadre of New Left adherents. Not only were movement ideas marketed to the base alone, but they were understandable and palatable only to ideological adherents, using progressive language and relying on shared ideological assumptions to build their arguments.

These shortcomings ring true today, as accusations of being overly “woke” and engaging in “identity politics” hinder the image of the contemporary progressive movement. While social media means that messages almost always reach a wider audience, the insular lexicon of PSMO messaging continues to bar movements off from the outreach. Leaders who focus on progressive performance and insular communications lose sight of the movement’s ultimate tactical goals. Stacey Abrams notes that while some groups, particularly young people, see the “woke” jargon as their everyday vocabulary, making it the language that reaches them best, other communities are overwhelmed or exasperated by the careful and unfamiliar language that progressive movements often use.<sup>36</sup> John B. Judis, a former 1960s-era activist warned today’s progressives against their “quasi-religious adherence to special language and gestures.”<sup>37</sup> After attending a Democratic Socialists of America conference, Judis observed that any outsider in attendance “would think they were on another planet” given the obscure practices and lexicon of the organization.<sup>38</sup> The moral and ideological convictions of progressives can keep them in a self-confirming echo-chamber of invented language, barring them from reaching a larger swath of people.

### **The Relevance of Progressive Pluralism**

From getting the moderate outreach to take meaningful action to getting the progressive base on board, progressive pluralism is uniquely suited to the current sociopolitical environment. The reasons for this are myriad and wide-reaching. Progressive pluralism allows PSMOs to capitalize on aspects of identity politics that were previously weaknesses. The intersectional nature of many of these organizations will make ideological pluralism easy to incorporate and maintain. Easy routes of participation like petition-signing that have become common, yet empty, actions in the age of “click-tivism” become central to capturing moderates when seen as “gateway actions” that coax new members into future participation, not “one-and-done.” Lastly, progressive pluralism, as the antithesis to progressive performance, helps organizations reach the instrumental as well as the ideological base and engage in strategic and successful messaging.

### **Progressive Pluralism & Identity Politics**

Politics are often seen through the lens of self-interest: each person casts their vote after carefully determining it to be the one that will personally benefit them the most. People form policy

---

<sup>34</sup> Gregory, “Remapping the American,” 16.

<sup>35</sup> Gregory, “Remapping the American,” 26.

<sup>36</sup> Stacey Abrams, “Cowboy Up, Joe Manchin,” interview by Jon Favreau, June 3, 2021, in *Pod Save America*, produced by Crooked Media, podcast, audio, 79:20.

<sup>37</sup> Judis, “A Warning,” *The Washington Post*.

<sup>38</sup> Judis, “A Warning,” *The Washington Post*.

opinions based on their own personal values and self-interest, creating a calculated web of political views that directly benefits them. However, no matter how rational political institutions as a whole may be, each human is far from this image of a calculated, selfish citizen. Calculated, rational approaches like this rational-choice theory must always be counterbalanced by approaches that account for the irrational and emotional nature of individual participants—the transition from resource mobilization theory to social-constructivist in the social movements literature perfectly illustrates this delicate balance.<sup>39</sup> These psychological approaches remind us that humans live in a perceived reality, and do not always act in an objectively rational way. This means that political participation must be viewed in a different way that better accounts for human nature.

An alternate perspective emphasizes the importance our identity has in shaping our political views. Lilliana Mason, a leading scholar on American political polarization, argues that we experience politics through identity, not policy. Politics have become more polarized, and our opinions more gridlocked, as we become more socially distant from those with identities different than us, and create partisan alignments to match.<sup>40</sup> Following our biological tendencies, politics become what psychologist Jonathan Haidt calls a “groupish” phenomenon.<sup>41</sup> We choose the party where we feel our identity best fits in, and mold policy opinions to defend our membership in that group.<sup>42</sup> There exist Republicans who, based on policies, seem like they should be Democrats, and vice versa. These partisans, however, exhibit a “warmth bias” to their self-defined party alignment over their rational party choice.<sup>43</sup> In such an environment, our thinking becomes “motivated reasoning,” built to confirm our views.<sup>44</sup> Participation becomes about making your team win, not advancing your own personal policy agendas.<sup>45</sup> Rational appeals to change our minds, including those focusing on our self-interest, just don’t reach us.

A sensible hesitation towards progressive pluralism is that if PSMOs include the moderate outreach without co-opting and absorbing them into the ideological base, the moderate outreach will end up co-opting them. That is to say, PSMOs will necessarily lose the integrity of their platform as progressive in the quest to attract moderates. However, the sociopolitical landscape of identity politics ensures that policy will be left unscathed in outreach efforts guided by progressive pluralism.

Progressive movements should embrace the landscape of identity politics as somewhat of a silver bullet when it comes to messaging to and mobilizing the moderate outreach. Because progressive movements need to appeal to the moderate outreach on the grounds of identity, not policy, no changes in their agenda need to be made that might threaten the “progressive-ness” of their goals. Put simply, PSMOs do not need to sell their souls to centrism for the sake of attracting more constituents and building their influence through progressive pluralism. The messaging and

---

<sup>39</sup> van Stekelenburg and Klandermans, “Social Movement,” 16.

<sup>40</sup> Lilliana Mason, *Uncivil Agreement: How Politics Became Our Identity* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2018).

<sup>41</sup> Jonathan Haidt, *The Righteous Mind: Why Good People Are Divided by Politics and Religion* (New York: Pantheon Books, 2012).

<sup>42</sup> Mason, *Uncivil Agreement*, 20-21.

<sup>43</sup> Mason, *Uncivil Agreement*, 52-53.

<sup>44</sup> Klein, *Why We’re Polarized*, 100.

<sup>45</sup> Mason, *Uncivil Agreement*, 103.

outreach tactics that lead to a broad coalition happen on a different level—the level of shared identity.

Despite this comforting truth, considerable work is necessary for PSMOs to meet the age of identity politics. The American right has been much more effective at consolidating their movements' identities and morals and at leveraging these crucial aspects in their messaging.<sup>46</sup> Furthermore, they often consolidate around fury, especially fury against a villainized left. The Left's status of being “everyone else” who doesn't conform to the tightly constructed conservative bloc makes unifying and mobilizing a constant struggle.<sup>47</sup> The left has yet to effectively address the salience of identity in their messaging or outreach, making it a key area to address when rethinking progressive messaging.

The dog-whistles and misconstrued words of a polarized information space make it easy to turn the public against a progressive movement that champions wokeness, which some see as a derogatory term. Social constructivist work by Bert Klandermans reveals that the individual decision to participate depends in part on the perceived social desirability of one's participation and the expected total number of fellow participants.<sup>48</sup> Given these factors, having moderates in an environment that constantly erodes progressive legitimacy is detrimental to the growth of progressive social movements. The moderate outreach will exaggerate expected backlash from their moderate circles and underestimate the number of people who will have a positive opinion of the organization and also be compelled to participate. As a result, they will discourage themselves from taking action.

Moderates who participate on behalf of their “team” need to be convinced to abandon it and participate on behalf of their individualistic values by aligning with progressive organizations. One way to address the challenges of identity politics is to facilitate affinity for progressive organizations among moderates—this is where intersectionality across ideology becomes a key characteristic of progressive pluralist movements.

### **Progressive Pluralism & Intersectionality**

A broad ideological coalition does not need to jeopardize the unity or mobilizing capability of the constituents of a PSMO. In *The Principles of Sociology*, Edward Alsworth Ross equates political parties to sexes, ages, races, nationalities, and classes as some of “the chief oppositions which occur in society.”<sup>49</sup> Given this, it is fair to say that ideological diversity can be treated as a facet of an organization's intersectionality. Dr. Kimberlé Crenshaw coined the term “intersectionality” to describe how different forms of discrimination can overlap within people's unique identities, and Garza expands this idea by noting how “in practice, intersectionality results in unlearning and undoing segregation and thus interrupting the ways that power is consolidated in the hands of the few.”<sup>50</sup> This means unlearning harsh ideological divisions between the progressive base and moderate outreach in order to work towards tangible and mutually beneficial goals. Research and commentary about intersectionality in general thus

---

<sup>46</sup> Haidt, *The Righteous*.

<sup>47</sup> Abrams, “Cowboy Up, Joe Manchin,” interview.

<sup>48</sup> Bert Klandermans, “Mobilization and Participation: Social-Psychological Expansions of Resource Mobilization Theory,” *American Sociological Review* 49, no. 5 (October 1984), JSTOR.

<sup>49</sup> Edward Alsworth Ross, *The Principles of Sociology* (1920), quoted in Klein, *Why We're Polarized*.

<sup>50</sup> Garza, *The Purpose of Power*, 35, 144.

points to the best way to incorporate multiple ideologies into one central group, finding strength in heterogeneity.

When exploring the efficacy of intersectional movements, Women's and Gender Studies professor Cricket Keating advocates for an approach called "everyday coalition-building." Instead of focusing on a singular shared goal and formulating a singular shared strategy, intersectional movements need to facilitate mutual recognition between identity groups. Each identity group experiences its own struggles, which are interconnected with other groups' in some ways and entirely unique in others. Each group also has its own methods of confronting these struggles—their organizational tactics.<sup>51</sup> Intersectional movements must embrace the power of plurality, not force everyone into a singular box, in order to gain the power that comes from cooperation.

Alicia Garza, a founder of the Black Lives Matter movement, explores the need for intersectionality in her book *The Purpose of Power*. Garza emphasizes the need to counterbalance affinity movements, such as those that mainly mobilize the Black community on Black issues, with majoritarian movements that invite all groups into the fold while retaining their goals on behalf of a specific group, in this case the Black community, in order to prevent counterproductive "isolationism".<sup>52</sup> In the words of resource mobilization theory, majoritarian movements are looking to engage ideological constituents as well as potential beneficiaries. Progressive movements, which attract people based on ideology, are thus naturally intersectional.

Garza admits that working across identity lines provides a PSMO with specific organizational problems to confront. She expresses frustration with a Latina co-organizer who once griped to her that "the push for Black and brown unity will get lost if we aren't talking about it" in response to a multiracial group spending "too much of their energy" on what she perceived as strictly Black issues.<sup>53</sup> From this experience, Garza reflects that "multiracial organizing rooted in principles of representation, rather than strategy, is as dangerous as it is ineffective."<sup>54</sup> Garza's experiences in multiracial coalitions reveal that inviting all groups to the table can quickly hinder productivity if left unchecked. Having a diverse ideological coalition means addressing a wide range of concerns, yet every single action cannot always please everyone and put everyone's voice at the forefront. Groups need to acknowledge this line between productive and arbitrary intersectionality.

Intersectionality also means changing the narrative of the issues progressives confront by revisiting the questions of "whose issue is it, anyway?" Shay Farley, leader of the Southern Poverty Law Center's policy team, notes that issues that someone might not see as "theirs" often "still affect [them] in some way," citing as an example how lower income white people are equally disadvantaged by systems of poverty as the black working class, yet tend to be less engaged on the issue.<sup>55</sup> Reshaping the narrative of who "owns" progressive issues is key to Farley's persuasive work in a historically conservative state, Alabama. Garza sees intersectionality as a way to combat the "xenophobic" narrative that "groups outside [certain]

---

<sup>51</sup> Cricket Keating, "The Politics of Everyday Coalition-Building," *New Political Science* 40, no. 1 (February 2018).

<sup>52</sup> Garza, *The Purpose of Power*, 157-9.

<sup>53</sup> Garza, *The Purpose of Power*, 152-3.

<sup>54</sup> Garza, *The Purpose of Power*, 155.

<sup>55</sup> Farley and Glenn, videoconference interview by the author.

communities don't also exist within them."<sup>56</sup> Intersectionality is built on overlap that often goes under the radar. With the right understanding between groups, heterogeneity is not a force that pulls a group apart. Rather, bringing people with interconnected struggles together strengthens a group.

Given the previous section, the ideological diversity of progressive pluralism will also exist in a coalition built on otherwise intersecting identities. Viewing ideology as one facet of intersectionality means allowing discord and slight disagreement to exist within an organization. Moderates become an expansion of the organization, not a co-opted group forced to change out their views and affiliations for ones the organization prescribes. Intersectionality gives us the infrastructure to sustain a pluralist movement, but progressives need to lay out a welcome mat to get the moderate outreach mobilized in the first place.

### **Working Beyond the Participation Binary**

In order to embrace progressive pluralism, it is necessary to eliminate the binary of participation and encourage low-stakes gateway actions alongside high-impact collective action. All-or-nothing ideological expectations of ideological purists translate into all-or-nothing expectations for taking action, but that view is far from accurate. The moderate outreach needs to be eased into taking action in ways that minimize personal and social costs in order to eventually lead up to the open and unrestrained participation that moderates are initially hesitant to embrace.

Social-constructivist theory of social movements confirms the importance of “gateway actions” with low social risk attached to them to attract new members, especially those in the moderate outreach. Klandermans’s argument that social costs are a barrier to participation is especially important when considering how the moderate outreach might view the pros and cons of participation.<sup>57</sup> Moderate social circles are often socially distant and not warm to PSMOs. Organizations must act in a way that minimizes these perceived social costs in order to maximize their resources and chances of success.

In order to achieve this goal, it is important to counterbalance collective grassroots action with isolated “gateway actions” such as writing to representatives, donating on a small scale, petition-signing, text-banking or attending a webinar or lecture-type event. This category of actions gets the moderate outreach involved in a low-stakes environment and gets them in the loop (via the email and text database of the organization) for sustained communication that can expand their involvement in the future. While not the be-all-end-all for moderate outreach participation, gateway action gets the ball rolling.

At the same time, it is also important to foster social connectivity between participants and form a grassroots community that encourages sustained action. Many large, national SMOs are “federalized,” creating local chapters that allow more interaction between constituents. These connections within the organization are dubbed essential by resource mobilization theory. McCarthy and Zald see “isolated” constituents as a less reliable flow of resources, so they encourage organizations to bring their participants together in shared spaces where they can

---

<sup>56</sup> Garza, *The Purpose of Power*, 158.

<sup>57</sup> Klandermans, "Mobilization and Participation."

interact face to face.<sup>58</sup> At the same time, they note the potential for “tension and conflict” when all types of constituents come together at these chapter meetings.<sup>59</sup> This fine line between solidarity and infighting makes eliminating the binary all the more important. Moderates dip their toes in the water and become familiar with the language, values, and practices of the organization through gateway actions before diving head-on into full engagement.

Local chapters also have the benefit of bringing the organization closer to instrumental issues affecting people in their everyday lives through an emphasis on local policy. The left engages in counterproductive “hobby politics” when it fixates on federal policy: one example of this is showing up to cast inconsequential presidential ballots in safely blue states but staying home in the more contested local and state level races where it really matters, just as Massachusetts Democrats did in the last election cycle.<sup>60</sup> This spills over into PSMOs that focus on federal policy, which often relies on a deep ideological foundation, and neglect the most tangible manifestations of their issues at the state and local level. Federalizing the structure of a PSMO prevents this fixation from taking over the strategic outlook of the organization at all levels. Gateway actions allow the moderate outreach to get involved in a low-social-cost way and acquaint them with the world of grassroots organizing. Katie Glenn of the SPLC’s policy team expresses her frustration with “unengaged white liberals saying ‘I wish I had a Stacey [Abrams] in my state,’” completely oblivious to the ten-plus years of work that built the coalition affording Abrams and Georgia progressives their huge 2020 success.<sup>61</sup> When the moderate outreach knows how to get involved and feels encouraged to do so, this apathy becomes impossible to justify or sustain—yet without doing the work of eliminating the binary of participation, no one can expect the moderate outreach to shake this attitude.

### **Rising Above Progressive Performance**

No matter how proven the effectiveness of progressive pluralism is, this ideal will only be achieved if progressive leaders are willing to adopt it. The biggest roadblock to getting there is replacing the current strategy of progressive performance, which signals a staunchly progressive agenda to the progressive base but frames the benefits of the movement’s goals only on ideological terms. Abandoning progressive performance does not mean abandoning the ideological progressive base. In fact, it allows organizations to capture these people even more effectively while also reaching the moderate outreach and the instrumental base, meaning the people who stand to directly benefit from the organization’s work.

The best way to counteract broad-brush progressive performance is by zeroing in on personalized and values-based appeals. To achieve this, Tom Steyer advocates for reaching out to people as individuals, learning their values, and letting them know “you care about the same things they care about,” even if you might disagree on policy, through pitches that “address what they already believe.”<sup>62</sup> When it comes to advocating for climate action, Steyer emphasizes the power of “very local, very personal” advertising, instead of the “spray can” of non-targeted TV

---

<sup>58</sup> McCarthy and Zald, “Resource Mobilization,” 1228

<sup>59</sup> McCarthy and Zald, “Resource Mobilization,” 1231

<sup>60</sup> Shankar Vedantam and Eitan Hersh, “Passion Isn’t Enough,” February 10, 2020, in *Hidden Brain*, podcast, audio, 47:54.

<sup>61</sup> Farley and Glenn, videoconference interview by the author.

<sup>62</sup> Steyer, interview by the author.

ads or the traditional, intellectual approach of “polar bears, ice caps, and science.”<sup>63</sup> These approaches play to identity-based affinity to reach people more effectively in their perceived reality. The SPLC policy team takes a similar approach, emphasizing the importance of “meaningful one-on-one conversations” that reveal how “people are not binaries” and will often be sympathetic with certain areas of a progressive cause even if they tend to hold more moderate or conservative views.<sup>64</sup> To them, “the best social movements acknowledge the complexity of people’s wants and needs.”<sup>65</sup> These purposeful connections allow people to lean into their personal affinities with the organization’s values instead of being confronted by ideological convictions they may disagree with.

In the pursuit of the moderate outreach, it is important to retain connections with the progressive base and keep them engaged. Garza puts it simply: “no base, no movement.”<sup>66</sup> Glenn and Farley share a similar sentiment, saying that, for progressives, especially those working in more conservative environments, even though “just the base won’t win anything,” “if you don’t have the base, you’re not ready” to persuade anyone else.<sup>67</sup> Luckily, each member of the base retains just as much humanity and individuality as the moderate outreach, so the individualized, one-on-one approaches that captivate the outreach can also apply to the base. Steyer shuns being “dogmatic” with the base just as much as with the outreach.<sup>68</sup> Instrumental and individualized messaging approaches should replace progressive performance, at least to an extent, even when communicating to the progressive base.

It is also important to see a PSMO’s base not only as ideological adherents, but as also including the chief people they are fighting for. Farley notes that the SPLC “was not particularly representative” of the instrumental base, the populations most impacted by the issues the SPLC confronts, for a long time.<sup>69</sup> A lot of their current work reconciles this fact by “ensur[ing] what [the SPLC is] working on is what the impacted people would want.”<sup>70</sup> Will Tucker of Jobs to Move America calls this disconnect the “nonprofit-industrial complex” and emphasizes that the true base of the workers’ rights movement is the workers themselves, not the progressives that share the same ideological convictions as his organization.<sup>71</sup> In a PSMO entrenched in progressive performance, the true people that the movement is fighting for can easily become obscured. Achieving tangible gains for the core affected groups is much more important than signaling ideological purity to the intellectual base. It is important that all work in a movement has the former ultimate goal in mind, not the latter.

Moving past progressive performance is an important goal for all progressive movements. Eliminating this strategy does not mean losing the ideological base. Rather, replacing progressive performance with progressive pluralism allows organizations to better address both the progressive base and the moderate outreach as individual people, all whose wants and needs intersect with their platform.

---

<sup>63</sup> Steyer, interview by the author.

<sup>64</sup> Farley and Glenn, videoconference interview by the author.

<sup>65</sup> Farley and Glenn, videoconference interview by the author.

<sup>66</sup> Garza, *The Purpose of Power*, 212.

<sup>67</sup> Farley and Glenn, videoconference interview by the author.

<sup>68</sup> Steyer, interview by the author.

<sup>69</sup> Farley and Glenn, videoconference interview by the author.

<sup>70</sup> Farley and Glenn, videoconference interview by the author.

<sup>71</sup> Will Tucker, telephone interview by the author, Atherton, CA, October 27, 2021.



### **Case Studies in Progressive Pluralism**

A large part of my inquiry into PSMOs took part in personal interviews with leaders in the field. Leaders from three different PSMOs which organize around a particular issue provided case studies for the current state of progressive pluralism. Each case study includes background on the PSMO analyzed, public opinion polling and memos on messaging concerning their specific organizing issue, and an analysis of their messaging strategies based on the insights of the memos and the theory of progressive pluralism. All of these organizations incorporate progressive pluralism into their messaging to a commendable degree, but no organization is bound to be perfect. As such, each case study concludes with a specific insight for improvement on progressive pluralism moving forward.

### **End Citizens United**

End Citizens United (ECU) is a PSMO that focuses on “creating a system that functions better for the people,” not corporate interests, through advocacy for campaign finance reform and voting rights. The organization began with a focus on “small-dollar grassroots fundraising” in 2015, and has since expanded into advocating for legislation and, most recently, grassroots organizing.<sup>72</sup> Their main focus, as a political action committee (PAC), is helping elect candidates who prioritize their platform.<sup>73</sup>

ECU has achieved a number of major successes in its six years of existence. As the organization has been able to endorse and fund successful campaigns, they have gained a legislative foothold and been able to leverage their partnerships as candidates they support move into lawmaker positions.<sup>74</sup> This allows their founding focus on grassroots fundraising to wane over time, making way for a larger emphasis on policy advocacy. Another feedback loop of successful campaigns funded and endorsed by ECU is that they legitimize the organization’s cause, showing the world that being a champion of campaign finance is something that gets candidates elected, even moderate ones.<sup>75</sup>

ECU spent much of the last year campaigning for the For The People Act (HR1/S1), and is now supporting its successor, the Freedom to Vote (FTV) Act. Both Adam Smith, ECU’s VP of Strategic Partnerships, and Adam Bozzi, ECU’s VP of Communications, celebrate the existence of the For the People Act as a major win for the organization in and of itself. As the symbolic first bill of the session, it established campaign finance and voting rights as a top priority, signifying campaign finance reform’s transformation from a “wonky, boring” issue that people don’t care about to a top priority in Washington.<sup>76</sup>

Even as campaign finance reform is seen as a “Democratic base issue” among legislators, the general public tends to be in support of ECU’s positions. A 2018 Pew Research survey found that 90% of Americans find it important that big donors do not have more influence on

---

<sup>72</sup> Adam Bozzi, telephone interview by the author, Atherton, CA, October 18, 2021.

<sup>73</sup> Bozzi, telephone interview by the author; Adam Smith, telephone interview by the author, Atherton, CA, November 4, 2021.

<sup>74</sup> Smith, telephone interview by the author.

<sup>75</sup> Smith, telephone interview by the author.

<sup>76</sup> Bozzi, telephone interview by the author.

lawmakers than others, and 72% think that this is an ideal our country has not yet achieved.<sup>77</sup> There is not a big discrepancy between the views of Democratic and Republican voters—71% of Republicans versus 74% of Democrats agreed with the second statement mentioned above.<sup>78</sup> There is likely even less discrepancy between moderates and progressives within the democratic group given the wide agreement on this issue.

ECU commissioned a research report by ALG Research to evaluate how certain messaging on the Freedom to Vote Act lands with Democratic, Independent, and Republican voters in order to better tailor their messaging strategies. The report found that 72% of voters expressed support for the FTV Act when framed in terms of cracking down on corruption and corporate influence in elections.<sup>79</sup> While a majority of subjects of all political affiliations supported the FTV Act, the margin was widest with Democrats and smallest with Republicans (95% of Democrats, 71% of Independents, and 55% of Republicans).<sup>80</sup> In addition, the report found that a “money in politics” framing of the FTV Act significantly increased the number of independents who were “very convinced” as opposed to the “traditional Democratic” framing, while having little effect on partisans (a majority of Democrats and a slim portion of Republicans were “very convinced” in both scenarios).<sup>81</sup> “Traditional Democratic” framing started with the words “Democrats in the U.S. Senate...” and used framing common in Democratic campaigns to tie ECU’s agenda to the Democratic majority’s legislative priorities, whereas “money in politics” framing, while still mentioning “Democrats in the U.S. Senate,” emphasized the ECU agenda’s intended impact to get money out of politics rather than referring primarily to established Democratic Party goals.<sup>82</sup> The results of this study give a strong argument for progressive pluralism in ECU.

In practice, ECU uses the universal appeal of anti-corruption messaging to their advantage. As it is evocative of van Stekelenburg et. al.’s “power-oriented mobilizing context,” anti-corruption messaging is proven to be noncontroversial across ideological lines.<sup>83</sup> To Bozzi, the most important part of his work is ensuring that money in politics and voting rights remain “something that moderates and progressives can agree on” and something that Democratic lawmakers can “run on and legislate on in unity.”<sup>84</sup> For this reason, both Bozzi and Smith stated that they do not see much of a “code switch” on messaging between moderates and progressives, a response that was outside the norm in my research.<sup>85</sup> At the same time as they appeal across the ideological spectrum, ECU engages with the core progressive community through coalitions and strategic partnerships with other PSMOs. Smith, as the director of these relationships, emphasizes the necessity of this work to “align strategies, lift each other up, and combine efforts” between organizations to maximize effectiveness.<sup>86</sup> While this level of progressive pluralism may be

---

<sup>77</sup> Bradley Jones, "Most Americans Want to Limit Campaign Spending, Say Big Donors Have Greater Political Influence," Pew Research Center, last modified May 8, 2018, <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2018/05/08/most-americans-want-to-limit-campaign-spending-say-big-donors-have-greater-political-influence/>.

<sup>78</sup> Jones, “Most Americans,” Pew Research Center.

<sup>79</sup> ALG Research, "Senate Battleground Poll," End Citizens United, last modified September 2021, <https://www.endcitizensunited.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/ECU-SENATE-BATTLGROUNDFINAL-AFv2-copy.pdf>.

<sup>80</sup> ALG Research, "Senate Battleground," End Citizens United.

<sup>81</sup> ALG Research, "Senate Battleground," End Citizens United.

<sup>82</sup> ALG Research, "Senate Battleground," End Citizens United.

<sup>83</sup> van Stekelenburg, Klandermans, and van Dijk, "Context Matters."

<sup>84</sup> Bozzi, telephone interview by the author.

<sup>85</sup> Bozzi, telephone interview by the author; Smith, telephone interview by the author.

<sup>86</sup> Smith, telephone interview by the author.

difficult to achieve for movements that organize around issues that are less universal in nature, ECU stands as a beacon of cooperation across ideology.

Even though HR1/S1, the For the People Act, ultimately did not get passed (which led to the creation of the FTV Act as a successor), ECU was able to use this bill to prove that campaign finance and voting rights are winning platforms for any lawmaker left of center, moderate or progressive. Even as support among the electorate transcends ideological lines, in Smith's words, the current climate of politics means that ECU has accepted that, with lawmakers, they "are not going to get bipartisan support no matter what [they] do," especially when it comes to voting rights, because they are "working on an issue that one party has decided they are going to lie about."<sup>87</sup> Still, ECU's issues retain support and attention across the broad ideological spectrum of democrats in congress, as HR1 was cosponsored by every democratic member of the House of Representatives. Bozzi points out that ECU's endorsements range from Conor Lamb to AOC, spanning the ideological spectrum of the party and engaging a variety of voices on the issue.<sup>88</sup> Moderate lawmakers are on board in the fight for campaign finance reform, communicating the importance of the issue to their like-minded constituents.

The main challenge currently facing ECU is growing their grassroots presence. While ECU signals to collective strength to help encourage donations, this cannot replace the community feel of true grassroots organizing. ECU recognizes this hole in their engagement, and is working to expand into the organizing sphere, as well as bringing their issues closer to home through local- and state-level initiatives. Their newly founded "Leaders of American Democracy" program creates a network of local and state politicians committed to prioritizing campaign finance reform and voting rights. Bozzi hopes that this program will "lead to a stronger grassroots network" because ECU will be spending more time and energy in local communities.<sup>89</sup>

Bozzi and Smith both identified continuing to grow grassroots engagement as a top priority, especially emerging from the Covid-19 pandemic. Bozzi believes that seeing Joe Manchin have somewhat of a change of heart on the For the People Act following widespread grassroots pressure was the "tangible reaction [that] motivates people" to continue to participate in or join their grassroots campaign.<sup>90</sup> Leveraging this recognition among lawmakers encourages volunteers to continue to prioritize this fight, helping grow ECU's grassroots resources. Smith also points out their strategy of "engaging existing [donors] and turning them into volunteers," treating grassroots donation as a gateway action to more direct involvement.<sup>91</sup> While not every donor will necessarily take further action, ECU's strategy of balancing outreach to donors and rented lists of activists currently doing work on other issues means ECU can expect a robust response.<sup>92</sup>

In my view, as ECU moves into the activism sphere and their public image gains the potential to become more disparate, it is crucial that they retain their universal, power-oriented messaging. As Garza's experiences with representation power struggles show, giving a larger voice and

---

<sup>87</sup> Smith, telephone interview by the author.

<sup>88</sup> Bozzi, telephone interview by the author.

<sup>89</sup> Bozzi, telephone interview by the author.

<sup>90</sup> Bozzi, telephone interview by the author.

<sup>91</sup> Smith, telephone interview by the author.

<sup>92</sup> Smith, telephone interview by the author.

public platform to each participant in protest or meeting settings is a risky, yet necessary, move for organizations. It is crucial that letting one voice be heard does not mean ostracizing others, and that the issue continues to be treated not as a merely ideological issue but an issue that engages all people against the political elite.

### **Sunrise Movement**

The Sunrise Movement (referred to as “Sunrise”) is a youth-focused PSMO that organizes around climate change solutions. Sunrise specifically advocates for a Green New Deal (GND), which they have been engaged in since before it formally existed as a resolution. According to its website, Sunrise is “a youth movement to stop climate change and create millions of good jobs in the process.” The organization has gained much of its notoriety from its partnership with Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, the co-author of the Green New Deal and one of the most vocal progressive members of congress. Sunrise mainly focuses on organizing volunteers into local “hubs” and mobilizing these members to draw attention through “big stunts and spectacles” like the Climate Strike or a sit-in at Speaker Pelosi’s office.<sup>93</sup> In my research, I mainly interacted with leaders of the Sunrise Silicon Valley hub (referred to as “SSV”), which often aligns with Sunrise national but diverges in a number of key ways.

In just four short years since its founding in 2017, Sunrise has had a huge impact. In January 2020, Varshini Prakash, a co-founder of Sunrise, stated the organization’s biggest accomplishments as “push[ing] every major Democratic candidate to release climate plans,” “push[ing] climate change, through the Green New Deal, to be at the forefront of our politics,” and “engag[ing] tens of thousands of young people [ . . . ] and giving them the tools to manifest the reality they want in this country.”<sup>94</sup> Sunrise’s ability to elevate both their personal political influence and that of their key issue is an impressive show for their short existence.

Sunrise has worked as a central player in Ed Markey’s (the other GND co-author) senatorial campaigns against the Kennedy political dynasty in Massachusetts, pushing the GND to the forefront of his electoral messaging with great success. Markey’s involvement with the GND has boosted his support among the progressives and young people that make up Sunrise’s base. Sunrise’s other co-founder, Evan Weber, saw Markey’s successful re-election in September 2020 as a message that “running boldly and aggressively on climate change is a political winner.”<sup>95</sup> Since Sunrise targets youth, a group that tends to be more progressive than the electorate as a whole, progressive pluralism has the potential to feel less necessary for Sunrise to grow their movement. However, the need for progressive pluralism remains when marching towards the ultimate goal of influencing tangible policy change. Markey’s re-election was key to maintaining Sunrise’s foothold in Washington, D.C. The campaign ultimately relied on suburban moderates to receive the necessary votes to defeat Markey’s primary challenger.

The GND is certainly stamped as a divisive and staunchly progressive policy goal, but public opinion polling tells a bit of a different story. While it is true that a much larger portion of Democrats than Republicans support the GND (83% versus 36%), both a majority (57%) of

---

<sup>93</sup> Matta, telephone interview by the author.

<sup>94</sup> Varshini Prakash, "It's Wide Open!" interview by Jon Lovett, January 13, 2020, in *Pod Save America*, produced by Crooked Media, podcast, audio, 70:21.

<sup>95</sup> Evan Weber, "Here Comes the Sunrise Movement," interview, September 9, 2020, in *What a Day*, produced by Crooked Media, hosted by Gideon Resnick and Akilah Hughes, podcast, audio, 21:07.

Independents and a majority (60%) of the electorate as a whole support the resolution.<sup>96</sup> The incendiary nature of the term “Green New Deal” is revealed when looking at the polling on individual provisions of the resolution: each policy action has higher support than the resolution as a whole, ranging from 67% (climate innovation and climate justice) to over 80% (cheaper utilities, reducing pollution) of people supporting them.<sup>97</sup>

Data For Progress also commissioned a research report by Pollux Group to evaluate how certain messaging around the GND lands with base democratic, “persuadable,” and independent voters. The goal of this memo was to encourage better messaging strategies among climate-focused PSMOs. Independents were defined as participants who tested more moderate on the diagnostic, and Persuadables were both moderate on the diagnostic and had a history as “switch voters.” The report found that support for the GND can be expanded among persuadables and independents if messaging focuses on “local impacts and tangible benefits,” and “economic benefits, especially job creation.”<sup>98</sup>

Sunrise has a reputation of being a hardline progressive organization but recognizes the importance of appealing beyond the progressive base. Sunrise puts all endorsements up to a direct community vote, and, for the 2020 Democratic primary, that meant endorsing far-left candidate Bernie Sanders. Sunrise’s strategy of “spectacle” is incendiary by design, drawing negative attention all the same as positive. Ideologically-rooted convictions like “climate justice” or supporting the “indigenous sovereignty” of Palestine are everyday language to Sunrise, labeling important work but ostracizing some who do not share this lexicon. Despite this, Weber emphasized that the polling on Markey’s supporters showed, “climate is not only an issue that can motivate the Democratic Party base, which is younger, more progressive, more diverse, [ . . . ] but is also something that can win over suburban moderates, particularly moderate women and young swing voters, young Republicans.”<sup>99</sup> Weber not only recognizes the importance of a pluralistic appeal, but emphasizes the ability of climate-focused organizing to build a pluralist coalition. This energy is laudable, but noticeably missing without the galvanizing event of a political campaign.

Sunrise’s Silicon Valley Hub has a considerably less hardline approach than Sunrise national. Former hub leader Javier Matta explains that while “there tends not to be too much discrepancy between political opinions” of SSV members, SSV looks to engage people of a variety of views in two main ways: by discouraging unproductive infighting and by using messaging that frames climate change as a “general fight.”<sup>100</sup> This means emphasizing parts of the GND like clean air, clean water, and jobs creation with tangible and universal effects—just as the doctor ordered in the Pollux Group report. An anonymous SSV leader also notes that “[Sunrise] national is sometimes extreme in certain areas,” so, while the hub works to apply what national is doing to their local community, this sometimes means electing to diverge from their messaging path and taking a more universal approach.<sup>101</sup> The discrepancy between Sunrise national and SSV reveals

---

<sup>96</sup>Danielle Deiseroth and Lew Blank, “Voters Overwhelmingly Support the Green New Deal,” Data for Progress, last modified April 19, 2021, <https://www.dataforprogress.org/blog/2021/4/19/voters-support-green-new-deal>.

<sup>97</sup> Deiseroth and Blank, “Voters Overwhelmingly,” Data for Progress.

<sup>98</sup> Pollux Group, “Memo: Messaging the Green New Deal,” Data for Progress, last modified July 9, 2019, <https://www.dataforprogress.org/memos/messaging-green-new-deal>.

<sup>99</sup> Weber, “Here Comes,” interview.

<sup>100</sup> Matta, telephone interview by the author.

<sup>101</sup> Anonymous, telephone interview by the author, Atherton, CA, November 1, 2021.

yet another benefit of “federalizing” PSMOs—allowing the national face of the organization to remain staunchly progressive while local grassroots networks pull most of the weight of progressive pluralism.

However, when it comes to interactions with lawmakers, SSV mainly focuses on forming connections with lawmakers who “support the type of action they are pushing for already” by reinforcing messages of “allyship” and “expectation” to follow through on promises.<sup>102</sup> When approaching more moderate lawmakers, they tend to “use far more statistics, figures, and news coverage” to make the argument that supporting the policies SSV is advocating for will be beneficial to and popular amongst constituents.<sup>103</sup> SSV focuses on these relationships less because they take far more energy to forge and maintain. While SSV is more pluralistic than Sunrise National, nothing is black-and-white, and both the local and national levels of the organization have their strengths and shortcomings when it comes to progressive pluralism.

In my view, Sunrise needs to examine its tendency towards inward-focused messaging and take a less compartmentalized approach to progressive pluralism. While the campaign strategists in Sunrise’s national leadership come out and do the necessary work for a moderate approach during election season, as seen with Markey, the off-season remains a missed opportunity to engage moderates and strengthen their coalition. In her January 2020 interview, Prakash mentions a goal to “double or triple” the size of their movement in the coming years, citing Sunrise’s ability to “giv[e] people the tools so they don’t have to wait to take action” through hubs as the main factor that will motivate that many people to join.<sup>104</sup> Access to this wide swath of people requires a willingness to let universally popular goals of the movement as outlined by the Pollux Group report eclipse progressive performance when it comes to messaging.

### **Jobs to Move America**

Jobs to Move America (JMA) is a think tank and policy organization for worker advocacy. JMA advocates on behalf of workers to ensure that their rights are respected through good working conditions, transparency, and communication between management and workers, and works to ensure that public funding is directed towards organizations that treat their workers fairly. The organization uses public records to conduct research evaluating working conditions at corporations and identifying the best policies to achieve their goals. JMA includes a national team that focuses on policy development and advocacy and regional teams that balance state and local policy with organizing workers and engaging grassroots coalitions at a local level.

JMA has achieved many key policy successes in the past few years. Pete Buttigieg’s May 2021 re-launch of the “hire local” pilot in the Department of Transportation was a huge win for JMA, as such initiatives are a central part of JMA’s policy advocacy platform.<sup>105</sup> Recent legislation in Los Angeles and New York has included JMA’s U.S. Employment Plan framework.<sup>106</sup> JMA’s Southern team also helped launch a very powerful grassroots coalition for corporate accountability to workers.<sup>107</sup>

---

<sup>102</sup> Matta, telephone interview by the author.

<sup>103</sup> Matta, telephone interview by the author.

<sup>104</sup> Prakash, “It’s Wide Open!” Interview

<sup>105</sup> Alaa Milbes, telephone interview by the author, Atherton, CA, November 9, 2021.

<sup>106</sup> “About Jobs to Move America,” Jobs to Move America.

<sup>107</sup> Milbes, telephone interview by the author.

Public opinion polling shows clear support among democrats in some areas of the progressive labor platform, and potential to reach majority consensus in the rest. Five out of seven progressive labor policies polled by Data for Progress, pulled from Bernie Sanders and Elizabeth Warren’s presidential campaign policy proposals, showed majority support among Democrats.<sup>108</sup> Yet in the cases where the majority of Democrats do not outright agree with progressive labor policies, being “not sure,” whether from apathy, unawareness, or being on the fence, is the culprit, not staunch disagreement. For example, the policy of “first contract dispute” only has support among 45% of Democrats, but the response of “not sure” accounts for another 41%—giving the policy only 14% disapproval among Democrats.<sup>109</sup> The issues that have gotten more “air time” in the Democratic platform of late, like federal contractor laws, showed a much clearer consensus of support from the party’s voters.

Noticing a low priority on labor issues among the Democratic party, Data for Progress, with the help of Strikewave, also searched for a potential “persuadable” group of people that care about progressive labor policies but do not align with the Democratic party. They found that 14.8% of the electorate supports the seven progressive labor issues presented, yet voted for Trump in the 2016 election.<sup>110</sup> Data For Progress sees these voters as a “persuadable” group for Democrats to tap into by giving a strong argument for being the “party that voters can trust on labor.”<sup>111</sup> While these voters tend to be further to the right than the moderate outreach themselves, their existence shows the political salience of progressive labor policies among moderate, independent, and right-wing circles.

True to this notion of a universal appeal surrounding labor issues, JMA embraces progressive pluralism in their interactions with lawmakers. JMA’s Director of Communications, Alaa Milbes, emphasizes the importance of “values-based messaging,” putting the universal goals of “good jobs and healthy communities” at the forefront of interactions with lawmakers.<sup>112</sup> While the nature of JMA’s work in liberal cities means that they often interact with progressive or Democratic lawmakers, Milbes maintains that JMA is open to working with all politicians with good values, even if they disagree with JMA on some policy issues.<sup>113</sup> The constituents argument is also core to JMA’s work. Milbes sees “keeping [lawmakers] up-to-date on how policies can impact their constituents” as core to “keep[ing] them engaged,” since politicians have a vested interest in increasing their “re-election capability.”<sup>114</sup>

JMA’s regional grassroots work focuses on the instrumental base of workers. Will Tucker of JMA’s Southern team sees fostering unity among workers as the first step to organizing them, focusing on issues that “affect all people equally,” such as workplace injuries in order to “overlook all the differences,” including education level and race, within the group.<sup>115</sup> Employer

---

<sup>108</sup> Kevin Reunig and C. M. Lewis, “The Progressive Labor Platform Is Popular,” Data for Progress, last modified October 3, 2019, [https://www.filesforprogress.org/memos/labor\\_unions.pdf](https://www.filesforprogress.org/memos/labor_unions.pdf).

<sup>109</sup> Reunig and Lewis, “The Progressive,” Data for Progress.

<sup>110</sup> Reunig and Lewis, “The Progressive,” Data for Progress.

<sup>111</sup> Reunig and Lewis, “The Progressive,” Data for Progress.

<sup>112</sup> Milbes, interview by the author.

<sup>113</sup> Milbes, interview by the author.

<sup>114</sup> Milbes, interview by the author.

<sup>115</sup> Tucker, interview by the author.

intimidation and distrust of unions provide unique roadblocks for recruiting workers to labor PSMOs, making it all the more important to appeal to as many workers as possible. In Tucker’s words, it takes a whole list of workers to find five that agree with you.<sup>116</sup> JMA’s strategy of “start[ing] with the workers” emphasizes the instrumental base, therefore avoiding progressive performance that can come with primarily pursuing the ideological base.<sup>117</sup> Tucker’s comment reveals how engaging primarily the instrumental base, as opposed to the ideological, can act as a safeguard against devolving into progressive performance. The instrumental grassroots focus of JMA allows them to keep their tunnel vision of tangible policy change. While they advocate for progressive policies, JMA does not waste energy preaching progressive adherence to a choir of ideologues.

As I see it, JMA’s tangible and tactical agenda protects the organization from counterproductive progressive performance, yet the behind-the-scenes nature of their work reinforces Data For Progress’s notion that progressives are not making enough noise about their labor agenda. Moving forward, JMA has the potential to leverage the ideological base as disseminators of their demonstrably salient policy agenda, possibly capturing the attention of the “persuadable” group Data For Progress identified. This could be an apt task for JMA to engage their powerful coalition partners in as well.

### **Policies for Progressive Pluralism**

The following recommendations give specific, actionable policies for PSMOs to adopt based on the argument for progressive pluralism given in this paper. In presenting these policies, I hope to encourage PSMOs to evaluate the current status of progressive pluralism in their organizations and commit to best practices for progressive pluralism moving forward.

### **Recommendations for Messaging to the Moderate Outreach**

- **Play to individual sets of values.**<sup>118</sup> Values-based messaging is core to progressive pluralism. People are not binaries, so even if policy opinions diverge, values are bound to line up in certain areas—for example, equal voices in our democracy (ECU), clean air and clean water (Sunrise), or respect for everyone in the workplace (JMA).
- **Focus on the tangible and personal effects of an issue.** Convincing moderates, who are by definition less partial to calls for sweeping change, that change is necessary is an important part of messaging to them. Showing the moderate outreach how issues affect them in their homes can reveal to them how their values are being compromised in a way that demands taking action for change.
- **Facilitate identity-based connections between the base and outreach** by choosing messengers that people will feel an affinity with despite their ideological differences.<sup>119</sup> Once moderates are convinced that action is necessary, they need to feel that the progressive organization in question is the best option for their participation, meaning the

---

<sup>116</sup> Tucker, interview by the author.

<sup>117</sup> Tucker, interview by the author.

<sup>118</sup> Thanks to Alaa Milbes, for her emphasis on values-based messaging, and Shay Farley, for her comment that people are not binaries, which inspired the ideas and language of this recommendation.

<sup>119</sup> Thanks to Tom Steyer for inspiring this recommendation by discussing his careful choice of social media “messengers” to support his climate campaigns.



agenda of the organization will represent them well. Emphasizing their similarities with the progressive base will help moderates reach this conclusion.

- **Unify the base and outreach through a shared identity as “the people.”** Another way to convince moderates that change is necessary and that they share values with the progressive base is through power-oriented messaging. Emphasizing this key similarity that transcends ideological differences allows the base and outreach to advocate together as “the people” against the elite or establishment.<sup>120</sup>
- **Use conversational, non-confrontational, and universal language.** Messaging that reaches the outreach needs to be universally understandable and warm people to the movement, not offend them. The information space of many moderates demonizes “wokeness,” so particular language that might fire up the base will be a nonstarter to the outreach.
- **Identify and stick to a clear set of policy-based tenets while communicating a platform based on values.**<sup>121</sup> Keep progressive pluralism from becoming a compromise by making the organization’s ultimate goals clear. Identifying a specific agenda can also help organizations pursue partnerships with moderate lawmakers while being upfront and unyielding on demands. However, to avoid progressive performance, these policies should not be confused with the messaging agenda.

### Recommendations for Mobilizing the Moderate Outreach

- **Incorporate “gateway actions” as a form of participation:** individual, behind-the-scenes work such as signing petitions, writing to representatives, or donating a small amount of money. These actions are low-effort and low-risk, making them ideal for the moderate outreach to “dip their toes” in progressive organizations. Ensure that the moderate outreach who become involved through these gateway actions are brought into the loop by collecting and leveraging contact information, encouraging further grassroots participation in the future. At the same time, encourage these actions as impactful in and of themselves.
- **Facilitate full acceptance and recognition of moderate outreach participants among the organization’s progressive base.** In the world of identity politics, moderates will only come back to organizations where they feel at home amongst other participants. This feeling of a new home can also help lessen the fear of the social repercussions in moderate circles of openly participating in progressive movements.
- **Communicate and celebrate gains with lawmakers, especially moderate lawmakers.**<sup>122</sup> Keeping all participants up to date on the impacts of their actions keeps morale up. When it comes to moderates, showing positive responses among their “camp” of the political establishment can motivate them to keep participating.

---

<sup>120</sup> I would like to be clear that this recommendation does not advocate for progressivism to take on the tactics of exclusionary populism, which relies on a tightly-defined and often implicit definition of “the people.” I am rather, in a sense, advocating to beat populists at their own game by constructing an ever-expanding and radically inclusive group of “the people” that truly represents everyone progressivism stands to benefit, stretching a cross race, gender, class, and, most notably, ideological lines in a true, people-driven coalition.

<sup>121</sup> Garza, *The Purpose of Power*, 179-180.

<sup>122</sup> Thanks to Adam Bozzi for inspiring this recommendation by talking about how Joe Manchin’s “change of heart” on the For the People Act encouraged ECU’s grassroots organizing community.

## Bibliography

- Abrams, Stacey. "Cowboy Up, Joe Manchin." Interview by Jon Favreau. June 3, 2021. In *Pod Save America*, produced by Crooked Media. Podcast, audio, 79:20.
- ALG Research. "Senate Battleground Poll." End Citizens United. Last modified September 2021. <https://www.endcitizensunited.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/ECU-SENATE-BATTLEGROUND-FINAL-AFv2-copy.pdf>.
- Anonymous. Telephone interview by the author. Atherton, CA. November 1, 2021.
- Bozzi, Adam. Telephone interview by the author. Atherton, CA. October 18, 2021.
- Deiseroth, Danielle, and Lew Blank. "Voters Overwhelmingly Support the Green New Deal." Data for Progress. Last modified April 19, 2021. <https://www.dataforprogress.org/blog/2021/4/19/voters-support-green-new-deal>.
- Farley, Shay, and Katie Glenn. Videoconference interview by the author. Atherton, CA. October 22, 2021.
- Garza, Alicia. *The Purpose of Power: How We Come Together When We Fall Apart*. New York: One World, 2020.
- Gregory, James N. "Remapping the American Left: A History of Radical Discontinuity." *Labor: Studies in Working-Class History* 17, no. 2 (May 2020): 11-45.
- Haidt, Jonathan. *The Righteous Mind: Why Good People Are Divided by Politics and Religion*. New York: Pantheon Books, 2012.
- Halpin, John, and Marta Cook. "Social Movements and Progressivism." Center for American Progress. Last modified April 2010. <https://www.americanprogress.org/article/social-movements-and-progressivism/>.
- Halpin, John, and Conor P. Williams. "The Progressive Intellectual Tradition in America." Center for American Progress. Last modified April 2010. <https://www.americanprogress.org/article/the-progressive-intellectual-tradition-in-america/>.
- Han, Hahrie. *How Organizations Develop Activists: Civic Associations and Leadership in the 21st Century*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014. Digital file.
- Jones, Bradley. "Most Americans Want to Limit Campaign Spending, Say Big Donors Have Greater Political Influence." Pew Research Center. Last modified May 8, 2018. <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2018/05/08/most-americans-want-to-limit-campaign-spending-say-big-donors-have-greater-political-influence/>.

- Judis, John B. "A Warning from the '60s Generation." *Washington Post*.  
<https://www.washingtonpost.com/magazine/2020/01/21/i-was-60s-socialist-todays-progressive-are-danger-repeating-my-generations-mistakes/>.
- Keating, Cricket. "The Politics of Everyday Coalition-Building." *New Political Science* 40, no. 1 (February 2018): 177-83.
- Klandermans, Bert. "Mobilization and Participation: Social-Psychological Expansions of Resource Mobilization Theory." *American Sociological Review* 49, no. 5 (October 1984): 583-600. JSTOR.
- Klein, Ezra. "How Identity Politics Took Over the Republican Party." August 13, 2021. In *The Ezra Klein Show*. Podcast, audio, 78:10.
- . *Why We're Polarized*. New York: Avid Reader Press, 2021.
- Mason, Lilliana. *Uncivil Agreement: How Politics Became Our Identity*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2018.
- Matta, Javier. Telephone interview by the author. Atherton, CA. October 26, 2021.
- McAdam, Doug. *Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency, 1930-1970*. 2nd ed. Chicago, Ill.: Univ. of Chicago Press, [20]07.
- McCarthy, John D., and Mayer N. Zald. "Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory." *American Journal of Sociology* 82, no. 6 (May 1977): 1212-41. JSTOR.
- Menand, Louis. "The Making of the New Left." *The New Yorker*, March 2021.  
<https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2021/03/22/the-making-of-the-new-left>.
- Milbes, Alaa. Telephone interview by the author. Atherton, CA. November 9, 2021.
- Pollux Group. "Memo: Messaging the Green New Deal." Data for Progress. Last modified July 9, 2019. <https://www.dataforprogress.org/memos/messaging-green-new-deal>.
- Prakash, Varshini. "It's Wide Open!" Interview by Jon Lovett. January 13, 2020. In *Pod Save America*, produced by Crooked Media. Podcast, audio, 70:21.
- Reunig, Kevin, and C. M. Lewis. "The Progressive Labor Platform Is Popular." Data for Progress. Last modified October 3, 2019.  
[https://www.filesforprogress.org/memos/labor\\_unions.pdf](https://www.filesforprogress.org/memos/labor_unions.pdf).
- Smith, Adam. Telephone interview by the author. Atherton, CA. November 4, 2021.
- Stephens, Bret. "Why Wokeness Will Fail." *New York Times*. Last modified November 9, 2021.  
<https://www.nytimes.com/2021/11/09/opinion/social-justice-america.html>.

Steyer, Tom. Interview by the author. San Francisco, CA. September 20, 2021.

Teixeira, Ruy, and John Halpin. "The Progressive Tradition in American Politics." Center for American Progress. Last modified April 2010.  
<https://www.americanprogress.org/article/the-progressive-tradition-in-american-politics/>.

Tucker, Will. Telephone interview by the author. Atherton, CA. October 27, 2021.

van Stekelenburg, Jacquelin, and Bert Klandermans. "Social Movement Theory: Past, Present, and Prospect." In *Movers and Shakers: Social Movements in Africa*, edited by Stephen Ellis and Ineke van Kessel, 17-44. African Dynamics 8. Brill, 2009.

van Stekelenburg, Jacquelin, Bert Klandermans, and Wilco W. van Dijk. "Context Matters: Explaining How and Why Mobilizing Context Influences Motivational Dynamics." *Journal of Social Issues* 65, no. 4 (December 2009): 815-38.

Vedantam, Shankar, and Eitan Hersh. "Passion Isn't Enough." February 10, 2020. In *Hidden Brain*. Podcast, audio, 47:54.

Weber, Evan. "Here Comes the Sunrise Movement." Interview. September 9, 2020. In *What a Day*, produced by Crooked Media, hosted by Gideon Resnick and Akilah Hughes. Podcast, audio, 21:07.

Zelizer, Julian E. "The Forgotten Legacy of the New Deal: Fiscal Conservatism and the Roosevelt Administration, 1933-1938." *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 30, no. 2 (2000): 331-58. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27552097>.