

寄稿論文

Electoral Earthquake: Reflections on the 2016 US Presidential Election

Matthew F. Filner

The United States' Presidential Election of 2016 was one of the most polarizing elections in American history. Supporters of Donald Trump are experiencing unexpected euphoria as ideas that had once seemed marginal and anachronistic are entering mainstream discourse. At the same time, supporters of Hillary Clinton are experiencing fear and a kind of post-traumatic stress. Simultaneously, almost half of eligible voters opted not to vote and feel deeply disconnected from what was, arguably, the strongest democracy in the world. Many Americans are wondering whether American democracy has been permanently altered and whether the United States Constitution will survive the Trump administration. Finally, people around the world wonder what impact President Donald Trump and his administration will have on global politics.

In order to begin to understand what Americans and the world are likely to face under the Trump administration, we must begin to understand what happened and why in the United States Presidential election of 2016. In the reflections that follow, we will see that the result was a complex result of myriad factors that combined to create an unprecedented "electoral earthquake." The "perfect storm" of factors set the United States on a deeply uncertain course that will maximize global instability in the years to come. The factors that conspired to elect Donald Trump included: 1. An extremely close race in five key swing states; 2. The peculiarities of America's Electoral College system; 3. The racism, sexism, and xenophobia of a minority of citizens drove a powerful right-wing social movement; 4. The Sanders-led anti-corporate, left-wing social movement was defeated and demoralized in the Democratic primary process; 5. The peculiar strengths and weaknesses of Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton created an election in which policy differences were notably absent from most voters' decisions; 6. An unprecedented announcement by FBI Director James Comey less than two weeks before the election; 7. The global authoritarian movements founded in deep concern for the negative impacts of globalization fueled a series of overt and covert influences. As a result, the United States is spinning toward a deeply uncertain era in which the very institutions of American constitutional democracy will be placed under strain unseen since the U.S. Civil War. Whether the U.S. Constitution survives the Trump Administration will determine the extent to which American instability affects the future of global liberal democracy.

1. The Key Swing States

Hillary Clinton won the popular vote by 2,864,974 votes over Donald Trump.¹⁾ Clinton won the votes of 65,844,610 Americans, which almost matched President Obama's comfortable 2012 total of 65,918,507. In fact, Hillary Clinton won the 3rd most total votes in the history of American Presidential campaigns (behind President Obama's two wins). A wide swath of American voters believed Hillary Clinton was the best choice for President, and despite claims to the contrary, there were highly enthusiastic supporters—particularly highly educated women and men, and people of color in urban areas and Southern states. For many commentators, this result proves the “demography is destiny” argument—as America becomes more diverse and well-educated, Democrats have clear advantage. The fact that Democrats have now won six of the past seven (except 2004) Presidential popular votes attests to the demographic advantages that Democrats enjoy.

Nevertheless, Hillary Clinton won the popular vote in 2016 by a relatively tight margin of 48.06 to 45.97%. This 2.09% margin was smaller than President Obama won in 2012 (3.86%) and 2008 (7.26%), but greater than Vice President Gore's popular vote margin (0.52%) in 2000 and comparable to President Bush's 2004 win (2.46%). The close popular vote margin reflected a deeply divided and partisan American electorate. Despite the political earthquake emerging out of 2016, one thing will not change: the American electorate is profoundly divided. The Democrat and Republican parties represent more than ideological differences. They also represent two Americas: one diverse, urban and globally-orientated, the other homogenous, rural and nationally-oriented. This split has been growing since the 1980s, and will likely ossify even more in the years to come.²⁾

Thus, Clinton's victory margin was not created by close elections in most states, but rather significant margins in many states coupled with extremely close margins in five key states: Wisconsin, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Florida, and New Hampshire. In 33 states, either Trump or Clinton won by a margin greater than 10%. In fact, in the 10 states with the most disparate margin, Trump or Clinton won by wide margins. Clinton's 30% win in California, by more than 4.2 million votes, was historic. As well, Trump's comfortable margins in rural states such as North and South Dakota, Idaho, Wyoming and West Virginia, Oklahoma and Kentucky cut Clinton's California margin in half. In short, Trump and Clinton both ran extremely well in their base states and were highly successful in turning out their voters in these key states. These data are presented in Table 1. Overall, the 33 states paint a picture of two strong candidates who ran up large margins in their base states. Yet because Clinton's large margins were primarily in a few highly populous states (e.g., California, New York, Maryland, Massachusetts, and Illinois), she was able to overcome the fact that Trump won by large

¹⁾ For comprehensive election results, see uselectionatlas.org.

²⁾ For a detailed analysis of the growing partisan split, see the Pew Research Center's excellent study “Political Polarization in the American Public.” pewresearch.org.

margins in many “small states” (e.g., North Dakota, South Dakota, Wyoming, West Virginia, and Idaho).

State	Electoral Votes	Trump	Clinton	Trump %	Clinton %	Margin	Margin %
CA	55	4,483,810	8,753,788	31.49%	61.48%	4,269,978	29.99%
DC	3	12,723	282,830	90.86%	4.09%	270,107	86.78%
WY	3	255,849	55,973	68.17%	21.88%	118,446	46.30%
WV	5	489,371	188,794	67.85%	26.18%	300,577	41.68%
OK	7	949,136	420,375	65.32%	28.93%	528,761	36.39%
HI	3	128,847	266,891	30.04%	62.22%	138,044	32.18%
ID	4	409,055	189,765	59.25%	27.48%	219,290	31.76%
KY	8	1,202,971	628,854	62.52%	32.68%	574,117	29.84%
SD	3	227,721	117,458	61.53%	31.74%	110,263	29.79%
ND	3	216,794	93,758	62.96%	27.23%	123,036	35.73%

2. The Peculiarities of the American Electoral System

Yet American elections are not won in a popular vote contest and thus Clinton’s popular vote “win” was nothing more than an historical anachronism. Defined in Article 2 of the United States’ Constitution, and further enumerated in the 12th Amendment, the Electoral College is the formal voting mechanism that elects the President of the United States. The number of electors in each state equals the number of members of the House of Representatives (varies according to population) and the number of members of the Senate (two for every state). For example, Minnesota has eight members of the House plus two Senators, so the state has ten electoral votes. In addition to the three votes for Washington, D.C. (from the 23rd Amendment), there are a total of 538 electoral votes. The candidate who wins a majority of these electoral votes is elected President.

On December 19, 2016, electors met in state capitols across the United States to cast their votes. This was the decisive vote, which Donald Trump won 306-232 (57%-43%), a truly remarkable result given Clinton’s popular vote victory. In fact, it was only the fifth time that a Presidential election was won by the candidate who lost the popular vote (in addition to 1824, 1876, 1888 and 2000) and not since 1876 has a President-elect lost the popular vote by such a large margin and won anyway.³⁾ It is not surprising, however, that close Presidential elections are decided in the Electoral College—the most pressing fear for James Madison and Alexander

³⁾ In 1876, Rutherford B. Hayes lost the popular vote by 3%, marking the abrupt and radical end to post-Civil War Reconstruction.

Hamilton, the primary authors of the Constitution, was tyranny of the majority.⁴⁾ Thus stopping a popular vote win by a candidate who threatened a tyrannized minority was precisely the purpose of the Electoral College. From the perspective of the relatively wealthy authors of the Constitution, the Electoral College served its purpose in 2016: protecting the wealth of a minority of the United States citizens.

Trump won Electoral College despite losing the popular vote because he was able to hold all the “red states” — even with closer-than-expected margins in Arizona, Georgia and Texas — and win (by razor-thin margins) Florida and three key states that had previously been described as part of the “blue wall” (states Democrats had won every election since 1992. These data are presented in Table 2.

It is worth emphasizing just how close the results were in the closest states. Donald Trump won three states by less than 1%: Michigan, Pennsylvania and Wisconsin. He won Michigan by 10,704 votes, Pennsylvania by 44,292 votes and Wisconsin by 22,748 votes. These three states combined for 46 electoral votes and were enough to flip the election from Clinton to Trump.

State	Electoral Votes	Trump	Clinton	Trump %	Clinton %	Margin	Margin %
MI	16	2,279,543	2,268,839	47.26%	47.04%	10,704	0.22%
NH	4	345,790	348,526	46.46%	46.83%	2,736	0.37%
PA	20	2,970,733	2,926,441	48.20%	47.48%	44,292	0.72%
WI	10	1,405,284	1,382,536	47.22%	46.45%	22,748	0.76%
FL	29	4,617,886	4,504,975	48.60%	47.41%	112,911	1.19%
MN	10	1,322,951	1,367,716	44.92%	46.44%	44,765	1.52%
NV	6	512,058	539,260	45.50%	47.92%	27,202	2.42%
ME	4	335,593	357,735	44.87%	47.83%	22,142	2.96%
AZ	11	1,252,401	1,161,167	48.08%	44.58%	91,234	3.50%
NC	15	2,362,631	2,189,316	49.83%	46.17%	173,315	3.66%

In other words, had fewer than 78,000 voters in these three states changed their votes (.057%), Hillary Clinton would have been elected President. In fact, these 78,000 voters changed what had been a relatively predictable outcome following historic patterns, and in which a small but decisive popular vote win was ratified by the Electoral College, to one of the most unexpected and lopsided Electoral College results in American history.

Overall, in the five states in which one candidate won by less than 1.5% (Michigan, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin and Florida), Donald Trump won an astounding

⁴⁾ See James Madison “Publius” in Federalist #10.

75 of 79 electoral votes. By contrast, in the most recent “razor-close” election (2000), Vice President Al Gore won the popular vote by fewer than 600,000 votes (about 0.5%) and there were six states decided by less than 1.5%: Florida, New Mexico, Wisconsin, Iowa, Oregon and New Hampshire. In these six states, Gore and Bush won almost exactly the same number of electoral votes (30 to 29). As a result, while the 2000 election was both a close popular vote and Electoral College election (Bush won the Electoral College 271-266), the dramatic disparity in extremely close states meant that Trump lost the popular vote but won the Electoral College by a very comfortable margin.

a. How did Trump Win These Swing States

i. Demographics and Resentment⁵⁾

Without question, one of the most significant factors in Trump’s victory was the fact that he won in states that are generally less diverse, less urbanized and less educated than the rest of the United States. These states—primarily Wisconsin, Michigan, Ohio and Pennsylvania, the so-called “Rust Belt”—have a higher-than-average proportion of voters for whom the lived experience of the massive demographic, political and economic changes wrought over the past several decades have been decidedly negative. Many voters in these states feel profound “resentment” against perceived urban elites who seem to care very little about the plight of citizens in these communities.

Trump appealed to these voters, many of whom had been infrequent Republican voters since the 1980s. In communities with generally lower education levels, low economic success, and less diversity, there was a strong backlash against the globalizing, pluralizing and urbanizing direction that the Obama administration embraced. In what Van Jones termed a “white-lash,” voters who were deeply troubled by how the country had changed in the past thirty years embraced Trump.⁶⁾ People left behind by the growing instability of a global economy, particularly in economically struggling states like Wisconsin, Michigan, and Pennsylvania were poised to listen to a politician who specifically spoke to them, even if they did not love everything they heard. Trump exploited resentment, much as Governor Scott Walker of Wisconsin had done in 2010.

This rural resentment is a far stronger motivator than is party or ideology. According to Katherine J. Cramer, “place-based identities profoundly influence how people understand politics, regardless of whether urban politicians and their supporters really do shortchange or look down on those living in the country.” As presented in Table 3, there is a growing divide in the United States between citizens who live in diverse urban and suburban areas and people who live in relatively homogeneous rural communities. In states where a large majority of the

⁵⁾ For a compelling book-length treatment, see Katherine J. Cramer, *The Politics of Resentment: Rural Consciousness in Wisconsin and the Rise of Scott Walker* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2016).

⁶⁾ See “Van Jones: Trump Vote is a ‘White-lash,’” *Politico*, accessed January 10, 2017, <http://www.politico.com/story/2016/11/van-jones-trump-2016-presidential-election-231048>.

population live in rural communities, resentment against urban liberals is a powerful electoral motivator (for Republicans and against Democrats), even when each party’s proposed policies run counter to the self-interest of these voters.

State	Population	"White"	African American	American Indian	Asian American	Latino American	Urbanization
MI	9,928,300	75.6%	14.2%	0.7%	3.0%	4.9%	74.6%
NH	1,334,795	91.0%	1.5%	0.3%	2.6%	3.4%	60.3%
PA	12,784,227	77.4%	11.7%	0.4%	3.4%	6.8%	78.7%
WI	5,778,708	81.9%	6.6%	1.1%	2.8%	6.6%	70.2%
FL	20,612,439	55.3%	16.8%	0.5%	2.8%	24.5%	91.2%
AZ	6,931,071	55.8%	4.8%	5.3%	3.4%	30.7%	89.8%
NC	10,146,788	63.8%	22.1%	1.6%	2.8%	9.1%	66.1%
TX	27,862,596	43.0%	12.5%	1.0%	4.7%	38.8%	84.7%
CA	39,250,017	38.0%	6.5%	1.7%	14.7%	38.8%	95.0%
US Total	323,127,513	61.6%	13.3%	1.2%	5.6%	17.6%	80.7%

Whereas Hillary Clinton largely ignored the emotions that drove rural resentment, choosing instead to offer policies meant to help these voters, Donald Trump spoke directly to these voters’ emotions. In this sense, many voters in Michigan, Wisconsin and Pennsylvania (as well as the more rural Florida Panhandle) saw more similarity between Hillary Clinton and Mitt Romney. In fact, in an odd twist of history, Mitt Romney’s “forty-seven percent” comment⁸⁾ and Hillary Clinton’s “basket of deplorables”⁹⁾ were remarkably similar and emblematic of the perceived elitism. Despite the fact that the two candidates were describing a different group of Americans, citizens who felt resentment saw Clinton’s comments as evidence that she was out-of-touch and entrenched in the urban elite. By contrast, despite the fact that Trump was himself very much a member of the urban elite, he was able to present himself as a voice of rural resentment. Trump’s slogan—Making America Great Again—was a call to the mythical past in which rural America was not a marginalized, forgotten region, but the true “breadbasket” of America.

Trump’s hyperbolic claims that America is “collapsing,” a “disaster,” where “everything

⁷⁾ All national and state-based demographic data is available from the U.S. Census. See: <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/table/PST045216/00> (accessed January 10, 2017).

⁸⁾ For the full quote, see “Full Transcript of the Mitt Romney Secret Video,” *Mother Jones*, accessed January 10, 2017, <http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2012/09/full-transcript-mitt-romney-secret-video#47percent>.

⁹⁾ For the full quote, see “Transcript: Clinton’s Full Remarks as She Called half of Trump Supporters ‘Deplorables,’” *Los Angeles Times*, accessed January 10, 2017, <http://www.latimes.com/nation/politics/trailguide/la-na-trailguide-updates-transcript-clinton-s-full-remarks-as-1473549076-htmstory.html>.

is broken” spoke to these citizens’ feelings of resentment. While Clinton and others dismissed Trump’s rhetoric as out-of-control, aggressive hyperbole, his supporters heard a voice speaking to their lived experience. Trump’s shouts about the imminent collapse of a mythic “America” held enormous emotive meaning for rural Americans who felt left behind. As a result, people in the rural parts of Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, Michigan and elsewhere came to view their own plight (both economically and culturally) as essential part of the national decline.

These voters were hungry for a story of rejuvenation. We are going to make America “so, so great,” Trump averred. While Clinton, and Trump’s Republican primary opponents, too often dismissed Trump’s rhetoric as bumbling incoherence, his supporters heard a reawakening for America – reminiscent of Ronald Reagan’s “Morning in America” imagery. Trump’s supporters in these regions were so enthusiastic not because they are raging bigots (although some of them no doubt are), or because they are uniquely in agreement with his policies, but because they are hungry for a story of greatness. While Clinton was busy critiquing the lack of coherence (and even basic knowledge) of Trump’s policy ideas, Trump was instead focused on an emotionally powerful story of rebirth.

Finally, voters in the Rust Belt view themselves as having sacrificed so much for their nation and were searching for a powerful reason to sacrifice again for their country. Many of these families are military families, and Trump called on his supporters to sacrifice for their nation, much as soldiers do. Enthusiastic crowds were quite willing to devote themselves to their nation, achieving a transcendent sense of meaning. In his speeches—which in a different context, could have been characterized as a call to service—Trump asked of his supporters to sacrifice with him. He called on his supporters to help him “blow up” the institutions of government in Washington and the “rigged system,” and to stop the “establishment” from protecting that system. For these rural voters, Trump’s call to “drain the swamp” was a needed and loud voice attacking urban elites and embracing the politics of resentment. While these rural voters were not enough to single-handedly tip the election, rural resentment (sometimes frame in racist and xenophobic language) was clearly a factor in the key swing states where Trump eeked out extremely narrow wins.

ii. Campaign Strategy

Yet despite the fact that rural resentment was well-known and widely documented, the Clinton campaign almost completely ignored these voters. Fueled in part by constant polling that seemed to legitimize their strategy, the Clinton campaign decided that it would speak directly and repeatedly to urban and suburban voters, rather than rural resentment. While a national Presidential campaign should never ignore a wide swath of voters, it still must make strategic decisions. According to the Wesleyan Media Project, the Clinton campaign dominated advertising throughout the country, except in Wisconsin and Michigan.¹⁰⁾ The Trump victories

¹⁰⁾ See “Clinton Crushes Trump 3:1 in Air War,” Wesleyan Media Project, accessed January 10, 2017, <http://mediaproject.wesleyan.edu/releases/nov-2016/>.

in Florida and Pennsylvania cannot be attributed to poor Clinton campaign strategies—she was heavily invested in these states and viewed them rightly as deeply contested. By contrast, the Clinton campaign viewed Wisconsin and Michigan wrongly as safely ensconced in the Democratic “blue wall.”

Yet the Clinton campaign also developed a broad and expansive “field strategy” throughout these states. In some ways, they understood the need to reach voters in the upper Midwest, and decided to do so with field offices rather than advertising. The problem was that these field offices focused on so-called “likely voters” rather than “infrequent voters.” Repeating a mistake that many pollsters made in the lead-up to the election, the Clinton campaign polled and contacted people who regularly voted in presidential campaigns. Typically defined as two-out-of-the-last-three presidential elections, likely voters do not miss presidential elections except in rare cases. By contrast, infrequent voters vote only when there is a candidate or issue that particularly motivates them. Precisely because they felt disconnected from both President Obama and Mitt Romney, many of the “resentment” voters in Michigan and Wisconsin (as well as other key states such as Pennsylvania and Florida) did not vote in 2008 and 2012 were simply ignored by the Clinton campaign. Because they were using the same voter screen as most pollsters, the Clinton campaign failed to pick up the trend that Donald Trump was successfully appealing to infrequent voters. These so-called “Bowling Alone” voters, due to their propensity to disconnect from social groups, were decisive in the swing states.¹¹⁾ And while there was some advanced reporting into this phenomenon, the power of these infrequent voters was largely ignored by the Clinton campaign, Washington D.C. based pollsters, and the mainstream media.¹²⁾

By contrast, Trump’s data analytics team, led by a London-based Cambridge Analytica¹³⁾, found a group of infrequent voters they categorized as “disenfranchised new Republicans.” These voters were deeply resentful of the urban elites, were largely male and often misogynist, were fiercely populist, and were enthralled by the anti-establishment campaign of Donald Trump. Many of these voters could be construed as “Tea Party Republicans” who likely did not vote in 2008, were highly motivated to oppose the Obama Administration in 2009, and helped fuel the 2010 Republican surge that elected so many Tea Party Republicans. These same voters were extremely disappointed when the GOP nominated another urban elitist in

¹¹⁾ See “How Pollsters Missed the ‘Bowling Alone’ Voters That Handed Trump the Presidency,” *Wired*, accessed January 10, 2017, <https://www.wired.com/2016/11/pollsters-missed-bowling-alone-voters-handed-trump-presidency/>.

¹²⁾ For some counter reporting, see “Inside the Trump Bunker, with Days to Go,” *Bloomberg Businessweek*, accessed January 10, 2017, <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2016-10-27/inside-the-trump-bunker-with-12-days-to-go>.

¹³⁾ It is notable, although not surprising, that Cambridge Analytica was a data consultant for the “Leave” campaign during the British Referendum on the European Union. See “A British Firm which Helped Deliver Brexit is Working for Donald Trump’s Campaign,” *Business Insider*, accessed January 10, 2017, <http://www.businessinsider.com/donald-trump-brex-it-us-presidential-election-2016-9>.

2012, Mitt Romney. Therefore, many of them stayed home in 2012, further deepening the perception that they were highly unreliable voters.

iii. Voter Suppression

As an advanced democracy, the expectation is that American elections are free and fair, and that every citizen who wants to vote is able to cast a ballot without barrier. The reality, however, is quite different. American elections are extremely decentralized, governed almost exclusively by state law and implemented at the county, city and precinct level. While these factors are extremely important for state elections, they tend to be overlooked at the federal level except in extremely close elections. Due to the fact that Wisconsin, Michigan, Pennsylvania and Florida were so close (not to mention other close states such as Arizona and North Carolina), we cannot ignore the impact of voter suppression efforts in these states.

Since the 2013 U.S. Supreme Court case *Shelby County v. Holder*, states across the nation enacted a series of highly suppressive voting laws meant to limit the vote of likely Democratic voters. In *Shelby County*, the Court struck down key provisions of the Voting Rights Act (hereafter VRA), originally passed in 1965 and reauthorized most recently in 2006. In *Shelby County*, the Majority ruled that key aspects of §4 and §5 of the Voting Rights Act violate the “principles of federalism and ... equal sovereignty” (570 U.S. 1). The majority specifically struck down the coverage formula that determines which jurisdictions are required to seek preclearance before changing their voting laws. Whereas the VRA has required states with a history of racial discrimination and voting rights’ violation to seek approval from the U.S. Justice Department before changing their voting laws, the Supreme Court in *Shelby County* ruled that these states could make changes with simple state legislative majorities.

And make changes they most certainly did. As the Brennan Center for Justice has shown, states (primarily in the South and Midwest) passed extensive changes to their voting laws that made it more difficult to vote. States throughout the South, plus non-Southern states such as Wisconsin, Indiana, Arizona and North Carolina passed voter suppression laws limiting early voting, dramatically reducing the number of polling places, requiring government issued photo identification with current address and other measures. While Republicans quickly dismiss such claims as overstated and electoral “whining,” there is compelling evidence that a national effort to suppress votes and engineer election results affected the 2016 election.

Wisconsin has some of the most aggressive voter suppression laws in the United States. While it is impossible to know exactly how many voters were suppressed as a result of real or perceived ineligibility, the United States General Accounting Office estimates that Voter ID and other suppression laws can reduce Democratic turnout by as much as 2%.¹⁴⁾ There is strong evidence that such suppression occurred in highly transient areas, such as college campuses and urban areas. Voter turnout was dramatically down in these precincts by as many

¹⁴⁾ See the General Accounting Office, <http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-14-634> (accessed January 10, 2017).

as 300,000 voters across the state.¹⁵⁾ According to the *Chicago Tribune*, Wisconsin saw its lowest turnout in 20 years (where overall national turnout increased) and roughly 41,000 fewer voters cast ballots compared to 2012.¹⁶⁾

In Florida, early voting indicated that Hillary Clinton was headed for a solid win. Yet by Election Day, it was clear that Donald Trump had eeked out a narrow victory. What happened in Florida is a case of substantial dispute. According to Trump and the GOP, registered democrats voted for Trump in higher than expected numbers, and there were only “minor problems” at the polls. Democrats, however, counter that there were innumerable problems, including hacking, malfunctioning voter machines, and voters turned away at the polls because they had allegedly “already voted.” It is impossible to know the extent of the problems because the Republican controlled state government opposed an audit of results or hand recount on the grounds that it was too expensive. In all likelihood, we will never know the extent of the election suppression efforts in Florida, although with an election decided by less than 1.5%, it is clear that suppression could have a significant impact on the outcome.¹⁷⁾

Whatever may or may not have happened on Election Day, it is clear that Florida moved to limit vote well in advance of the election. The state closed hundreds of polling places, limited early voting, and continued a long-standing policy of suppressing the vote of former felons. Florida is one of only three US states (Iowa and Kentucky are the others) that ban voting for former felons for life.¹⁸⁾ Over six million Americans are denied the right to vote due to past criminal convictions and over one quarter of those Americans live in Florida. According to Erika Wood, Florida disenfranchises 21% of its African-American voting-age population. This is a legacy of the Jim Crow South, an effort to disenfranchisement former slaves made possible by the particular wording of the 13th and 15th Amendments. The problem of disenfranchisement of African-Americans is neither new nor limited to Florida. According to Myrna Perez, Director of the Voting Rights and Elections Project at the Brennan Center for Justice: “Across the nation, criminal disenfranchisement laws deny over 6 million Americans a say in our democracy. More than 4.7 million of these citizens have left prison and are in their communities — working, raising families, and paying taxes. At the same time, they remain blocked from joining their neighbors at the polls. People of color bear the brunt of the practice, with over 1 in 13 African Americans disenfranchised — one-third of the total denied the right to vote.” This legacy of the Jim Crow South was likely decisive in the 2016 election in close

¹⁵⁾ See “An “Epidemic” of Voter Suppression,” *Urban Milwaukee*, accessed January 10, 2017, <http://urbanmilwaukee.com/2016/11/17/murphys-law-an-epidemic-of-voter-suppression/>.

¹⁶⁾ “Did voter ID Laws Hurt Election Turnout? Look at Milwaukee,” *Chicago Tribune*, accessed January 10, 2017, <http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/nationworld/midwest/ct-milwaukee-wisconsin-voter-id-laws-20161217-story.html>.

¹⁷⁾ “Plaintiffs Want Presidential Recount in Florida,” *Tallahassee Democrat*, accessed January 10, 2017, <http://www.tallahassee.com/story/news/2016/12/05/plaintiffs-want-presidential-recount-florida/95007210/>.

¹⁸⁾ See “Florida: An Outlier in Denying Voting Rights,” *Brennan Center for Justice*, accessed January 10, 2017, https://www.brennancenter.org/sites/default/files/publications/Florida_Voting_Rights_Outlier.pdf.

states such as Florida, North Carolina and possibly Georgia.

In Michigan, failed voting machines in the Detroit area were not rectified due to a state law that prevents a hand recount unless the original vote tally matches the machine tally.¹⁹⁾ A federal judge halted the recount effort, despite hundreds of mismatched machine/sign in tallies.²⁰⁾ A group of Trump supporters, formalized in the so-called Great American Political Action Committee (GAPAC), filed a lawsuit to stop recounts in Michigan and Wisconsin. Following the logic of the 2000 Supreme Court decision in *Bush v. Gore*, according to an American public television report: “The PACs’ lawsuit contended Wisconsin was violating the U.S Supreme Court’s 2000 *Bush v. Gore* ruling because the state lacks uniform standards to determine which votes should be recounted. The lawsuit also argued that the recount threatened due process rights because it might not be completed by the federal deadline to certify the vote, putting Wisconsin’s electoral votes in jeopardy. If states miss the deadline, Congress allots their electoral votes.”²¹⁾ In Pennsylvania, a \$1,000,000 bond to proceed with a recount was never paid, effectively stopping a recount. Yet all these recount efforts were highly unlikely to change the outcome, because once a tally is made the chance of changing more than a few hundred votes is remote.

Taken together, the effort to suppress the vote is difficult to ignore. While we will likely never know the specific impact of voter suppression efforts, political scientists K. G. Bentele and E. E. O’Brien argue persuasively that voter suppression efforts are real and significant. According to Bentele and O’Brien: “Our results indicate that proposal and passage are highly partisan, strategic, and racialized affairs. These findings are consistent with a scenario in which the targeted demobilization of minority voters and African Americans is a central driver of recent legislative developments.”²²⁾ These voter suppression efforts tend to reinforce themselves. As pro-suppression Republicans increasingly win close state elections, they pass laws that further suppress the vote, which increases the likelihood that pro-suppression candidates will win in the future. While these suppression efforts typically do not affect Presidential elections because margins are too large, in 2016 in Florida, Wisconsin, Michigan, Pennsylvania, North Carolina, and possibly Arizona, suppression efforts likely affected the outcome, maybe decisively.

¹⁹⁾ See “Detroit’s Election Woes: 782 More Votes than Voters,” *Detroit Free Press*, accessed January 10, 2017, <http://www.freep.com/story/news/local/michigan/detroit/2016/12/18/detroit-ballots-vote-recount-election-stein/95570866/>.

²⁰⁾ See “Federal Judge’s Ruling Halts Michigan Presidential Election Recount,” *Detroit Free Press*, accessed January 10, 2017, <http://www.freep.com/story/news/local/michigan/detroit/2016/12/07/federal-judge-halts-michigan-election-recount/95110008/>.

²¹⁾ “Judge Refuses to Stop Wisconsin Recount; Michigan Judges Recuse themselves from Stein Appeal,” PBS Newshour, accessed January 10, 2017, <http://www.pbs.org/newshour/rundown/judge-consider-wisconsin-recount-michigan-judges-recuse-stein-appeal/>.

²²⁾ Keith Gunnar Bentele and Erin E. O’Brien, “Jim Crow 2.0?: Why States Consider and Adopt Restrictive Voter Access Policies,” *Perspectives on Politics* 11, no.4 (December 2013), 1088–1116.

3. A Thriving Right-Wing Social Movement: Paleoconservatism and The Alt-Right

The energy on the far Right for Donald Trump also clearly propelled the Trump campaign. It is not an exaggeration to claim that Trump's 2011 effort to question President Barack Obama's citizenship was the spark that fueled Trump's presidential campaign. On April 7, 2011, on NBC's *Today Show*, Trump famously said: "I have people that have been studying [Obama's birth certificate] and they cannot believe what they're finding . . . I would like to have him show his birth certificate, and can I be honest with you, I hope he can. Because if he can't, if he can't, if he wasn't born in this country, which is a real possibility . . . then he has pulled one of the great cons in the history of politics."²³) It is worth pausing for a moment to consider these comments. Donald Trump, a real-estate developer with no political experience, appeared on a national television program to call into question the citizenship of the President of the United States. While these claims have been thoroughly dispelled, even by Trump himself who later admitted that his words were the "con"²⁴), the audience Trump effectively reached was the so-called "alt-right."²⁵) Trump advisor Steve Bannon, a former Breitbart executive, led the effort to provide a platform for a previously marginal movement to promote white nationalism, libertarianism, cultural conservatism and a kind of place-based rural populism. White nationalism, neo-Nazism, and White supremacy were not new movements in the United States. In fact, they have been a key part of the Republican coalition since the Civil Rights Movement effectively divided the Democratic Party along civil rights lines. But not since Ronald Reagan and the 1980s had these members of the far Right had a political hero on the national stage. Specifically, these alt-right members call themselves "paleoconservatives." According to Dylan Matthews, paleoconservatives "adhere to the normal conservative triad of nationalism, free markets, and moral traditionalism, but they put greater weight on the nationalist leg of the stool — leading to a more strident form of anti-immigrant politics that often veers into racism, an isolationist foreign policy rather than a hawkish or dovish one, and a deep skepticism of economic globalization that puts them at odds with an important element of the business agenda."²⁶) Paleoconservatives reject mainstream Republicans who are allegedly too "soft," too willing to compromise conservative principles and welcome diverse voters to their movement. They explicitly rejected the post-2012 election "autopsy" in which Republican elites argued that the Republican Party had to appeal to Latino voters to

²³) "Trump: I have 'Real Doubts' Obama was Born in U.S.," *Today*, accessed January 10, 2017, http://www.today.com/id/42469703/ns/today-today_news/t/trump-i-have-real-doubts-obama-was-born-us/.

²⁴) "Donald Trump Finally Admits President Obama Born in U.S.," NBC News, accessed January 10, 2017, <http://www.nbcnews.com/politics/2016-election/donald-trump-obama-was-born-united-states-n649501>.

²⁵) For a detailed history of the so-called alt-right, see "History of the Alt-right," *Salon*, accessed January 10, 2017, http://www.salon.com/2016/11/24/history-of-the-alt-right-the-movement-is-not-just-breitbart-and-white-nationalists-it-is-worse_partner/.

²⁶) "Paleoconservatism, the Movement that Explains Donald Trump, Explained," *Vox*, accessed January 10, 2017, <http://www.vox.com/2016/5/6/11592604/donald-trump-paleoconservative-buchanan>.

have a chance to win future elections in the United States. These mainstream Republicans, who paleoconservative leader Richard Spencer called “cuckservatives,” were interested in defending the rule of the law, the United States Constitution, and the so-called free market of neo-conservatism. In effect, these mainstream conservatives—epitomized in the campaign of former Florida Governor Jeb Bush—wanted to protect and promote the United States and push it from within in a more conservative direction. By contrast, paleoconservatives sought a far more radical, anti-state approach that focused on reclaiming the so-called “nation,” and viewed politics as a struggle between race, religion and culture.

The prefix “paleo” means “prehistoric” or “early” or even “primitive.” Paleoconservatives view themselves as returning for “first” or “pre-civilization” principles such as nationality, ethnicity, and race. For these activists, the liberal democratic state is a direct threat to these first principles and in Donald Trump they found a wealthy and brash voice for their vision for a return to the original “America.” Trump’s slogan—“Make America Great Again—along with his call to “drain the swamp,” were focused directly on the paleoconservative claim to return to a “pure” America where people share a common race, ethnicity and nationality. This has led some commentators, including the author, to identify Trump’s victory as the beginning of American fascism.²⁷⁾ Trump’s rallies were fueled by paleoconservatives in the alt-right who embraced an authoritarian who embodied their (at-times) fascist perspective on the purpose of politics. Notably, in a widely reported post-election event in Washington, D.C., Richard Spencer—a leading paleoconservative—received Nazi-style salutes amid the call: “Hail Trump, hail our people, hail victory!”²⁸⁾

Donald Trump knew how to throw “red meat” to conservatives on a paleo diet. In fact, anti-immigrant and anti-Muslim rhetoric—in short, racism and bigotry—fueled Trump’s campaign. In the opening months of the Trump campaign, he garnered the support of a tiny fringe of Republican voters. In March 2015, Trump was polling at approximately 3% of Republican primary voters and was ninth of eleven candidates. Yet on June 16, 2015, Trump announced his candidacy, declared Mexican immigrants as rapists, and went on within days to call for a ban on Muslims entering the United States. By early July, only two weeks after these xenophobic claims, Trump had jumped to first place, polling over 14% of the vote. While his level of support was still limited given the large number of candidates (17 candidates at the peak), it was enough to launch Donald Trump into first place. This 14% was clearly the paleoconservative element within the Republican Party.

This is not to suggest that all of Donald Trump general election voters were members of the alt-right, were paleoconservatives, or supported the most virulent fascist views of Richard

²⁷⁾ For more on American Fascism, see “American Fascism: The Presidency of Donald J. Trump,” Post-Election Forum, accessed January 10, 2017, <http://www.publicseminar.org/2016/11/american-fascism/#.WFmyG2UyCII>.

²⁸⁾ ““Hail Trump!”: White Nationalists Salute the President-Elect,” the *Atlantic*, accessed January 10, 2017, <http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2016/11/richard-spencer-speech-npi/508379/>.

Spencer and his adherents. However, what is clear is that paleoconservatives in the alt-right was the major force propelling Donald Trump to the Republican nomination. Once Trump was the Republican nominee, mainstream Republican voters were faced with tolerating the most egregious Trump claims and ignoring the bigotry and nativism of his paleoconservative base or voting for Hillary Clinton (or not voting, which had the same effect as voting for Trump). For most Republicans, these was an easy choice given their decades of opposition to and downright hatred of Hillary Clinton.

4. An Interrupted Social Demographic Social Movement: Bernie or Bust

Another major factor was the relative lack of energy within the Democratic Party for Hillary Clinton. It was clear from the primary campaign that there was strong Democratic energy in the 2016 election—for social democratic challenger Bernie Sanders. The Sanders campaign and its professed “political revolution” drew millions of disaffected voters to rallies, particularly voters under 40 who were hungry for a social democratic turn in the United States. Sanders offered a strident critique of massive inequality in the United States, focused specifically on wealth inequality, Wall Street excess, student loan debt and government collusion with the billionaire class. Sanders’ call for a “political revolution” attempted to turn the energy of the 99% movement into a successful Presidential campaign.

And it almost worked. A broad left-wing social movement was brewing in the United States, particularly in the most northern parts of the country, creating enormous energy for citizens who felt “the Bern.” From east to west, the Sanders campaign mobilized millions of previously disaffected voters in northern states such as Maine and Vermont, Michigan and Wisconsin, Oregon and Washington. These states are generally less diverse than the United States as a whole (see Table 3), and are filled with millions of voters who were suffering the effects of economic inequality. Like Donald Trump, Bernie Sanders offered an explanation for this suffering. Sanders’ explanation, however, focused on economic inequality and billionaire excess, rather than immigration and bigotry.²⁹⁾

Yet the energy of the Sanders campaign in the most northern parts of the country was not met with equal energy in the Democratic primary and caucuses in the southern and southwestern.³⁰⁾ While Sanders won twenty states, enough states to make the contest for

²⁹⁾ For a complete transcript of Sanders’ post-New Hampshire victory speech, see “The Transcript of Bernie Sanders’s Victory Speech,” *Washington Post*, accessed January 10, 2017, https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/post-politics/wp/2016/02/10/the-transcript-of-bernie-sanders-victory-speech/?utm_term=.8e2bd25aa57a.

³⁰⁾ The North/South split is not perfect: Clinton won in key northern states such as New York and Massachusetts, while Sanders won in key southwestern states such as Oklahoma and Nevada. Yet the overall pattern is clear.

Democratic Party delegates a relatively close contest (although not as close at 2008), Clinton clearly won the Democratic nomination with wins throughout the southern half of the country. In large part, Clinton's strong appeal among older African-Americans and Latino voters was the key to her primary victories in key states such as Virginia, South Carolina and Florida. For Clinton, the "solid South" was built on strong support from African-Americans with whom Clinton had long historic relationships and for whom Sanders "economics-first" appeal rang hollow.

Moreover, while Sanders offered a very powerful critique of economic inequality and his focus on student loan debt was particularly salient for younger voters, Clinton's historic campaign gave her a base among women (and some men) who were ready to help bust the glass ceiling. Therefore, even while she was losing among young voters, Clinton ran up large margins among older voters (particularly older women) who helped ensure a significant, if not comfortable, primary win for Clinton.³¹⁾

Clinton's win thus clipped the wings of an insurgent Democratic Party social movement. While Clinton gained overwhelming support from regular Democratic voters, she was unable to motivate infrequent Democrats and independents for whom Sanders' campaign had important appeal. This meant depressed turnout, particularly among social-democratic leaning young voters and the most progressive Democrats. While the likely 1-2% in depressed turnout was not significant in the overall popular vote, it appears decisive in key swing states such as Wisconsin, Michigan, Pennsylvania and Florida. Whereas President Obama had won states in the Midwest by running up large margins in urban areas such as Detroit, Philadelphia, Milwaukee, Miami and elsewhere, Hillary Clinton simply didn't create adequate voter energy in these urban areas.³²⁾ Part of the reason for lower Democratic turnout was clearly voter suppression efforts as noted above. In particular, states such as Wisconsin and North Carolina have been aggressively depressing voter turnout in urban areas for over a decade.

Moreover, the Trump campaign developed a targeted voter suppression effort.³³⁾ For example, the Trump campaign distributed flyers with the wrong date or voting location, they

³¹⁾ For a detailed analysis of the Democratic primary electorate and demographic support for Clinton and Sanders, see "Democratic Primary Voter Demographic Shifts and Candidate Coalitions," Public Opinion Strategies, accessed January 10, 2017, <http://pos.org/democratic-primary-voter-demographic-shifts-and-candidate-coalitions/>

³²⁾ See, for example, "Voter Turnout Fell, With Biggest Declines in Urban Areas," *Wall Street Journal*, accessed January 10, 2017, <http://www.wsj.com/articles/voter-turnout-fell-with-biggest-declines-in-urban-areas-1478741378> or "The Non-Voters Who Decided The Election: Trump Won Because Of Lower Democratic Turnout," *Forbes*, accessed January 10, 2017, <http://www.forbes.com/sites/omribenshahar/2016/11/17/the-non-voters-who-decided-the-election-trump-won-because-of-lower-democratic-turnout/#7d76545640a1>.

³³⁾ See "Donald Trump Campaign Seeks 'Voter Suppression,' Report Says, but It's Legal," *New York Times*, accessed January 10, 2017, http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/28/us/politics/donald-trump-campaign-voter-suppression.html?_r=0.

sent out “vote for Hillary on Facebook” posts (on line voting does not exist in the United States), and generally sought to create confusion for some voters in targeted areas.

Yet even with all the voter suppression efforts, it’s also true that the public energy that was clearly present for the Sanders and Trump campaigns was largely absent for Hillary Clinton. Clinton never achieved the kind of enthusiastic crowds that President Obama had, even when Obama himself was campaigning on her behalf.³⁴⁾ Again, while the so-called “enthusiasm” gap may not have been significant on the national level, in key swing states such as Wisconsin, Michigan and Pennsylvania, a modest drop of a single percent was decisive. For example, in Wisconsin, while Donald Trump’s results mirrored Mitt Romney’s 2012 results, Hillary Clinton received almost 240,000 fewer votes (See Table 4). As well, Clinton received almost 300,000 fewer votes in Michigan. Trump’s increased appeal in Michigan was significant (over 160,000 votes), but without the large Democratic drop Clinton would have won Michigan. As well, while Trump did much better in Pennsylvania than Mitt Romney (over 290,000 more votes), Clinton’s drop in support by almost 65,000 voters largely in Philadelphia and its suburbs, was more than Trump’s eventual margin of victory. In short, lower turnout among Democratic voters in key urban areas in swing states was another contributing factor to Trump’s victory.

State	Electoral Votes	Trump (2016)	Clinton (2016)	Romney (2012)	Obama (2012)	Republican 2016-2012	Democrat 2016-2012
MI	16	2,279,543	2,268,839	2,115,256	2,564,569	164,287	-295,730
NH	4	345,790	348,526	329,918	369,561	15,872	-21,035
PA	20	2,970,733	2,926,441	2,680,434	2,990,274	290,299	-63,833
WI	10	1,405,284	1,382,536	1,407,966	1,620,985	-2,682	-238,449
FL	29	4,617,886	4,504,975	4,163,447	4,237,756	454,439	267,219
MN	10	1,322,951	1,367,716	1,320,225	1,546,167	2,726	-178,451
NV	6	512,058	539,260	463,567	531,373	48,491	7,887
ME	4	335,593	357,735	292,276	401,306	43,317	-43,571
AZ	11	1,252,401	1,161,167	1,233,654	1,025,232	18,747	135,935
NC	15	2,362,631	2,189,316	2,270,395	2,178,391	92,236	10,925

5. Outside Influences: Illiberal Democracy in the United States and Abroad

The final factor is the overall decline of American liberal democracy and the rise of authoritarian and illiberal democratic movements in the United States and abroad. Over the past several decades, liberal democratic norms in the United States have been eroding. Diplomatic traditions and institutional norms are losing their salience in America’s liberal

³⁴⁾ See “Obama Tries To Bridge A 'Black Enthusiasm Gap' In Florida,” NPR, accessed January 10, 2017, <http://www.npr.org/2016/11/03/500480062/obama-tries-to-bridge-a-black-enthusiasm-gap-in-florida>.

democracy.³⁵⁾ Donald Trump's refusal to disclose his tax returns violated a long-standing political norm: in order to ensure that a presidential candidate is not vulnerable to undue influence, Americans came to expect that all candidates for President would release their tax returns. Yet when Donald Trump refused to do so that norm collapsed.

Even more significant, a past norm had been for government agencies, notably the FBI, to remain neutral in an election year, even if there was potentially explosive information about a campaign. They followed this norm in withholding information about Russian hacking. Yet James Comey's decision to announce his investigation of Hillary Clinton's emails was not only a partisan effort to help elect Donald Trump, it was also a direct assault on a key norm of American liberal democracy.

These "outside influences" also crossed the U.S. border. It is clear that global authoritarian states are increasingly seeking to influence liberal democracies around the world. Led by the "Big Five" — China, Russia, Iran, Saudi Arabia and Venezuela — authoritarian regimes are increasingly coordinating efforts to globalize authoritarianism as a viable alternative to liberal democracy.³⁶⁾ This "movement" seeks to "challenge the liberal international political order and to contain the spread of (liberal) democracy."³⁷⁾ These authoritarian states make no pretense of protecting liberal rights, ensuring free and fair elections, or promoting the principle of limited government. In fact, they view these liberal principles as unsustainable and dangerous.

Notably, authoritarians have discovered that there are myriad ways to come to power. Gone are the days when the only way to defeat a liberal democracy was from without—primarily as a military coup or populist revolution. Increasingly, authoritarians understand that internal transformation is a more effective and enduring path to authoritarian control. To this end, so-called "illiberal democratic" movements have brought authoritarians to power in Turkey, Hungary, Egypt, Peru, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Pakistan, and the Philippines. In 2016, it the spread of illiberal democracy hit the shores of the United States.

Donald Trump embraced these critiques of liberal democracy and famously praised authoritarian leaders like Vladimir Putin. While we may not ever know the full extent of Russian hacking and technological manipulation of the American election, U.S. intelligence agencies have concluded that the Russians were actively involved in an effort to aid Trump and defeat Clinton. It is unclear exactly how much of an effect these efforts had, but pollsters detected a clear shift in the final week as FBI director Comey sent a letter to Congress indicating that he was "reopening" an investigation of Clinton's emails, due in significant part to information provided by Russian hackers.

³⁵⁾ See "What the King of Hawaii Can Teach Us About Trump," *Politico*, accessed January 10, 2017, <http://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2017/01/what-trump-taught-us-about-american-democracy-214596>.

³⁶⁾ See Larry Diamond, Marc Plattner, and Christopher Walker, *Authoritarianism Goes Global: The Challenge to Democracy* (Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2016).

³⁷⁾ *Ibid.*, 6.

Conclusion: Donald Trump and the Future of American Constitutional Democracy

One of the central questions Americans—and citizens all around the world—are facing is: will American Constitutional democracy survive the Trump Administration? This is an essential question in the United States, which has enjoyed a relatively stable political system for over 150 years. But it is also an essential question for the world at large. For the stability of the post-war liberal democratic system grounded in the principles of liberal democracy, national constitutional institutions and global institutions such as the United Nations, an illiberal United States will prove deeply disruptive. Increasingly, it appears that this is exactly what a Trump Administration will look like. With his appointment power, Trump is assembling a cabinet of billionaires, nationalists, and autocrats who are quite willing to challenge the norms and institutions of liberal democracy. Moreover, it is clear that Donald Trump himself, with his penchant for outbursts on Twitter, is mentally unstable.

It is impossible at this point to predict what might happen, but there is likely a range of possible outcomes. In the worst case scenario, American Constitutional Democracy will collapse. President Trump will assume broadly expansive powers and use them. The system of checks and balances, dependent in part on a commitment to liberal democracy norms, will be ineffective. Moreover, while individual U.S. states may prove an effective buffer to protect citizens and liberal democratic principles in their state, overall a rise of illiberal democracy will likely mean a collapse of essential liberal democratic rights. In this worst-case scenario, Americans will live much as citizens of Russia or China do, with few opportunities for public free expression and significant and likely violent repression of those people who challenge the Trump Administration. It is also likely in this worst case scenario that armed gangs will seek to “enforce” the more extreme nationalizing tendencies of the Trump Administration. Americans who do not meet the racial, ethnic, religious, or political “standards” of these gangs will likely be threatened—the post-election rise of hate crimes attests to this possibility.³⁸⁾

Along with this loss of individual rights will likely come a direct attack on the free press. Americans will have an increasingly difficult time accessing the truth about their federal government, relying on underground and threatened “dissident” media. Meanwhile, the Trump Administration will likely build its own media, either independent of the current media outlets or by taking over a network such as NBC.

We can only begin to conceptualize the impact on the rest of the world if the United States transitions to an authoritarian regime.” Likely (and ironically), nations such as Germany and Japan may become leaders in a counter movement supporting liberal democracy. Yet without the political and economic power of the United States, liberal democracy will clearly be in jeopardy.

Of course, the vision painted above is a “worst-case” and one can easily imagine a

³⁸⁾ See, for example, “‘Make America White Again.’ Hate Speech and Crimes Post-election,” CNN, accessed January 10, 2017, <http://www.cnn.com/2016/11/10/us/post-election-hate-crimes-and-fears-trnd/>.

less extreme impact of the Trump Administration. There are signs that some Republicans in the United States Congress are willing to fight back against Trump's authoritarian turn. Arizona Senator John McCain, chairman of the Senate Armed Services committee, is holding hearings into Russian hacking, directly challenging Donald Trump.³⁹⁾ Likewise, Michigan House Member Justin Amash has criticized Trump's "crony capitalism" and attack of First Amendment freedom of expression rights.⁴⁰⁾ While these Republican efforts will not alone be enough to curtail the illiberal actions of the Trump Administration, combined with a broad-based Democratic social movement, there could be enough political power to preserve American constitutional democracy. For those of us who are deeply committed to the preservation of the American Constitution, this may be our best hope.

³⁹⁾ See "Will John McCain Protect America from Trump's Strange Affinity for Putin?," *Los Angeles Times*, accessed January 10, 2017, <http://www.latimes.com/opinion/topoftheticket/la-na-tt-mccain-russia-20170106-story.html>.

⁴⁰⁾ "The One House Republican Who Can't Stop Criticizing Donald Trump," the *Huffington Post*, accessed January 10, 2017, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/justin-amash-donald-trump_us_58406d7ae4b017f37fe35a9e.