Anthropology is a discipline that prides itself on trying to understand cultural phenomena from the perspective of those involved, using these insights to offer analyses that help outsiders to "make sense" of the beliefs, behaviors, and actions of "others." In the wake of the election of Donald Trump to be the 45th president of the United States, many have been left shaking their heads in awe, wonder, disgust and shame. All are asking one question: How could this happen?
Several authors, anthropologists and others using the "ethnographic techniques" favored by the discipline -- going out and spending time with the people you wish to understand, offer insightful analyses to help us understand the assent of Donald Trump. These include comparisons of Trump to an alpha male chimp and a Melanesian "Big Man," explorations of Trump’s abilities to tap into major cultural metaphors (the "strict father") and preoccupations (celebrity culture, the body as speaking truth beyond words), Trump as charismatic leader or trickster clown in political anthropological discourse, and the uprising of a despondent working class who has felt personally assaulted (and offended) by the progressive agenda of perceived elites.

As Paul Stoller wrote in a recent Huffington Post blog post, "Now is the time for ethnographers to step up to the plate and communicate our powerful insights to our students and to the public. Now is the time to craft a powerful counter-narrative that will ensure a viable future for our children and grandchildren." As the AAA (American Anthropological Association) wrote using the same venue, this is why "universities need anthropology now, more than ever."

**Here is the roundup:**

https://storify.com/AriannaHuhn/anthropologyoftrumplandia
Charismatic Leadership

Anthropologist Paul Stoller suggests that Trump’s success is based (at least in part) on his embodiment of celebrity culture in which "shallow perception is more valuable than deep insight" -- a fantasy world where problems are easy to solve, initiatives are easy to fund, and unification is a matter of words rather than sentiment -- it only takes "attitude and a high degree of self-confidence ... to solve any problem."

The Anthropology of Trump: Myth, Illusion and Celebrity Culture
Yesterday, millions of American voters cast presidential primary ballots on Super Tuesday. In a political season that has confounded political pundits w...

The same author in a different piece compares Trump to a Melanesian "big man" in his dependence on big talk, full of emotion, to win appeal, and the appeal to common welfare as a guise for self-interest and economic calculation. Like the big man too, Trump is continually plotting and scheming to reinforce his renown, meeting challenges head-on and always willing to raise the ante.

Trump, Fear and the Big Man
Donald Trump is nothing more -- and nothing less -- than what anthropologists used to call a “Big Man.” As I listened yesterday to his hour-long speech ...

The Trickster Clown

Joan Davison draws on the figure of the “trickster” or the “demon clown” from political anthropology to analyze Trump’s successes. The terms are used to define those who “take advantage of people who feel confused or alienated during times of transitions.” The transition, in this case, is the growing “ambiguity of the identity and influence of many white men,” which has mounted over the past half century as the possibilities of upward mobility have dwindled and American exceptionalism has faltered. Decline in American prestige has particularly negatively impacted men, the working class, and those without a college education. Davison sums up the situation: “The status of some women and minorities has improved, while economic opportunities, especially for working class males, decline.” In steps the trickster clown, who specializes in deceiving and confusing frightened individuals. “One senses supporters attend [Trump’s rallies],” she writes, “not to listen to a speech, but to
participate in a challenge to their present reality.” Trump provides a new reality for them, in which they are, once again, the victor.

**Donald Trump as Trickster Clown**

Donald Trump fits the paradigm of a “trickster clown”, taking advantage of people who feel confused or alienated during times of transitions.

*JOAN DAVISON*

---

**The Alpha Male**

Hidden within an Atlantic article by James Fallows, famed primatologist Jane Goodall, meanwhile, finds a parallel between the tactics used by Trump and those of one particular alpha male -- Mike -- in the Gombe population she studied. Mike, like Trump, gained power by intimidating and confusing people. Goodall explains alpha males more broadly, "In order to impress rivals, males seeking to rise in the dominance hierarchy perform spectacular displays: stamping, slapping the ground, dragging branches, throwing rocks. The more vigorous and imaginative the display, the faster the individual is likely to rise in the hierarchy, and the longer he is likely to maintain that position." For many, this sounds familiar.

*CHRIS BODENNER*

---

Christopher Boehem, who studied with Goodall, draws on the same comparison in his article in *New Scientist*.

---

Following Trump’s temporary transformation and subdued persona in the GOP debate season, Boehem offered additional commentary on the alpha-like tactics of Trump. Alpha chimps too, he offers, do not succeed only through intimidation -- they have additional strategies that include grooming others, breaking up fights, and otherwise showing one’s benevolence as a ruler. The commentary is summarized in Jesse Singal’s piece in New York Magazine.
Ethnographer Morgan Ramsey-Elliot suggests that Trump’s appeal to rural America is based on his ability to tap into their intense sense of duty to the community. Based on participant-observation in Texas and Colorado, on a project to understand the lives and values of truck owners (contracted through ReD Associates), Ramsey-Elliot suggests that it may be too simplistic to label Trump supporters’ rejection of liberal politics as “racist.” “It is true that fundamental prejudice plays a role in some conservatives’ attitudes toward minority groups,” he writes. But underlying this position is a perception that advocating for minority rights is, in a word, selfish.

“For many I met in rural America, ‘minority’ agendas and the individualism they are seen to represent are a manifestation of a larger problem: the vanishing respect for duty and self-sacrifice for the sake of the local community.” Ramsey-Elliot continues, “The gap between the individual and immediate community in these small towns is extremely small. In many ways, the community is an extension of the self.” Here, Trump’s unpolished persona and his appeals to loyalty are relatable, and they represent what used to make small-town America great.
Ramsey-Elliot’s work echoes nicely with Arlie Russell-Hochschild’s account of “red” America, highlighting the fear of losing community, family values, and economic stability as fueling conservative views. Paired with the absolute failure of polls to predict the election outcome, these works provide a great reminder of the vital importance of ethnography for understanding the realities that quantitative researchers often miss.

This point -- on the power of ethnography -- is precisely the focus of Paul Stoller’s post-election to-do list for life in a Trump presidency -- "An ethnographer of a community that voted overwhelmingly for Mr. Trump would have known—unlike the pundits, political operatives and most scholars—that there was broad, deep and enthusiastic support for Mr. Trump’s view of the world. They would have known that Mr. Trump had understood profoundly the social and economic pain of his supporters. They would have also realized how he had used the dynamics of celebrity culture the shape that pain into a powerful political narrative. In this age of social media and celebrity culture old thinking no longer works. Ethnographic thinking, by contrast, enables us to understand social and political dynamics and use them to precipitate meaningful social change.” Ethnographic thick description provides the cultural context that pollsters cannot access or that they overlook, and the cultural critique of everyday taken-for-granted realities that is necessary to produce a counter-narrative to Trumpism.

The Working Class White Male & the Failure of the American Dream
A variety of analyses have suggested Trump's base lies in a group of disgruntled, working class, non-college educated White males. The demographic has seen their life expectancy decline (which is pretty unprecedented), and their chances of class ascendency all but disappear. Enter ethnographer and political scientist Kathy Cramer, whose work is discussed in Jeff Guo's Washington Post article, “A new theory for why Trump voters are so angry — that actually makes sense.” The Trump demographic feels, according to Cramer, that they've been cheated out of what they deserve. The rural Wisconsin residents Cramer has spent time with blame their plight on not only progressive policies that have allowed "others" to "but in line", but also the urban "elites" who aren't "paying attention" to the lives of rural Americans and "think we're a bunch of redneck racists" (implicating politicians, academics, journalists, and others who get paid a decent salary for doing things that are mental -- rather than physical -- labor). Then comes a candidate that tells this demographic they're right -- they're not getting their fair share, and he's going to fight for them. A vote for Trump becomes a fight-for-your-life effort -- not only to maintain the status quo, but to maintain a fighting chance for the American dream, which seems to be slipping away. If you work hard, this demographic is beginning to realize (though many other groups have realized this before), this doesn't guarantee you can get ahead.

Cramer is quoted in an interview with the author pointing out that while many Trump supporters may in fact be racist, this doesn't explain the enthusiasm of their support for the unconventional candidate promising to "make America great again": "Of course [some of this resentment] is about race, but it's also very much about the actual lived conditions that people are
experiencing. We do need to pay attention to both ... it’s not just about dollars. People are experiencing a decline in prosperity, and that’s real.”

While Trump supporters may not be experiencing these declines in longevity and prosperity themselves, they sense that people like them are. “[It’s] the perceptions that people have about their reality are the key driving force here. That’s been a really important lesson from this election.” And the election has shown, Cramer finds, that more and more politics are a matter of identity -- voting as a representation of who you are, and who you think other people are. More than positions on particular policies, people are voting with their worldview in mind. Cramer suggests this necessitates a fundamental change in the way we try to predict election results, “I think all too often, we put our energies into figuring out where people stand on particular policies. I think putting energy into trying to understanding they way they view the world and their place in it — that gets us so much further toward understanding how they’re going to vote, or which candidates are going to be appealing to them.

All of us, even well-educated, politically sophisticated people interpret facts through our own perspectives, our sense of what who we are, our own identities.”

Cramer points out that progressives labeling Trump supporters as ignorant, fooled, or misinformed accomplishes little. She encourages trying to understand one another, rather than writing one another off. Her interview with Guo concludes, “One of the very sad aspects of resentment is that it breeds more of itself. Now you have liberals saying, ‘There is no justification for these points of view, and why would I ever show respect for these points of view by spending time and listening to them?’” She details her development of rapport with rural folks, and their coming to see one another as human, despite their preconceived notions of each other. “That’s partly about listening, and that’s partly about spending time with people from a different walk of life, from a different perspective. There’s nothing like it. You can’t achieve it through online communication. You can’t achieve it through having good intentions. It’s the act of being with other people that establishes the sense we actually are all in this together. As Pollyannaish as that sounds, I really do believe it.”

A new theory for why Trump voters are so angry — that actually makes sense

“It’s absolutely racist to think that black people don’t work as hard as white people. So what? We write off a huge chunk of the population as racist and therefore their concerns aren’t worth attending to?”

Further complicating attacks on Trump supporters as racist deplorables are those like Courtney Parker West who are calling out White progressives for their shock at the election results. West writes in a blog post (and here we can take lived reality as akin to ethnography), ”More white people than I can count, people who are quick to profess themselves as oh-so-woke, have
expressed some real shock and dismay not only at the election results, but at the racism, sexism, xenophobia, and bigotry that paved the way to those results.” This shock is, in a word, a microaggression.

“Dear liberal white people whom I often love,” West writes, “advertising your shock and surprise that racism, sexism, xenophobia, and bigotry are pervasive enough to hand that man the Presidency is a microaggression. Please stop.” In other words, it is not only Trump supporters who can commit offensive acts toward marginalized populations. It can also be those with progressive politics. Both are seated in the same lack of understanding of the lives of people of color.

On “Woke” White People Advertising their Shock that Racism just won a Presidency

Last night my black friend posted that he needs to Call in Black tomorrow; I “liked” his status and was immediately irritated when what...

An aside: It is useful in these moments of throwing stones to remember the deep-seated socialization into racism and other forms of discrimination, oppression, and prejudice that all Americans are subjected to. Even when we consciously oppose such beliefs and behaviors, they may work as implicit biases and underly the institutional racism and other forms of subtle and often unintentional discrimination that lead to hypervigilance, stress, and basic daily challenges for marginalized populations. Think you’re an exception? Take a few of the Harvard Implicit Bias tests and see if any unconscious prejudices are revealed.

Dismissing Trump’s supporters for bigoted views may also prove counterproductive. Arun Gupta’s Nation of Change article, which is based on in-depth interviews with Trump supporters, likewise concludes: that while “[m]any commentators … focus exclusively on Trump’s bombast and racism, and conclude his supporters are ‘a disparate group of bigots’ and ‘idiots’ who ‘are not victims,’ this is “as uninformed as believing that deporting 11 million immigrants will revive working-class fortunes.”

Gupta cautions against seeing Trump supporters as a monolith: “The supporters I met included military vets, retirees, high-school students, entrepreneurs, college graduates, business owners, factory workers, service industry employees, police officers, management personnel, union members, and lawyers. I discovered a sprinkling of Asians, Blacks, and Gays, and interviewed many women, though Trump’s support is disproportionately male. I met Christian conservatives and atheists, pro-war hawks and isolationists, fervent supporters who said, ‘We love Trump so much it hurts,’ and voters in disbelief that they
were supporting a vulgar reality-TV star because, in their view, he was the lesser evil.” What ties them together is that many are experiencing economic and social distress. Gupta rounds up the research: “[Trump’s] backing is highest among Whites who are affected by declining and stagnant wages, are less likely to have high-school or college degrees, have been knocked out of the workforce, or whose life expectancy declined.” These middle aged white workers are suffering, Gupta suggests, “in distinct ways from an economic war that’s waged as much by liberals as conservatives.”

Gupta adeptly explains this voting bloc’s alienation from progressive agendas and the democratic party, “Many of the White workers planning to vote for Trump would likely have supported a Democratic candidate in the past, but the party now offers them little. Adding insult to injury, liberals deride them as privileged and ignorant racists, rather than acknowledging their real economic grievances.” This helps us to understand why some Bernie Sanders supporters defected to Trump, rather than Clinton. While Gupta, at the time of writing, saw Trump’s chances of winning the election as slim, he still offered some words of advice on the Democratic party addressing these deep divides going forward -- and they echo the words of Kathy Cramer, focusing on listening rather than name-calling or dismissal: “The best way to defeat Trumpism is by fusing race, class, and gender issues. A starting point is learning to listen to Trump voters, finding genuine points of connection that can lead them away from divisive bigotry to the common good.”

Utopian Promises

But the voting bloc for Trump was not entirely White. In an ethnographically-informed piece posted on Cuba Counter Points, anthropologist Ariana Hernández-Reguant considers the messy political landscape in Florida, and where the Cuban American population stands. Hers, she says, responding to comments made by Maureen Down, is not a “Margaret Mead road trip” to search for the "exotic Trump voter," as the Trump voter, in Miami, is ubiquitous.

The anthropologist details her visit to a local Trump office (where the staff seemed to be from out of town, and used only landline phones), a Cuban Trump supporters flash mob (where there seemed to be a “taken-for-granted belonging to the U.S. nation”), in addition to her recordings of talk radio listener comments. In addition to cluing readers into various pop-culture mockeries of the election cycle (eg, Javier Berridy’s reworking of “La Gozadera” into “La Votadera”) and Spanish-language
banter about the two primary candidates (eg, "Trumposo," which sounds like tramposo, or cheater), Hernández-Reguant suggests an interest in "restoring the might of the American Empire and bringing the Castro government to its knees" as underlying the Cuban American vote. While providing little in the way of detail to explain her conclusions, she suggests that the population found "la" Clinton (and Obama) too weak for the job of Commander-in-Chief, whereas "Trump's bravado's ... made him appear as a leader." The context is more clearly laid out: Trump is "the embodiment of the American dream and a living proof that neoliberal tax policies allow just about anyone to pull themselves up by their bootstraps and reach the top. Thus, to new cohorts of Cuban immigrants, Trump represents hope ... because he promises self-reliance." In a word, Hernández-Reguant concludes, the vision is utopian, which resonates loudly with a "fragmented Cuban society still finding its place within the United States."

**Worldview & Key Metaphors -- The Strict Father Family**

Linguist George Lakoff offers a slightly different take. Drawing on his own pre-Trump research trying to understand why certain policy positions tend to "hang together" (like pro-life and pro-gun), he suggests that political views in the US tend to coalesce around two forms of family life, "the Nurturant Parent family (progressive) and the Strict Father family (conservative)." These divergent forms ground and encapsulate our political positionings.

Detailing the "Strict Father family," Lakoff argues that here father knows best, and that he has authority to make sure everyone (children, spouse) does as he says (which is automatically correct). Disciplining children is a moral duty for the father, such that children grow strong and are able to be responsible for themselves -- doing what is right, rather than what feels good. Where children fail to become prosperous it is thus the child’s fault. "This reasoning shows up in conservative politics," Lakoff explains, "in which the poor are seen as lazy and undeserving, and the rich as deserving their wealth." It is a world of discipline and personal responsibility, where those who deserve to win do win.
And those who win (because of their moral superiority) have, traditionally, been predictable: “The hierarchy is: God above Man, Man above Nature, The Disciplined (Strong) above the Undisciplined (Weak), The Rich above the Poor, Employers above Employees, Adults above Children, Western culture above other cultures, America above other countries. The hierarchy extends to: Men above women, Whites above Nonwhites, Christians above nonChristians, Straights above Gays.” Your moral worldview, Lakoff concludes, “defines for you what the world should be like. When it isn’t that way, one can become frustrated and angry.”

This is an important part of the story for understanding Trump supporters’ frustrations and feelings of unfairness in the pushing of “political correctness” and “inclusivity,” and their elation at having someone (Trump) say out loud what they’ve been quietly experiencing. Lakoff writes, and it is worth quoting at length, “There are at least tens of millions of conservatives in America who share strict father morality and its moral hierarchy. Many of them are poor or middle class and many are white men who see themselves as superior to immigrants, nonwhites, women, nonChristians, gays — and people who rely on public assistance. In other words, they are what liberals would call ‘bigots.’ For many years, such bigotry has not been publicly acceptable ... As liberal anti-bigotry organizations have loudly pointed out and made a public issue of the unAmerican nature of such bigotry, those conservatives have felt more and more oppressed by what they call ‘political correctness’ ... This has become exaggerated since 911, when anti-Muslim feelings became strong. The election of President Barack Hussein Obama created outrage among those conservatives, and they refused to see him as a legitimate American (as in the birther movement), much less as a legitimate authority, especially as his liberal views contradicted almost everything else they believe as conservatives. Donald Trump expresses out loud everything they feel — with force, aggression, anger, and no shame. All they have to do is support and vote for Trump and they don’t even have to express their ‘politically incorrect’ views, since he does it for them and his victories
make those views respectable. He is their champion. He gives them a sense of self-respect, authority, and the possibility of power."

Lakoff turns to his knowledge of brain circuitry to explain how Trump’s support swelled through non-stop media coverage of Trump’s outrageous behaviors and remarks. Where the language of Trump fit with potential voters’ worldviews (the Strict Father model, and associated ideals of morality and hierarchy), their worldview was strengthened and hardened.

Worldview, Lakoff argues, also impacts our preferred form of reasoning. Conservatives have been shown to prefer reasoning via "direct causation" (deal with a problem via direct action), contrasting with the "systematic causation" (which has "chains of direct causes, interacting causes, feedback loops, and probabilistic causes — often combined" -- and which is a form of reasoning that has to be learned, rather than being a seemingly human instinct) which is preferred among progressives. "The reason," Lakoff explains, "is thought to be that, in the strict father model, the father expects the child or spouse to respond directly to an order and that refusal should be punished as swiftly and directly as possible." Trump depends on direct causation to develop his policy proposals, and this resonates with his supporters -- meaning that Hillary’s experience and detailed policy proposals not only don’t matter, they don’t count. He summarizes, "Trump supporters and other radical Republican extremists could not care less [about Clinton’s experience], and for a good reason. Their job is to impose their view of strict father morality in all areas of life. If they have the Congress, and the Presidency and the Supreme Court, they could achieve this. They don’t need to name policies, because the Republicans already have hundreds of policies ready to go. They just need to be in complete power."

In addition to tapping into worldview, Lakoff argues, Trump is able to "use your brain to his advantage" through a variety of tactics that subconsciously embed his messages in our minds through neural circuitry built on repetition (win, win, win!), framing ("crooked Hillary," drawing on the Strict Father morality again to frame basically everything she has ever done as immoral), well known examples (drawing on fear), grammar (using words like "radical" and "terror"), and metaphor (eg, entry and exit, the idea that leaving takes us back to where we once were, underlying Trump’s "make America great again" sloganing). Lakoff concludes with the prediction that Trump has fundamentally altered brains with his tactics, and suggests what Democrats might do about that.
Taboo

But, why Trump? Tanya Luhrmann turns to Mary Douglas to understand. Following Douglas' analysis of religious convictions in *Purity and Danger*, she draws our attention to the power of "matter out of place" -- things that don't fit. In an attempt to make sense of the cruelties of the world that prevent the just order one could otherwise expect, societies, Douglas found, often attribute divine power to things that are deeply impure. "The paradoxical logic goes like this," Luhrmann explains. "That which is disorderly is always dangerous, and thus it is powerful; because our attempts to impose a just order fail, that dangerous, rule-violating power can be understood as the force to reset the system." In other words, Trump supporters find him appealing "because of his transgressions, not despite of them." What qualifies Trump as subhuman to some makes him superhuman to others -- dirt is made divine, and "that which is rejected is ploughed back for the renewal of life" because "that which is taboo redeems us."

Carnival: Entertainment, Gesture, Spectacle & Simulacra

In a Journal of Ethnographic Theory article, Kira Hall, Donna Meryl Goldstein, and Matthew Bruce Ingram use linguistic and cultural anthropology, along with rhetorical theory, and a heavy dose of post-structuralist and neo-Marxist analysis, to offer an analysis of Trump’s success in relation to his comedic entertainment value in a world that "values style over content." The authors suggest that their arguments are unique from others' that tend to "defin[e] segments of the population as economically, socially, or psychologically vulnerable to Trump’s messaging." However, they draw on many of the same characterizations of Trump’s supporters that dominate others' analyses, and particularly the anti-political-correctness of the "Make America Great Again" movement. Their focus on gesture and marketing tactics are, however, important and worth noting.
Citing Ervin Goffman, the authors suggest that humorous performance "is protected from the scrutiny that would be applied in other discursive domains" -- this sanctions disobeying rules and discussion of taboo topics without really breaking norms. They summarize, "It is hard to critique a clown: we are too busy laughing." Add to this crass taste, sarcasm, and bullying Trump’s reliance on theatrical comedic gesture (a variance from the “gestural prescriptivism” as the bodily comportment of more typical candidates -- and a harkening to the "widely circulating language ideology in the United States: the body is thought to speak its own truth beyond the ephemerality of words"), and his "pistol" hand gesture (a flashy show move that harkens back to the "arrogance, sovereign power, and commanding force" of his The Apprentice persona), and you have a very unconventional and anti-establishment candidate. These things "signal to Trump’s base," the authors argue, "that he challenges what is widely viewed as the political establishment’s debilitating rhetoric of political correctness." The message is all the more memorable because it is entertaining, and because Trump is a master of staying in the public eye -- indeed, it seems he is not a person, but a brand.

The authors find further parallels between Trump's entertainment and political personas in the running commentary on the attractiveness of female adversaries (a tactic from his days running beauty contests), and his branding of opponents -- in verbiage (eg, "Crooked Hillary") and in bodily gesture (Trump uses "gestural space" to present the elite political class as "bookish, stiff, and lackluster") to not only mock but also to entertain. Delving further into the analysis of gesture (the authors’ main preoccupation), they analyze Trump’s enactment of the "wrist-flailing reporter" (the impersonation of Serge Kovaleski clearly tapping into American gestures to signal physical and mental disability), the "food-shoveling governor" (here imitating John Kasich shoving a pancake into his mouth as a "veiled class assault") and the "border-corsing Mexican" (as greedy candy-snatchers) as collectively delivering the message that "he rejects progressive social expectations regarding how minority groups should be represented."

Trump’s style is read differently by conservatives and progressives. The authors summarize, "To advocates, Trump’s gestures suggest a man who is spontaneous and real instead of scripted. He is an unplanned man, even an honest man, who tells it how he sees it. To opponents, Trump’s gestures suggest a man who is vulgar if not offensive. They reveal a different sort of spontaneity: a buffoon, even a fake, who only poses as a politician." The interpretation doesn’t matter. The bottom line is this: we keep watching.
More Resources

Thanks to Kelsey Chatlosh for suggesting the Chronicle of Higher Education’s Trump Syllabus and the modified (to include more scholars of color and more directly address racism, sexism, and xenophobia) Trump Syllabus 2.0 (compiled by historians N. D. B. Connolly and Keisha N. Blain) for further reading. The weekly themed reading list “explores the emergence of “Trumpism,” which they define as “personal and political gain marred by intolerance, derived from wealth, and rooted in the history of segregation, sexism, and exploitation.”

On June 19th, the Chronicle of Higher Education ran a web version of a mock college syllabus that sought to explore the deep historical and political roots of Donald Trump’s political success during the 2016 Presidential campaign.

The CUNY Futures Initiative has also organized a dynamic “Election ClapBack Syllabus” using googledocs, which contains a hearty “How Did We Get Here” reading list.

Savage Minds posted a reading list initiated by Alicia Blum-Ross. The list includes “material suggested by anthropologists and others in response to question of what we should read/discuss in light of victories of both Donald Trump in US and Brexit campaign in UK.”
Ethnographic approaches to understanding Trump/Brexit/new rise of conservatism

Material suggested by anthropologists and others in response to question of what we should read/discuss in light of victories of both Donald Trump in US and Brexit campaign in UK (initially compiled by Alicia Blum-Ross, November 2016 - inclusion does not equal endorsement) US (books) Katherin...
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