It was December 12, 2015. I was nearing the end of a two-week stay with Alma Hasse and Jim Plucinski, two small business owners who live on a farm near Parma, Idaho. For the last five years, Alma had been working to stop natural gas development in Idaho. It was a new industry for the state. Jim had begun investing all of his time, outside of running their business, to challenge natural gas development after Alma spent seven days in jail when she spoke out of turn at a county planning and zoning meeting related to oil and gas in October 2014. The theme we were discussing was: How might we understand the oil and gas industry’s practices and what can we do about them? Jim had a simple answer. The oil and gas industry, he explained, is like a dog-walking business that doesn’t want to pick up after the dogs:

One analogy would be, you know, somebody that’s got a dog-walking business. And they have maybe fifteen employees and each one of ’em’s got certain dogs they walk every single day, but the problem they’re having is lack of productivity from them having to stop every so often and pick up a dog’s mess.

Well, most rational businesspeople will, number one, realize that that [the time spent picking up the mess] is just part of the job and it’s a good thing to do to clean up after yourself or your employees’ dogs. But unfortunately, today’s business climate, especially with large corporations, is that they don’t think about it that way. They think about, “How can we get rid of this?” And it’s usually through legislation, [..] lobbying everybody in the state or federal government to say, “You know what? [..] We’re really hurting the community by not having more jobs. We can have more people if we
don’t have to pick up dog poop, because we will make more money, we could hire more people, we could even pay them more”—not that they are going to do that, but it sounds good. “So, we would like to implement a law that we don’t have to pick up that poop anymore. You know, we could actually probably even get a couple more dogs in a day if we don’t have to pick up the poop on the walk, we can make more money.” But that’s behind the scenes.

That’s what they do, they create laws to do things that other people are not allowed to do, or conscientiously would not do, and make it legal. And then when they walk that dog and the dog does his thing right on the neighbor’s lawn [. . .] and the neighbor says, “Aren’t you going to pick that up?” they go, “No ma’am, we’re following the laws. We don’t have to pick that up; we’re doing everything regulated; we’re doing everything by the books; we’re following the laws.” And they walk off with a smile. [. . .] Guess who’s going to pay to pick up that poop? It’s going to be everybody else that lives in that neighborhood. [. . .] They’re taking time away from their family, and you know, utilizing their resources to do so.

“To deal with somebody else’s shit! That is a perfect analogy!” Alma broke in laughing. Jim went on: “Exactly. [. . .] It’s not about oil and gas, people have to realize that oil and gas is just a symptom of the problem. There are many, many different business entities and types that are doing the exact same thing.”

Jim then moved on to talk about how to confront this problem and his assessment of how people working on resistance could be more effective:

You have to look at it as a tree. Everybody is working on different branches and the bottom line is, I mean—can you tell me if you cut a branch off a tree, will that tree die? [pause] What’s it going to do? It’s going to put up another branch. [. . .] So the big thing is, is that everybody, as far as people that are activists, [. . .] everybody is working on a branch and not on the roots. [. . .] People need to start realizing what their true enemy is, and that’s the collusion between unethical business and corrupt government. [. . .] They are so busy keeping us separated between a right thing [on the political spectrum], and a left thing.

Jim’s dog-walking analogy illustrates a common sentiment among people resisting fossil fuels: oil and gas development is an affront to core values of integrity, accountability, fairness, and the health and well-being of families and communities. In the minds of Jim and other people I interviewed throughout the course of my research, the oil and gas industry walks all over people, uses legal and political systems to protect itself, and leaves communities to pick up the messes it produces. These messes are toxic environments and an inhospitable climate; sick
people; degraded social ties; and losses of homes, livelihoods, and public resources. For Jim, the collusion and corruption of the oil and gas industry represented a lack of care and respect, a lack of integrity and accountability that he, as a business owner, saw as common decency. He and Alma did not just believe in these values. They also acted on them, treating the people around them, their employees, customers, family, and activists, with care, respect, and generosity.2

Different people have different terms for these values, but at bottom, they revolve around issues of fairness, right and wrong, relationships, and justice. From 2014 to 2016, I set out to understand how people resisting fossil fuels in two very different settings—Idaho and California—understood and used their core values to work together.

At the dawn of the 2020s, it seems harder than ever to work together. In the United States, politics and ideas for addressing environmental problems and climate crisis are highly polarized. On one side are people benefiting from the current system—capitalism—who hope to continue fossil fuel extraction and enjoy its profits. On the other side are those who do not benefit from existing systems: communities on the frontlines of environmental and climate injustice. The lessons from this book, on how to work together across dividing lines within communities—how to identify shared values, acknowledge and value difference, and grow—are more critical than ever.3

Despite the social nature of our failure to address climate crisis—we have not figured out how to enact laws, policies, and behavior change on a large enough scale to stop greenhouse gas emissions—most research and policymaking on energy and climate change focuses on technology and physical science (Dunlap and Brulle 2015; Sovacool 2014). Understanding the social dynamics—what people do with the science and technology, and the justice elements, the inequality built into energy systems and the climate crisis—is vital (Caniglia, Brulle, and Szasz 2015; Harlan et al. 2015).

As scholars of climate justice maintain, building a broad-based social movement that centers the voices of people on the frontlines of environmental and climate hazards is critical for building political will to make our social, economic, and cultural systems less carbon intensive and, simultaneously, more socially just. Surprisingly, researchers have devoted relatively little attention to understanding how social movement coalitions work (Van Dyke and McCammon 2010). Most research that does address coalitions tends to focus on organizations, cause and effect, and single variables, such as how a threat or opportunity shaped
a coalition (see Van Dyke and McCammon 2010). This book provides a more holistic analysis of how culture interacts with many factors that shape movements (identity, political context, threats, and resources) to inform how activists—as individuals and within organizations—practice coalition building. I think of culture as the “lived experience” (Williams 1960) of activism and am interested in identifying best practices for coalition building that can aid in larger scale “movement building” efforts (Juris et al. 2014).

What we do know is that a lack of collective identity—a sense of shared understanding and vision, a sense of togetherness (see Melucci 1989; Taylor and Whittier 1992)—can be a barrier to movement building. In her research on resistance to mountaintop-removal coal mining, Bell (2016) finds that local Appalachians’ inability to identify with the environmental justice movement keeps them from participating in the movement. This is a problem for a movement that focuses on meaningful involvement of those most affected by environmental hazards. While Bell asks why people do not participate, my research asks how people do participate. How do they work to create inclusive collective identities?

Drawing from the experience and insights of diverse activists—Nez Perce tribal members in Idaho, a Chumash family in Santa Barbara, college students, elderly people, women, men, people with children, working people, unemployed people, wealthy people, poor people, people with disabilities, people of color, mixed-race people, and white people—this book is a study of how people work together by appealing to common values.

Chapters 3 through 8 of the book explore my interview- and fieldwork-based data. These chapters flow from in-depth analyses of practices and perspectives of particular groups of interviewees to comparative analyses that interweave stories of campaigns and perspectives across Idaho- and California-based groups and research sites. They reveal that resistance to extreme energy extraction is characterized by working across lines, a phrase I use to refer to activists’ efforts to organize people across lines of difference, whether these be lines based on political views, race, ethnicity, indigeneity, age, area of interest, strategic and tactical preferences, or type of organization (i.e., staffed nonprofits that I call “grasstops” groups versus grassroots groups). I identify four major components to working across lines as a method of resistance to extreme energy extraction:
• focusing on core values, which include community, justice, integrity, accountability, and the health of people and the more-than-human world
• identifying the roots of injustice, whether described as capitalism or lack of integrity and accountability of government and industry
• cultivating relationships, which some interviewees refer to as *relational organizing*
• welcoming difference

Through prioritizing perspectives and action to realize these elements of organizing, activists and groups across my research sites build capacity to construct unlikely alliances and coalitions to challenge the fossil fuel industry; they work across lines for a just and sustainable future. When activists agree on core values, illuminate how unjust conditions put these in jeopardy, and draw on relationships of trust to welcome and support diverse participants and tactics, they are better equipped to create a truly inclusive collective identity. Building an inclusive collective identity through working across lines has potential to grow a broad-based social movement, one that could be society’s best hope for achieving climate justice.

**GUIDING IDEAS: USEFUL FRAMEWORKS FOR WORKING TOGETHER**

Environmental justice, climate justice, intersectionality, and ecofeminism are four frameworks for organizing around environmental and social justice issues that can contribute to building broad-based collective identities. These frameworks are evident in the best examples of working across lines from this research and can enhance capacity for working across lines. In addition to these frameworks, this section unpacks movement building, collective identity, and coalition building, three key processes and goals of the social movements that I analyze in this book.

Environmental justice emphasizes “meaningful involvement of all people” in all phases of policy creation and implementation (US EPA 2017). If people are meaningfully involved in decisions about social movements, they will be more likely to feel a sense of ownership of the
movement, that their personal identities align with what the movement stands for.

Climate justice applies the necessity for meaningful involvement to the context of climate change, highlighting how those who are least responsible for the climate crisis are most affected. It seeks to address climate crisis through advancing social justice. I see the movements and activism that I explore in this book as contributing to climate justice, as part of the climate justice movement. The focus on climate crisis and social justice as global phenomena opens the possibility for people around the world to feel connected to this movement.

Intersectionality is the idea that the different social identities individuals hold come together to shape their experiences of oppression and privilege (Crenshaw 1989). Highlighting the intersectional identities of movement participants can help everyone feel welcome, as when, for example, the climate organization 350.org made a public statement of solidarity with the LGBTQIA+ community following the 2016 mass shooting in Orlando, Florida (350.org Staff 2016). Highlighting the intersectionality of movement issues—that is, how gender justice, anti-racism, and environmental justice all overlap—can help more people see how the social issues they care about are connected to the environment.

Understanding that the same systems that oppress the environment also oppress marginalized communities of people—a core insight of ecofeminism—can further contribute to people’s capacity to recognize how environmental issues relate to their personal lives. The same logic that elevates culture over nature also elevates men over women, leading to social arrangements where women experience environmental hazards first and worst and, therefore, rise up to propose solutions. This is one reason why women tend to be the majority of activists in environmental movements, particularly at the grassroots level (Bell and Braun 2010; Seager 1996; Stein 2004), a trend that holds in my research.

Though many interviewees had not thought much about how gender informed their organizing, their emphasis on collaboration, care, and community illustrates that feminine perspectives, values, and practices, shaped in particular ways by activists’ lived experiences, are important pillars of their activism. These ecofeminist values shape how the grassroots movements that I study understand the problems they face, the solutions they would like to see, and how they try to put these solutions into practice. Gender, then, is a structure of inequality, an individual identity, and a force in social interactions that shapes values and ways
of relating to other people that are central to how the climate justice movement works within my research cases.

Building strong, broad-based social movements is one method for achieving environmental and climate justice for everyone. Activists and scholars use the term *movement building* to describe the work movements do to inspire people to get involved, feel like they are part of a movement, and collaborate. Movement building includes creating organizations, relationships, networks, skills, identities, frames, and strategies—all the things that are required for sustained mobilization (Juris et al. 2014:329). Movement building is an outcome, just as legal victories or policy changes can be outcomes, of social movements. In other words, social movements can have goals related to movement building, and therefore, may succeed in movement building alongside successes, or failures, in policy or legal change. Movement building is about ensuring everyone has a seat at movement tables to envision, together, a different world.

The movement building that climate justice activists prioritize, and how people actually do movement building, has received less attention than other topics in social movement studies, especially at the grassroots level and in comparative contexts (Blee 2012; Juris et al. 2014). My research enhances understanding of two components of movement building—collective identity and coalition building.

As activists’ shared understandings of the context in which they organize and their plans of action, collective identity shapes how “actors ‘organize’ their behavior, produce meanings and actively establish relationships” (Melucci 1989:36). This conceptualization by Alberto Melucci resonates most closely with my research because of its focus on relationships and because of its understanding of collective identity as a constantly changing process, rather than a static definition. In her analysis of feminist mobilizations in Spain, María Martínez (2018) likewise argues that collective identity is best understood as a complex and unfinished process, grounded in emotions and relationships that people activate and transform repeatedly over time.

Collective identity is particularly important for the environmental and climate justice movements. Shannon Bell (2016) demonstrates that what people perceive as the collective identity of the environmental justice movement has actually deterred people on the front lines of mountaintop-removal coal mining (who, for example, suffer health effects related to coal mining) from participating in environmental justice organizations. They do not identify with those who identify themselves
as environmental justice activists. This is troubling for the environmental and climate justice movements because a central tenet of both is that their efforts should be led by the people most affected by climate change or environmental degradation. This is because, in line with ecofeminism, the people experiencing the highest levels of oppression have insights that are critical to designing paths toward justice. In Crenshaw’s words, the goal of movements for justice “should be to facilitate the inclusion of marginalized groups for whom it can be said: ‘When they enter, we all enter’” (1989:167). Understanding ways to create collective identities that resonate with broad bases of people, especially those on the front lines of climate change and energy extraction, is critical to achieving the climate justice movement’s goal of building a movement of everyone to change everything.

A second core component of movement building, something upon which a broad-based movement depends, is coalition building. Coalition building is the formation of relationships among people and across organizations. These relationships facilitate people’s capacity to draw on material and social resources. They also broaden the scope of issues, perspectives, strategies, and tactics that inform social movements’ actions. Appealing to diverse identities and recognizing difference as a strength are key to successful coalitions (Bystydzienski and Schacht 2001; Lipsitz 2006). Previous books on coalitions examine how social networks, ideology, and social and political contexts inform coalition emergence (Van Dyke and McCammon 2010); focus on how particular groups build relationships (see Davis 2010; Grossman 2017 on Native–non-Native alliances); or present edited collections of wide-ranging movements and contexts (e.g. Bystydzienski and Schacht 2001; Van Dyke and McCammon 2010). This book complements these efforts by enhancing understanding of the characteristics of effective coalitions, across diverse cases, groups of people, and organizations that are all connected by their common resistance to extreme energy extraction. Rather than asking why coalitions emerge, I explore how they work well, or do not, arguing that effective coalitions are intentionally constructed through the learning, labor, and creativity of activists.

In the tradition of scholarship and community organizing on climate and environmental justice, ecofeminism, and movement building, this book shares knowledge about how people work together to imagine and realize a feminist future and a livable climate. Through attention to each of these concepts, activists can enhance capacity for working across lines and scholars can illuminate processes that contribute to
social movements’ potential for building inclusive collective identities and coalitions. My hope is that, together, we can build feminist climate justice, a fossil-free and non-capitalist society that does not accept exploitation, where communities, rather than corporations, determine their futures, and where decisions are guided by what the most marginalized communities deem to be in the interest of peace and justice.

**METHODOLOGY: POSITIONALITY, ACCOUNTABILITY, AND RECIPROCITY**

My interest in working together and resisting fossil fuels is political and scholarly. As a person coming of age during this period, I am concerned about the future. I want to lend my labor to climate justice.

My positionality as a young white woman who spent my formative years in Idaho and California facilitated this research. For example, Alma and her girlfriends (who also resisted natural gas) invited me to their weekend coffee dates where the “girls” would get together to talk about their week. These conversations were mostly about oil and gas. Being in my mid-twenties and a graduate student facilitated my role as a learner. Interviewees, most of whom were significantly older than me, were generally very willing to share their stories. Finally, my own connection to place played an important role in my interactions with research participants. I strongly identify as someone from Idaho. I lived in Idaho from age seven to twenty-one. My connection to Idaho was one reason I wanted to do research there. I wanted to be informed about what was happening and build connections with people trying to preserve a way of life that I hold dear. This connection also facilitated my research, both in terms of previous contacts I had and by making me a kind of insider. Though I was coming from California, I was not “one of those Californians” that longtime Idaho residents see as trying to change Idaho. I also look like I am from Idaho, a state with very few people of color. As Bell (2016) has shown, being perceived as an outsider because of where you are from, or because of your opposition to industry and local elites, can be damaging for social relationships. Many of my interviewees played up their “local” or insider status, frequently referencing how long they had lived in Idaho, confirming that “outsider stigma” is real and something to be avoided.

On the other hand, being a California resident, who had built up relationships in the community over years by participating as a core member of the climate justice group 350 Santa Barbara, facilitated my
insider status in Santa Barbara County, the site of my research. In this setting, I was not just a graduate student passing through, but someone who had worked alongside grassroots activists for years. They trusted me to tell “our” story. Nonprofit staff also trusted me. They had seen me at local events, county hearings about energy, and knew that I had been involved with Measure P—a countywide effort to ban hydraulic fracturing—from the beginning.

Throughout the research, I identified myself as a scholar activist and strove to practice feminist accountability and reciprocity (see Bhavnani 1993; Haraway 1988; Pulido 1996). I worked to make my writing accessible and useful to activists, asked for interviewee feedback on my writing, and helped out in movement spaces by taking meeting minutes, paying for meals, carrying children, and cleaning. I also practiced accountability by offering interviewees the option of using their real names. Using real names is important because it gives people credit for their ideas and can facilitate movement building by giving readers the ability to learn more about interviewees’ work and to perhaps even link up with them and their organizations. Finally, feminist scholar activism means that I hope this research will facilitate social movements, public discussion, and scholarly capacity to envision and build a just and sustainable world that centers the experiences and expertise of communities most marginalized by the status quo.

The data in this book come from ethnographic fieldwork and 106 in-depth interviews. My ethnographic fieldwork consisted of a total of three months conducting research in Idaho in 2015 (spread throughout February, March, July, October, November, and December) and my participation and participant observation in climate justice organizing in Santa Barbara, California, from September 2013 to September 2016. The interviews were styled as “conversations with a purpose” (Burgess 1984), semi-structured interviews that recognize the importance of establishing relationships of trust and confidence with interviewees. I conducted sixty-two interviews in Idaho during the months I conducted fieldwork in 2015. In Santa Barbara, I conducted a total of forty-four interviews from May 2015 through September 2016. Twenty-nine of these interviews were with youth activists. Interviewees’ ages ranged from nineteen to seventy-eight years old. They identified as white, Native American, Latina/o, African American, Black, Filipino, Sinhalese Sri Lankan, and as mixed race and biracial. They held positions in different types of organizations. Sixty-two percent of all interviewees were women, reflecting their overwhelming participation and leadership
in the organizations I engaged with. Interviews averaged seventy-two minutes in length and explored themes including interviewees’ work as activists, their perspectives on diversity and inclusivity in their groups, and their hopes for the future.

**Research Context**

My research is set within a contradiction. In the late 2010s, climate science demanded we keep fossil fuels in the ground while US politics continued to support the extraction of the dirtiest fossil fuels. Global and national concern about the climate crisis resonated with the science. In 2016, the Paris Agreement went into effect, spurring the global community toward coordinated efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. That year, 64 percent of Americans worried a fair amount or great deal about global warming, the highest percentage since 2008 (Saad and Jones 2016). In 2018, 70 percent of Americans believed global warming was happening, with 85 percent in support of funding renewable energy research (Marlon et al. 2018). During this same period, the United States ignored these trends, becoming the world’s leading producer of oil and gas and ramping up its use of extreme extraction techniques. These include fracking, which uses many more resources and produces more greenhouse gas emissions than conventional drilling methods (US Energy Information Administration 2016b; 2016c; 2016d). Concerned communities rose up in resistance across the country, not only against extraction, but also against the transportation of extreme energy like the Canadian tar sands.

Amid this broader context, this research is grounded in California and Idaho, two places with different political, energy, and social contexts. In California—historically the most important and progressive state for environmental and climate justice—my research centers on Santa Barbara County, the site of the world’s first offshore oil drilling in 1896, the United States’ first major oil spill in 1969, and the birth of the modern American environmental movement. In 2014, amid a historic drought, California’s warmest year ever at the time, and proposed oil expansion, grassroots climate activists in the group 350 Santa Barbara formed a coalition that attempted to ban extreme energy extraction in the county with a ballot measure, Measure P. The effort relied upon substantial organizing by youth activists at Santa Barbara’s college and university. Over six million dollars in oil industry opposition inundated the community, sharpening already existing divisions among
residents, especially political and racial divides. Despite the measure’s failure on election day, the struggle remains the largest county-level electoral mobilization (in terms of volunteers and money) to ban fracking in California history.

Idaho is a more politically conservative state, with no oil or gas extraction until 2009. While often ignored, decisions in Idaho and similar states in the center of the country impact the majority of US land and, when combined, shape federal policy. My research in Idaho is based in three regions: southwest, central, and northern Idaho. Southwest Idaho is the site of the state’s nascent natural gas industry. In this region of rural farms surrounding Idaho’s capital and largest city, residents formed the group Citizens Allied for Integrity and Accountability (CAIA) in 2015, which is engaged in an ongoing struggle to protect property rights. Representatives of Idaho’s small number of statewide environmental nonprofit groups, after attempting to strengthen Idaho’s natural gas regulatory structure, mostly stand on the sidelines, unsure of how to widen their mission statements to include concerns of property-rights activists who do not consider themselves to be environmentalists. In the other two regions included in my research, central and northern Idaho, from 2011 to 2014, a grassroots coalition of individuals and organizations protested two-hundred-foot-long megaloads (trucks with trailers) of tar sands infrastructure on rural highways and in small towns before successfully barring the loads in a legal suit that concluded in 2017.

In both states, activists were in conversation across campaigns and across geographies, with many participating in regional, state-wide, national, and global social movement communities. My analysis elucidates the character of resistance to extreme energy extraction in these two different states to highlight commonalities across diverse contexts and to show how the particularities of these contexts inform how people attempt and fail to work together.

Organization of the Book

Chapter 1 lays the foundation for the remainder of the book by detailing the politics of climate change, extreme energy extraction, and the climate justice movement. I juxtapose the crisis of climate change and the need to keep fossil fuels in the ground with the continued pursuit of fossil fuel energy, particularly in the United States. In this context, the extraction, transportation, and processing of extreme forms of energy, such as tar sands and hydraulically fractured oil and gas, have taken off,
exacting tremendous environmental and human costs. I present climate justice and the climate justice movement as one way to confront this situation, providing the reader with background on the movement and its goals.

Chapter 2 provides the reader with further information on the two research contexts of Idaho and California and the specific towns where interviewees and their campaigns are based. I provide a concise overview of how the two states have managed fossil fuels and the key actors and campaigns that are the focus of the book.

Tracing interviewees’ journeys into activism, chapter 3 provides an in-depth account of how rural southwestern Idahoans built an unlikely alliance to resist natural gas development. The group they formed, called Citizens Allied for Integrity and Accountability (CAIA), has had board members who were former leaders of the local Tea Party group, people who consider themselves Democrats, climate change skeptics, and people who are very concerned about climate change. I argue that this unlikely trans-partisan alliance is created and maintained by the practice of talking across lines. Rather than rally around what have become divisive political issues, such as climate change, CAIA focuses on issues of private property, public infrastructure, and, as its name suggests, government and corporate accountability and integrity. The activism journeys I share in this chapter help readers understand activists’ lived experiences and values, the social setting in their communities, and why activists have needed to develop the tactic of talking across lines.

Chapter 4 analyzes how people succeed and fail in their efforts to talk across political lines in the context of the fight against natural gas in Idaho. Talking across lines depends on building relationships of trust through a dedication to shared values—in mission statement, messaging, and engagement—within and beyond the group. It also requires acknowledgment of differences in perspective by complicating labels related to political party, climate change beliefs, activism and Not In My Back Yard (NIMBY) environmentalism, and assumptions about how and whether these labels inform a person’s willingness to resist natural gas. Ultimately, talking across lines requires that activists agree to disagree on certain issues in the interest of working together to advance shared goals, a complicated way of navigating difference that is heavily reliant on trust.

Chapter 5 focuses on Santa Barbara, California, to explore the values and practices of youth climate justice activists. These youth, primarily organizing in the context of groups and campaigns embedded in college
and university environments, are developing progressive values and practices that create a particular culture of organizing. I call this culture a climate justice culture of creation because it is a political culture focused not only on resistance, but also on creation (see Foran 2014). It prefigures the world that youth want to see in the present—in their groups, interpersonal interactions, and experiences. The core values of this culture are accessibility, intersectionality, relationships, and community. Youth strive to make organizing accessible and enjoyable to all. They teach each other how social and environmental inequalities intersect to inform people’s lived experiences and different passions. Prioritizing relationships as the basis of understanding and supporting each other, they envision healthy communities as those where people are politically engaged and willing to build relationships with people who do not share their views. Specific practices, including horizontal leadership structures, anti-oppression trainings, and work to diversify members and leaders all embody these values. I see youth’s climate justice culture of creation as a powerful movement-building tool for working across lines.

In chapter 6, I transition to comparative analysis of my cases across campaigns, locations, and activist groups. The chapter explores the tensions and possibilities for building coalitions between grassroots and staffed nonprofit organizations—what I call grasstops organizations. I find that grasstops’ commitment to pragmatism challenges activists’ efforts to build coalitions between these elements of the movement. This pragmatism in rooted in grasstops’ organizational form, particularly nonprofits’ responsibilities to fulfill mission statements and secure funding, as well as strategic, tactical, and motivational divergences. To bridge these divides, activists stress the importance of welcoming new ideas, giving attribution, and centering, rather than marginalizing, demands for radical systems-changing actions.

Chapter 7 explores two resistance efforts—the Measure P effort to ban fracking in Santa Barbara County, and the mobilization to stop the transportation of tar sands processing equipment on giant trucks or “megaloads” on Idaho highways. I narrate each story of struggle, providing a synthesis of interviewee perspectives and lessons learned. I discuss the diversity of concerns and tactics that made the megaload struggle successful and the strengths and weaknesses that characterized the impressive and yet ultimately unsuccessful Measure P electoral campaign.

Chapter 8 employs comparative analysis to present the factors that facilitated and inhibited working across lines in the Measure P and