

**A Book Chapter for**  
***Why Irrational Politics Appeals: Understanding the Allure of Trump***

**An Anti-Establishment Theory of Trump**

**Gregg Henriques**

For months on the campaign trail, Donald Trump frequently proclaimed that banning Muslims from entering the United States was a necessary step until “we can figure out what is going on”. Paralleling this, many individuals in the liberal academic and social circles in which I travel had a very similar sentiment to the rise of Trump himself. That is, they have been dumbstruck about how Trump emerged triumphant out of a competitive field of 17 contenders for the Republican nomination, and they have voiced fantasies that the political process could be put on hold until folks could figure out what was going on. Indeed, when he announced his candidacy in 2015, virtually no serious commentator or established politician gave him any chance of winning and most viewed his entry into the race simply as an extension of his bid in the prior election and done for purposes of celebrity. It is worth recalling how, at the White House Correspondents’ Dinner in 2011, Seth Meyers captured this sentiment, “Donald Trump has been saying he will run for president as a Republican — which is surprising, since I just assumed he was running as a joke.”

But against all conventional wisdom and with virtually no initial support from the Republican establishment (and with many prominent Republicans openly criticizing or dismissing Trump as a viable candidate), Trump proceeded to vanquish one competitor after another and ultimately emerged as the clear choice from the majority of Republican voters to be the nominee. The goal of this chapter is to help the reader understand the psychological, social and political forces that propelled Trump to success when it initially appeared to be so unlikely.

The central thesis of this chapter is that what has driven Trump's unexpected success is that there has emerged a fundamental divide in the American character and identity, namely a divide between cultural traditionalists and cultural cosmopolitans (Trende, 2016), and that the former are feeling resentful about being unheard and left behind by the political and intellectual establishment and they view Trump as a disruptive force that can break up the current direction of the country return their sense of identity and value to the place it once rightfully held in American society. This chapter first articulates why the Trump phenomena requires academic analysis and then proceeds to briefly outline the frame that I am using to understand human behavior more broadly. I then highlight the key elements of Trump's rise, including: 1) the divide between cultural cosmopolitans and cultural traditionalists; 2) the reasons why the latter are feeling frustrated, angry, and left behind; 3) the reason that Trump's anti-political establishment message is absolutely central to his campaign; 4) the nature of Trump's personality and its symbolic value to Trump supporters; and 5) the patterns and concerns of Trump voters that provide aggregate data consistent with validity of these claims. Finally, I conclude with a comment about Trump's candidacy and why it is so risky.

### **Understanding What Is Being Explained and Why It Needs an Explanation**

If Jeb Bush had won the Republican nomination, there likely would not have been a push to gather academics together and to provide a framework for making sense of this event because we expect there to be a basic alignment with power structures, investment, beliefs and established tradition. As a candidate, Jeb Bush had this alignment, in terms of political stature, experience, money, backing from the establishment, and name recognition. Trump, of course, was in many ways the opposite. Although he had name recognition and wealth, it was all outside of the political establishment. At the start of the campaign, he had virtually no endorsements or

establishment connections and no political experience from which to base his campaign. Thus, his rise is something of a mystery from that perspective.

I also think it is useful to say something about the nature of explanation regarding this kind of event. When attempting to offer scientific explanations for phenomena, the focus is often on control of relevant variables and, especially, prediction. Prediction of future events is the sine qua non of good natural scientific explanation. While this is true for events in the physical sciences, large-scale social phenomena cannot be viewed via the lens of control and prediction, as control is limited and there simply are too many variables that lead to too many possible outcomes which prevent reliable prediction. This is particularly true of things that can be characterized as Black Swan events. A Black Swan is a metaphor for an event that emerges as a surprise and then attempts are made to explain the event after the fact. According to Nicholas Taleb, who authored *The Black Swan* (2010), such an event that (1) is a far outlier (i.e., was completely unexpected), (2) has huge consequences, and (3) in retrospect seems to have been at least somewhat understandable. It seems clear that the Trump nomination meets these criteria. But even if they are almost impossible to predict, it is useful to try and explain why they happen after the fact. So, the question to be addressed here is why did this Black Swan event happen? In what follows, I attempt to root out and highlight the central psychological, social, and political forces that are responsible for Trump's success in acquiring the Republican nomination. But prior to laying out the components that go into my analysis, I will provide a brief background of the conceptual framework that I use to understand human behavior.

### **A Brief Overview of the Current Framework**

I use a new, unified approach to psychology (Henriques, 2011) that pulls together many different threads within the field and related social science perspectives and offers a way to see

the whole in a way that is more coherent than the current fragmented arrangement of theories and findings. Although the formal details are beyond the scope of this chapter, I will highlight the core features of the approach central to understanding the forces that are giving rise to the Trump phenomenon. The first is the claim that animal minds (including human minds) can be understood as systems of behavioral investment that calculate the costs and benefits of actions and orient individuals to consider, protect, and advance their interests as they relate to fundamental valued states of being (e.g., states that foster survival and reproduction). The second feature is that, as social mammals, humans are deeply relational creatures who attempt to navigate the social world by attending to their level of social influence and felt sense of relational value (this is defined as the extent to which they feel known and valued by important others). Humans seek relational value in terms of their immediate connections and exchanges with others (such as family members and friends), but also in terms of their group membership and identity. This last point is crucial because it highlights how political groups serve as extensions and affirmations of the self (or not).

Finally, the unified approach characterizes humans as unique animals because of the evolution of human language, which set the stage for humans to give reasons for their actions and the happenings in the world around them. These reason giving processes gave rise to large-scale systems of explicit, language-based beliefs, which the unified approach characterizes as “justification systems”. Political frameworks are seen as large-scale justification systems that attempt to provide individuals with a group identity and a narrative about how the (political) world works and what we should value and the actions we should take to maximize our valued outcomes.

My goal in this chapter is to explicate the forces of human investment, social influence, and justification that have propelled Trump to the nomination. The answer is not to be found in simple theories of rational self-interest or individuals attempting to maximize utility. Rather what is being played out on the political stage is a battle for the very identity of the United States of America. Specifically, the Trump candidacy, especially when considered against the backdrop of an Obama Presidency, is about a battle for the core values (i.e., the interests, investments, and justifications) regarding what the American People stand for and represent.

### **Cultural Traditionalists versus Cultural Cosmopolitans: A Great Divide in the American Character**

At least since the 1980s, there has been a significant and clearly identifiable divide in America regarding cultural and family values. The Moral Majority, founded by Jerry Falwell, provided conservative Christians a clear voice that was defined against secular and progressive social values, and the culture wars that emerged in the wake of the Moral Majority provides a social and historical lineage to the present day. The landscape has changed somewhat in the last decade or so, and I believe the current divide is best captured by the distinction delineated by Sean Trende (2016), who coined the key difference in modern America as that between cultural traditionalists and cultural cosmopolitans. The essence of the cultural cosmopolitan view is the (apparent) capacity to step outside one's local knowledge and background and explore and embrace diversity. Cosmopolitans are open to the various ethnic, national, and religious ways of being, and see their lives as one way of being among many other possible ways. They also tend to be more open to ideas and experiences, are on average better educated than cultural traditionalists, and have values that emphasize multiculturalism, globalization, and an intellectual analysis of the issues, all while being suspicious of claims grounded in local traditional authority.

They also are more likely to live in the cities and coastal areas of the country. Unlike traditionalists, cosmopolitans are hesitant to place cultures in explicit hierarchies, although, as will be noted, cosmopolitans are often seen to express contempt or a sense of “elitist” superiority relative to traditionalists.

Cultural traditionalists, in contrast, take pride in their local perspectives and hometown values. Embodied in phenomena like “Duck Dynasty” and individuals like Sarah Palin, they like getting their hands dirty, telling it like it is in plain language, kicking the tires, and kicking ass when necessary. Although traditionalists exist across all educational and class levels, they are more heavily represented among working class individuals, and on average have lower levels of education than cosmopolitans. They are more likely to live in south, central, and rural America. They are much more likely to embrace the idea that America is an exceptional country, and many believe it was blessed by a Christian God as such. Such systems of justification are well-represented in an essay by Andrea Lafferty (2016) on why she supports Trump as an Evangelical woman:

Every American woman who professes to believe in God has a responsibility to raise her voice in this election cycle and vote for a candidate who stands ready to restore America and that means American values as the strongest force for good and freedom that modern history has known.

There can be debate and disagreement about Presidents George W. Bush and Bill Clinton but little can be said about any Barack Obama legacy other than he rarely saw anything positive in America past or present. There was never any chance he would make America great again because he never thought America was ever great.

As referred to above, a central dynamic between the two groups is that traditionalists resent being looked down upon or perceived as ignorant or racist or hyper-religious by the cultural cosmopolitan elites. In the 2008 campaign, Obama ignited precisely this issue when he explained the mindset of cultural traditionalists to a cosmopolitan audience at a San Francisco fundraiser, proclaiming that:

You go into these small towns in Pennsylvania and, like a lot of small towns in the Midwest, the jobs have been gone now for 25 years and nothing's replaced them. And they fell through the Clinton administration, and the Bush administration, and each successive administration has said that somehow these communities are gonna regenerate and they have not.

And it's not surprising then they get bitter, they cling to guns or religion or antipathy toward people who aren't like them or anti-immigrant sentiment or anti-trade sentiment as a way to explain their frustrations.

Crucial to understanding the rise of Trump is that the two parties have different alignments with the values and visions of cosmopolitans and traditionalists. The Democratic Party in general and its leadership in particular are essentially aligned with cultural cosmopolitan values and over the past two decades it has become an increasingly cosmopolitan institution. To see this, consider how Barack Obama's life narrative—born of a Kenyan father and White American mother, growing up in Hawaii and Indonesia, becoming the first black person to lead the Harvard Law Review, then on to the Senate and finally the Presidency—so epitomizes the views and values of cosmopolitan culture.

In contrast, the Republican Party has had a much more complicated relationship with cultural traditionalist values. On the one hand, the Republican Party has tried to reach out to cultural traditionalists with emphases on traditional Christian family values. It also attempts to project a strong and proud national identity in terms of international relations with emphases on American exceptionalism. And the Republican Party clearly aligned itself with traditional Whites in the “Southern Strategy”, which arose in response to the Civil Rights movement. But it also is the case that most leading establishment Republicans are largely cosmopolitan in their views, education, and many of their values. That is, they are well-educated, often advocate for measures such as free trade, are open to diversity, participate in the advancement of technology and globalization, and tend to live in the cities and have much contact with diverse peoples. Think here of Mitt Romney as an individual or of Libertarians as a group; both are largely

cosmopolitan in their orientation. Because of this, what has emerged over the past decade or so among many cultural traditionalists is the sense that the Republican Party is often seen as only paying lip-service to cultural traditionalist values. A return to Andrea Lafferty's essay makes this point clearly:

Americans rightly have a healthy skepticism concerning political matters, particularly the Republican Party. While the majority of Americans have dismissed the liberals and their party for some time, they have elected and then reelected Republicans who promised to be different, to reduce the size of government and make Washington work. They weren't different and they joined right in with the rest of the despised political class. Donald Trump promises he will be different.

The "despised political class" is largely cosmopolitan, and it is the central thesis of this chapter that what is propelling Trump is a wave of anger and frustration directed at the political and intellectual establishment from a group of disaffected traditionalists who feel unheard, unfairly treated, left behind, and betrayed by the dysfunctional establishment<sup>1</sup>. This group believes that the system is rigged by Washington insiders, politically correct academic leftists, and by processes of globalization. They fear what is happening is a redistribution of power away from traditional places and a shift toward multicultural values and international commerce that threaten both their economic livelihood and their very identity as Americans who take pride in their values and sense of exceptionalism. These individuals seek a strong leader who speaks their plain language and can break up the current establishment and give a metaphorical black eye to the smug cosmopolitan elites who have failed to govern the country effectively. It is this message that Trump has been so successful in selling.

### **The Decline of Traditional Christian White America**

A central claim of the current proposal is that cultural traditionalists, in particular male traditionalists, are experiencing anxiety and anger about the current state of affairs, in large part because they have witnessed a loss of power and prestige. In short, the world is changing in a



more cosmopolitan way and this is exacting an emotional toll and energizing this group toward someone they believe represents real change against these forces. Since the 1960s, the United States has experienced a sea change in power and dominance, especially at the socio-cultural normative level (i.e., what is socially justifiable). Throughout the history of our nation (and Western Europe more broadly), the power structures have been dominated by heterosexual, Christian, White males and this dominance has been legitimized with explicit justification. But (thankfully from the vantage point of cosmopolitanism) the justification for the inherent superiority of this group has been chipped away, from the Civil Rights movements in the sixties to the Feminist movement in the seventies to the LGBT and secular/nonreligious movements of today. Although many see these forces as having moved our society toward justice, it nevertheless is the case that they have come with a loss of relative power and prestige for White male cultural traditionalists

It is crucial to point out that this is a real phenomenon, and many analyses have been done which reveal just how much is changing for traditional Christian White males. In terms of economic power and prospects, it has been well-documented that many working class jobs have been eliminated and replaced either with technology or via global trade agreements, which have allowed for the production of goods via the cheaper labor markets in the developing countries resulting in the elimination of many good factory jobs in the US. The 2008 recession created many additional economic pressures and uncertainties, and although the US economy has definitely picked up over the past few years, the recovery has been much weaker for lower to middle income workers. In addition, males are likely to be frustrated because of difficulty in educational achievement; Leonard Sax (2007) documents these difficulties and points out that boys are graduating from high school and college at a substantially lower rate than girls. In

addition, there is an emerging sea change with regards to Christianity as well. Robert Jones (2016) documents the political eclipse of White Christian America and how both mainline and Evangelical communities have been losing members and influence. Importantly, it is quite plausible that these forces are taking a serious toll on the mental health of White traditionalists. In a revealing analysis of mortality rates, Deaton and Case (2015) documented that there has been a remarkable increase in mortality due in middle and lower class Whites over the past several decades, stemming largely from alcohol and drug abuse and suicide.

### **The Centrality of Trump's Anti-Establishment Message**

If there is a significant segment of cultural traditionalists that are feeling left behind, it follows that they would be seeking someone who could upend that establishment and replace it with something that more directly represents their felt sense of identity, values, and interests. And this is Trump's central message, repeated over and over. The establishment is rigged, broken, and corrupt, and filled with rules and ideas that are un-American and enacted by incompetents. By the "establishment", I am using the word in two senses. First, I mean the established values of the cosmopolitan class, which can be characterized in terms of (academic) political correctness. The progressive left version of political correctness is the idea that many of society's ills stem from injustices based in hierarchies based on sex/gender, race, religion, and sexual orientation and that we must work to change those inequities. In other words, from this perspective Heterosexual Christian White men have dominated and it is now time to diversify power and privilege. As a consequence, individuals, especially those in public or leadership roles, must be particularly sensitive to issues of hierarchy and injustice, especially involving race, sexual orientation, religion, or disability. The Trump campaign has, as a central message, the idea that this kind of political correctness has gone way too far and needs to be pushed back.

The second meaning of the term “establishment” is in regards to the current political establishment regarding rules of decorum, party alignment, ideology, and the need to play along at least somewhat with the existing structures and expectations of governance. Trump, of course, frequently embraces being an outsider and has regularly promoted the claim that what is needed is someone who has business sense, rather than the knowledge (and constraints and commitments) of a Washington insider. And, true to form, he has run an extremely unconventional campaign, in terms of organization, key players, and messaging. But even more striking has been the way the candidate himself has repeatedly behaved in a blatantly anti-establishment fashion. First, he opened his campaign with the claim that many Mexicans illegally crossing the border were “rapists”. Shortly thereafter, he proceeded to mock a disabled news reporter. He then shockingly dismissed John McCain’s service in Vietnam, saying he preferred heroes who were “not captured”. And, on the heels of the attacks in San Bernardino, he famously called for banning Muslims from entering the country. From the perspective of a traditional establishment politician or from the view of a politically correct cosmopolitan, these represent dramatic departures from what is justifiable, and thus many pundits and commentators consistently predicted that these kinds of acts and proposals would get Trump dumped by the electorate. However, these actions not only did not hurt Trump with his supporters, but often strengthened his support. Why? Because they embodied the anti-establishment movement that Trump was tapping into with the cultural traditionalists. In short, what is such a striking affront to establishment cosmopolitans is precisely what Trump is selling to disaffected traditionalists.

### **Trump’s Personality and Why It Appeals to the Cultural Traditionalists**

A central theme of this chapter is that people are not, generally speaking, reflective utility maximizers but instead are largely driven by intuitive factors associated with their interests and

influence, which they then develop justifications to legitimize. From this perspective, many of Trump's actions are emotional symbols to his supporters that he can disrupt the corrupt establishment that has left them behind. Indeed, Trump's personality (and persona) can readily be viewed as a symbol that drives his base. Evidence for this is first and foremost found via examining Trump's political ideology. Political movements are typically founded on justifications about what is happening and what should be done about it that are centered on key beliefs and values that organize the group's understanding of the world. With the exception of his anti-establishment message, this simply is not the case with Trump—he is all over the ideological and political map, and clearly has no guiding philosophy. Rather, Trump essentially latches on to issues that are of concern to cultural traditionalists, such as global trade and immigration, and he then makes sweeping claims that if he is elected all will be much better than is currently the case. Indeed, his actual proposals, such as building a great wall on the Mexican border (while having Mexico pay for it), rounding up and exporting 11 million illegal immigrants, banning Muslims from entering the US, and dramatically altering the global trade arrangements, are consistently evaluated by experts to be illegal, immoral, ineffective, and completely unworkable. The point here is that the Trump phenomenon is clearly not about a rational, justifiable, analytical analysis of the issues, but rather is much better described as a cult of personality. That is, it is what Trump's personality symbolizes that drives his current base.

What, exactly, is it about his personality that is so appealing to some (while being so abhorrent to others)? His unabashed egoism and narcissism, coupled with his (apparent) business success. Trump unapologetically views the world through a performance hierarchy. In the real world (or at least what Trump says is the real world), you either get the job done or you don't. His wealth and influence is evidence that he gets things done. Why is he a winner? Because he is

better than everyone else, and his intellect, charm and grit are the reasons. Others (i.e., the bimbos and losers out there) fail because they are weak and stupid. In short, Trump is completely and unapologetically defined by egotistical rankism.

But if Trump is so clearly in the top of the economic stratosphere, why would he be appealing to disaffected, white cultural traditionalists who feel left behind? When we rally around a candidate, we connect to them, we live vicariously through them, and they represent what we desire. By identifying with someone who has enormous money, power, influence, access to beautiful women and other powerful people, individuals who are feeling threatened and who long for that sort of power can vicariously connect with the life Trump leads by supporting him. The bottom line is that many white, male cultural traditionalists are anxious about the direction the country is taking and see additional threats in a diverse world. As such, there is a yearning to “the good old days” when American White Males embraced their exceptionalism and power and did not have to be shy about being “better”. They were better because they had more power, which is exactly the kind of logic that Trump symbolizes and endorses.

In 2008 cultural cosmopolitans rallied around Obama because he represented intellect, diversity, globalization, and a complete rejection of the anti-intellectual, cowboy diplomacy of “W”. Now we have Trump, who in many ways is the Anti-Obama candidate. Trump’s campaign slogan “Make America Great Again” is clearly designed to position Obama as a weak leader who is always making concessions and apologizing for America, rather than boldly advancing our exceptionalism. It is useful to note here that one of Trump’s most significant and early moves into politics came as he latched onto challenging Obama’s birthplace and for his incessant attacks on Obama as an “other” (i.e., not a real American Man). One can argue that Trump, who was a Democrat ten years ago, becomes a Republican essentially because of "identity politics"

and the root of his success is found in that he is so strongly defined against Obama. In sum, this analysis suggests that, for many, the idea of replacing Obama with Trump would be a both a practical and symbolic vindication of white cultural traditionalists over the cosmopolitans.

### **The Values and Demographics of Trump Voters**

The analysis offered here makes a number of hypothetical “predictions” that should be present in the aggregate voting patterns if the analysis has validity. The word predictions is in scare quotes because voting data are in large part the phenomenon that one is trying to explain (i.e., the success of Trump in the polls). Thus, I do not mean prediction here in the strong sense of the word of blindly predicting some unknown future event, but rather in the weaker sense of patterned matching. That is, there should be a coherent pattern matching the demographics and values of the aggregate of Trump voters to the analyses that have been laid out here. Specifically, the analysis predicts Trump voters should be: 1) heavily skewed in the direction of white relative to nonwhite; 2) heavily skewed toward males relative to females; 3) they should live in southern, central and rural areas (relative to coastal and urban areas); 4) they should be older; and 5) have somewhat less education and lower socio-economic status when compared with Clinton supporters (and controlling for relevant variables like ethnicity). In terms of values, Trump supporters should be: 1) More oriented toward authority and authoritarianism rather than an informed analytical analysis of the issues; 2) be more closed-minded and defensive than open minded; 3) be extremely frustrated with the direction of the country; 4) have extremely high disapproval ratings of Obama; 5) have extremely high disapproval ratings of Congress and the direction of the country in general; and 6) feel that they do not have a voice.

At the time of this writing (just prior to the conventions), analyses of voter behavior largely (but not completely) support these claims. For example, a March 2016 analysis found that Trump voters (compared to those supporting the other Republican candidates) exhibited four key

characteristics, including (1) being less likely to go to college; 2) being more likely to be authoritarian; 3) being less likely to feel like they have a voice; and 4) being more likely to live in a region that has higher racial tensions. A July 2016 Pew Research poll (<http://www.people-press.org/2016/07/07/2-voter-general-election-preferences/>) found a large disparity regarding race, with Whites supporting Trump overall (51% to 42%), whereas Hispanic and African Americans showed dominant preferences for Clinton (66% to 24% and 91 to 7%, respectively). Among Whites with a college education, a majority supported Clinton (52% to 40%), whereas among Whites without a college education, Trump received a clear majority (57% to 36%). In addition, there was a very large gender difference, with women supporting Clinton by a very large margin (59% to 35%) and men showing a preference for Trump (49% to 43%). Finally, there was a clear trend for younger voters to support Clinton (60% to 30%), whereas the oldest voters support Trump (49 to 46%).

It is important to note that not all analyses of voter patterns have been completely consistent with the above predictions. For example, the political polling site FiveThirtyEight has offered data showing that the typical Trump supporter has higher levels of income and slightly higher levels of education than the average voter (Silver, 2016). In the end, detailed analyses will need to be conducted after the election to determine exactly who voted for Trump and what their demographic and values tended to look like to determine the full validity of this analysis.

### **Conclusion: Trump is an Establishment Disruptor for the Disaffected**

This chapter has used a unified approach to human investment, social influence, and justification systems to develop a framework for understanding the rise of Donald Trump. The central thesis offered is that there has emerged a divide in American identity and character between cultural cosmopolitans and traditionalists, and the argument has been advanced that

traditionalists are feeling particularly resentful and left behind by the current political and intellectual establishment and they view Trump as a disruptive force that can return their sense of identity and value to the place it once rightfully held in American society. We have explored the characteristics of cultural cosmopolitans and traditionalists, explained why traditionalists are feeling resentful and unheard, and why Trump's outsider status, anti-establishment message, and narcissistic persona has much symbolic value for these voters.

Additionally, central to this analysis is that there is no deep organizing intellectual argument that spells out how a Trump presidency would actually unfold. What we are seeing is the product of the desire of a disaffected group to disrupt what they perceived to be a dysfunctional system; but the narrative of how to effectively reconstruct and reconstitute a more effective political system has been completely absent. In fact, the argument can be made strongly that Trump lacks an intellectual understanding of the issues and lacks the value of intellectual integrity. Thus, a grave fear arises from the current analysis, one that parallels what clinicians often see in the clinic room. That is, feeling unheard, disrespected and frustrated at the current situation, a group of individuals are engaging in an impulsive and destructive act born out of anger and frustration, rather than a rational analysis of the problem and reasonable solutions. Individuals who do this in their lives end up in treatment because the enacted "solution" fails and ends up bringing far more damaging consequences to them and others around them. Let us hope the same will not be the case for the United States of America.



## Endnote

1. Although not the focus of this chapter, it is central to acknowledge that the current political system is largely polarized and readily characterized as dysfunctional. One does not need to be a traditionalist to have this view. Bernie Sanders' remarkable campaign received much of its fuel from this claim and was very "anti-establishment" in that sense. And this is a view that both Trump and Sanders supporters share.

## References

- Case, A. & Deaton, A. (2015). Rising morbidity and mortality in midlife among white non-Hispanic Americans in the 21st century. *Proceedings from the National Academy of Sciences*, 112, 15078–15083. Doi [www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.1518393112](http://www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.1518393112)
- Henriques, G. R. (2011). *A new unified theory of psychology*. Springer, New York.
- Jones, R. (2016). The eclipse of White Christian America. *The Atlantic*.  
<http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2016/07/the-eclipse-of-white-christian-america/490724/>
- Lafferty, A. (2016, June). I am an Evangelical woman and I support Donald Trump. *Fox News*.  
<http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2016/06/30/im-evangelical-woman-and-support-donald-trump.html>
- Sax, L. (2007). *Boys Adrift: The Five Factors Driving the Growing Epidemic of Unmotivated Boys and Underachieving Young Men*. Basic Books, New York.
- Silver, N. (2016, May). The mythology of Trumps working class support. *FiveThirtyEight*.  
[http://fivethirtyeight.com/features/the-mythology-of-trumps-working-class-support/?ex\\_cid=story-twitter](http://fivethirtyeight.com/features/the-mythology-of-trumps-working-class-support/?ex_cid=story-twitter)
- Taleb, N. (2010). *The Black Swan: The impact of the highly improbable, Second Edition*. Random House, New York.
- Thompson, D. (2016, March). Who are Donald Trump supporters? *The Atlantic*.  
<http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2016/03/who-are-donald-trumps-supporters-really/471714/>
- Trende, S. (2016, January). Why Trump? Why now? *Realclearpolitics*.  
[http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2016/01/29/why\\_trump\\_why\\_now\\_129486.htm](http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2016/01/29/why_trump_why_now_129486.htm)