

THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION
FALK AUDITORIUM

2013 AMERICAN VALUES SURVEY: LIBERTARIANISM IN THE 21ST CENTURY

Washington, D.C.

Tuesday, October 29, 2013

PARTICIPANTS:

Moderator:

E.J. DIONNE, JR.
Senior Fellow
The Brookings Institution

Presentation of Survey Results:

ROBERT P. JONES
Chief Executive Officer
Public Religion Research Institute

Panelists:

WILLIAM A. GALSTON
Ezra K. Zilkha Chair and Senior Fellow
The Brookings Institution

KARLYN BOWMAN
Senior Fellow
American Enterprise Institute

BRINK LINDSEY
Vice President for Research
Cato Institute

HENRY OLSEN
Senior Fellow
Ethics & Public Policy Center

* * * * *

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. DIONNE: I want to welcome everyone here today, for what I think is a very exciting event. I'm E.J. Dionne. I'm here at Brookings, and, on behalf of the Religion Policy and Politics Project at Brookings, I want to welcome you all.

It has been our pleasure now, for some years, to work closely with Robbie Jones, Dan Cox, and Juhem Navarro-Rivera at the Public Religion Research Institute. This is the third American values survey in which we have, in one way or another, worked together, and we hope for many more years of collaboration.

This is actually a logical follow up to work we started back in 2010, where we did a survey on the relationship between the Tea Party and the religious conservative movement. We actually did two surveys that year -- one before and one after the 2010 election, where we re-interviewed our respondents.

And one of our major findings was the extraordinary overlap between the Tea Party and the religious conservative movement, which, at the time, wasn't widely discussed. It was felt more that the Tea Party might be more of a Libertarian movement.

But that left out the Libertarians themselves, and so we decided that it would be a great focus this year, because there is wide popular interest these days in Libertarianism, and, also, it's another piece of this coalition.

Robbie will present the findings of the survey, and then we will hear from my colleague, Bill Galston, and, really, three extraordinary respondents -- Karlyn Bowman, Brink Lindsey, and Henry Olsen.

Now it is said that there's a lot of disputation going on on the conservative side of politics. Here at Brookings, we like to bring people together. And so I'm very proud that we have brought more conservative think tanks together in Washington than you usually see in Washington.

We have with us today representation from the American Enterprise Institute, from the Cato Institute, and from the Ethics and Public Policy Center. And so we are very grateful that we're here.

We'll have a conversation up on the stage, and then we will bring you all into the discussion. Very quickly thereafter, copies of the survey -- I hope you've mentioned to get one. I think Robbie -- and this is a very cool cover that Robbie's folks put together.

First, I'll introduce Robbie, who will do his usual brilliant PowerPoint. I've gotten addicted to Robbie's PowerPoints during our collaboration. And then I'll introduce our panelists briefly. You have longer bios of them. There were some out on the table.

Robbie Jones is the CEO of PRRI. He's a leading scholar and commentator on religion, values, and public life. He is the author of two important books, numerous peer-reviewed articles on religion and public policy. He writes a weekly "Figuring Faith" column at *the Washington Post's* "On Faith" section, so we're double colleagues.

He holds a PhD in religion from Emory University, and a masters of divinity from Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary.

And so here for a mathematically rigorous, theological talk, I give you Robbie Jones.

MR. JONES: Great. Well, first, I want to thank Brookings Institution, particularly E.J. Dionne and Bill Galston, for what has now been a multiyear, fruitful, ongoing research relationship, and for their gracious hosting of this release event today.

And I also want to thank Henry, and Brink, and Bill, who will also be commenting here, and Karlyn Bowman, as well, who you will hear from shortly.

But my job is to give you the 30,000-foot flyover of the data. You have in front of you reports that kind of lay this out a little more in-depth, but I will hit the highlights and, hopefully, set the table pretty well.

I think E.J. has given us pretty much the rationale for why we did the survey. Now I'm going to tell you just a little bit about what you're looking at.

So, it was a survey designed and conducted by PRRI. It was a survey of 2,317 American adults, conducted online in English and Spanish. The margin of error is plus or minus 2.5 percentage points for the total sample. And I'd be remiss without saying a great thank you to the Ford Foundation and to the Nathan Cummings Foundation, who made this survey and this partnership possible.

So, where are we? In search of Libertarians -- how did we measure Libertarians? If you want to go in-depth on the scale -- and I can say more about it for any of you data heads out there who are interested in how we constructed this thing -- we basically built it from a set of nine questions across three subject areas. It's on page seven of the report, if you want to kind of delve into the exact question wording and exactly how the questions were scored.

But, basically, a set of questions around national security, and international intervention, economic policy, and personal liberty, and social issues -- and answers were scored consistently on one end of the scale for consistent Libertarian answers, and answers that were on the other end of the scale -- they were scored low. Answers on the other end of the scale were scored high. And then we constructed a composite scale to map, basically, Libertarians in America. This is how it turns out.

It turns out that, using these nine questions, you get a fairly normal distribution in the country. You can see a very symmetrical divide here. Seven percent of the country is what we call consistent Libertarians, that had more or less consistent answers across all nine of those questions on the Libertarian end of the scale.

On the other end of the scale -- I'm going to introduce a term that we basically made up, right? So, a "communalist" is the term that we put on the other end of the scale. We're going to say not a lot about them right now, but we can come back to them. But, basically, just so you

know, it's on the other end.

So, if Libertarians on this side of the scale, you know, favor low government intervention and high personal liberty, the communalists on the other end of the scale are basically the opposite; they're people who favor, you know, high government intervention for certain programs, even if it is at the cost of some personal liberties. So, those are the kind of two ends of the scales.

So, we have seven percent who are what we call consistent Libertarians; another 15 percent who kind of lean Libertarian. They're softer on these measures; lean Libertarian. A majority of the country is somewhere in the middle on this scale. And then very symmetrical numbers on the other end are what we might call communalists.

Just to give you a sense of how these break out in terms of party here, on political affiliation -- and I'm sorry about this -- the first one here is the Tea Party; the second one's Republican; the third one's Democrat. I'm not sure what happened to my labels here.

So, the first one is a Tea Party. You can see certainly higher rates of Libertarian. The middle one is Republicans -- again, apologies about the labels missing there. But 26 percent of the Tea Party are Libertarian, by our scale. Another 30 percent lean Libertarian. You can see Republicans are considerably lower -- only 12 percent are Libertarian, by the scale. A quarter lean Libertarian.

And this is Democrats over here, on the third one. You can

see only one percent Libertarian, with another eight percent leaning Libertarian.

One of the striking things, if you look at the second and the third scales here -- again, the second one is Republicans; the third one is Democrats -- is how sort of symmetrical they look, right? So, if you look at Democrats, 13 percent communalists, while Republicans are 12 percent Libertarian. And you can sort of see they're a mirror image of each other, basically, across this scale.

So, if we look inside of the group of Libertarians, what do they look like? Well, first of all, they're overwhelming white -- so white and non-Hispanic. So, here's the general population in yellow. Libertarians in orange -- 94 percent of Libertarians are white, non-Hispanic Americans. They're also overwhelmingly male -- 2/3 are male, compared to about half of the country. They also are more likely to be young than the general population. So, 62 percent are under the age of 50 here, compared to just 53 percent of the country. So, that's race, gender, and age.

What about religious affiliation? Here, also, very interesting - - I pulled out these two big wedges a little bit, to take a look at them. One that immediately stands out are the unaffiliated. So, much more likely than other conservative groups to be religiously unaffiliated; also, 27 percent mainline. So, between these two groups, mainline Protestants and unaffiliated, we have a majority of Libertarians -- so 54 percent, just between these two groups in the country.

One of the groups that stands out -- this green wedge at the bottom, 11 percent -- Libertarians about half as likely to be Catholic as the country, as another kind of interesting finding -- so overwhelmingly, unaffiliated and white, mainline Protestant, in terms of religious breakdown.

And just to give you a comparison here -- so these are the same numbers across the top that were in the pie chart. But on the Tea Party, you can see some differences here. For example, on the Tea Party, more than a third of the Tea Party are white, evangelical Protestants, compared to only 23 percent there. And then the other big difference you'll see is on the unaffiliated and among white, mainline Protestants -- 27 to 19. And then the unaffiliated -- really big difference -- the Libertarians three times as likely to be religiously unaffiliated compared to those in the Tea Party.

Also, you can see -- basically, this is predictable by now, but if we look at these three groups in the kind of selective, conservative constituencies -- Libertarians, the Tea Party, white evangelicals -- across a range of religious measures, begin to see a fairly consistent pattern.

So, here are white evangelical Protestants. You know, 90 percent believe in God. 44 percent say religion's the most important thing in their life.

I'm going to put up the Tea Party next. You'll see a little lower measures kind of across the board here, but still fairly high -- 3/4

believe in God, and the majority say it's necessary to believe in God to be moral. About half attend services weekly or more.

And the next slide is the group of Libertarians here, and you'll see slightly less on pretty much every measure here. Six in ten believe in God, but only 22 percent -- half as likely to attend religious services weekly or more, consistent with the higher rates of being unaffiliated, significantly less likely to be a Biblical literalist, and about half as likely to say that religion is the most important thing in their life. So, this kind of less religious profile, generally speaking -- certainly, compared to the Tea Party or white evangelicals.

Here are the all-American numbers, just for reference point. You can see, also, that Libertarians slightly lower than even all Americans in the country, across most of these measures.

In terms of political affiliation, here Libertarians do have an interesting profile. About half -- a little less than half, 45 percent -- identify as Republican. A fairly large chunk identify as independent, but another 15 percent positively identify with a third party, including eight percent who identify with the Libertarian Party itself -- and only five percent identify as Democrats.

So, one takeaway here, right -- clearly, much more likely to be a Republican constituency than a Democrat constituency here.

Looking back, just one way of kind of mapping this onto the election -- 80 percent of those who are Libertarian voted for Romney, but,

interestingly, 14 percent voted for a third-party candidate in the last presidential election. So, that's consistent with this 15 percent who actually identified with a third party when you ask about party affiliation, as well.

Okay. So, I'm going to take a little bit -- now to kind of give me a profile -- the next thing I want to do is to look at the overlap or the relationships between these groups, kind of in the conservative coalition.

The first one is about size. Libertarians make up 12 percent of Republicans. That makes them a little smaller than the Tea Party, smaller than those who identify with the religious right or conservative Christian movement, and, also, smaller than those who identify as white, evangelic Protestants -- but still, a significant constituency -- 12 percent. So, a little more than one in ten Republicans are classified as Libertarians.

If we start to look at the overlap here -- I'm going to kind of go through these slowly, so we make sure we understand them well. So, this is among Libertarians -- the way to read this -- among Libertarians, how many identify with the Tea Party movement? How many identify with the Christian right? 39 percent identify with the Tea Party movement, but 61 percent do not.

And this is kind of one of the big takeaways of the report, is finding that six in ten Libertarians do not identify with the Tea Party. Also, very few identify with the Christian right. Only 22 percent identify with the Christian right; 78 percent do not.

Now if we look at, among the Tea Party, kind of a similar set of slides -- so this is among the Tea Party. How many identify as Libertarian? 26 percent identify as Libertarian; 3/4 do not. And this number's interesting, though: 52 percent identify with the Christian right. this is actually pretty consistent with the polling that we've done between 2010 and now.

In 2010, we found 47 percent of those who identify with the Tea Party also identified as part of the Christian right. This number's right in line with that number -- so about half of those identified with the Tea Party also identify with the Christian right.

Another way of looking at this is that among those who are in the Tea Party, they're about twice as likely to identify with the Christian right as they are to identify with the Tea Party. That's one of the ways of kind of looking at this.

Now this next slide, you can thank E.J. and Bill for, who are always pushing us to kind of put all this together in one big relationship Venn diagram graph. We did this in 2010.

So, this is basically what the overlap looks like, put three ways between Libertarians, the Christian right, and the Tea Party. And you can see, like, this big chunk of the Libertarian circle outside of both of those circles, right? That's sort of one of the big takeaways here. And you can see the Tea Party -- this kind of bigger overlap between the Tea Party and the Christian right.

So, I'm going to put some numbers up here, and help you read this. So, if you read -- you know, among Libertarians, 39 percent of them are part of the Tea Party -- consider themselves part of the Tea Party movement. If we go across the Christian right, that little sliver in the middle is 22 percent of Libertarians consider themselves part of the Christian right. If we read it back the other way, among Tea Party members, 26 percent of them -- so about a quarter consider themselves Libertarian. And if we read the Tea Party one back the other way, half -- 52 percent of the Tea Party consider themselves part of the Christian right.

So, that's the kind of relationship we've got going between these two things, and it's one of the big takeaways of the survey, is just sorting out what the relationship is between these three groups.

So, I'm going to wrap it up by walking through a set of issues that kind of will paint the picture in terms of economic issues and social issues. The big picture here, really, is that on economic issues, there is certainly some daylight between Libertarians, and the Tea Party, and white evangelicals. But it is mostly a matter of intensity, with Libertarians being a little more intensely opposed to government intervention programs in economics.

On the social issues, though, there are quite striking differences between these groups. So, I'm going to walk you through, first, some economic issues -- so healthcare. You can see here, this is

one of those seven-point scale questions. On the one hand, individuals should take responsibility to pay for their own health insurance. That's the orange I'm showing here. On the other end is, the federal government should guarantee health insurance for all citizens, even if it means raising taxes on individuals and businesses.

As you can see here, a majority of the Tea Party, certainly on this end of the scale that says individuals should take responsibility to pay for their own health insurance. But seven in ten Libertarians are there. Evangelicals have a much more mixed attitude on this particular question. So, you can see some real daylight here, with Tea Party/Libertarians on the same side, but the intensity levels are certainly different. Here's the rest of the seven-point scale mapped out, where, you know, you can still see the intensity levels quite differently.

On just a couple of other example issues -- environmental law is the minimum wage increase. First of all, we look at favor/oppose tougher laws and regulations to protect the environment, even if it raises prices or costs jobs. You can see both Libertarians and members of the Tea Party, only a quarter favor tougher environmental laws. White evangelicals stick out for a little higher support, but still only around a third. All Americans, 52 percent favor.

If we look at increasing the minimum wage, you see a similar pattern. All Americans, overwhelming, seven in ten, support increasing the minimum wage from \$7.25 to \$10 an hour. Only about a third of

Libertarians favor this. Only four in ten Tea Party members favor this; six in ten white evangelical Protestants favor this. So, again, some real differences here -- but Libertarians and the Tea Party -- mostly on the same page across these sets of economic issues.

But now if we switch to look at some social issues -- and here, I've got three -- one on abortion, one on physician-assisted suicide, and one on making the use of marijuana legal.

So, the first one -- if we look at -- this is the number of those who oppose making it more difficult for a woman to get an abortion. Among all Americans, you know, six in ten oppose making it more difficult for a woman to get an abortion. Libertarians, largely in agreement with this question -- 57 percent.

But look at this -- this difference here between -- you'll start seeing, based on all of these, some real daylight between Libertarians, and the Tea Party, and white evangelicals, with this kind of step-down pattern. So, that's making it more difficult for a woman to get an abortion.

The second one is favoring allowing doctors to legally prescribe lethal drugs to help terminally ill patients end their own lives. And here, we have all Americans evenly divided on this question, seven in ten Libertarians in support of physician-assisted suicide, the Tea Party basically divided, and white evangelicals, only three in ten favoring this policy.

And then, finally, marijuana legalization -- fairly similar

pattern. We have the country fairly evenly divided -- slim majority favoring the legalization of marijuana -- seven in ten Libertarians favoring it, four in ten Tea Party members, and only 29 percent of evangelicals.

So, here, you can really see the space that opens up, really, on social issues between these constituencies.

One that I'm sure we'll talk about some more -- where there's actually less space -- I want to kind of put this on its own slide so we can kind of see here -- on allowing gay and lesbian couples to marry. All Americans, 52 percent favor allowing gay and lesbian couples to marry. Here, Libertarians are more supportive of this policy than Tea Party members or evangelical, but they still remain majority opposed. Only four in ten favor; six in ten oppose.

So, this issue plays differently than abortion, marijuana legalization, and physician-assisted suicide. We can maybe talk about why that is a little bit later. I'd be actually interested in the panelists' reflections on that question.

And then, finally, a little bit about the political context: This is, I think, an interesting slide that goes to why Libertarians, certainly, are important -- especially if we're thinking toward 2014, the mid-term elections. A majority of Libertarians -- this is the percent who say they always vote in primary elections, right? So, a majority -- 53 percent -- say they always vote in primary elections. That looks about like those who identify with the Christian right, about like Republicans. It's a little lower

than those who consider themselves part of the Tea Party movement, but higher than all Americans as a whole.

So, you know, one takeaway here is, this is a group that is engaged, and reports that it votes always -- a majority reported votes always in primary elections.

And then, finally, one look ahead at the candidate slate -- it's pretty early, but we thought, oh, you know, it'll be fun to kind of see where different constituencies are on at least a potential slate of presidential candidates.

So, here are the numbers for all Republican voters. So, this is among registered voters who identify with or lean toward the Republican Party. They're arranged in ascending order. So, you can see Paul Ryan, Chris Christie out ahead; Jeb Bush and Marco Rubio slightly behind, and then a little bit lower support for Rand Paul and Ted Cruz. So, that's kind of among all registered Republicans.

But look at the difference between those who are Libertarian voters. Rand Paul, right, far out ahead, right -- so not a surprise. This is what you might expect. Ted Cruz, Marco Rubio not far behind. Jeb Bush, significantly lower, and Chris Christie and Paul Ryan also a little bit lower. But Rand Paul, clearly out ahead.

And then if you look at the Tea Party group, right -- so we see Ted Cruz jumping up; here, less support for Rand Paul, Cruz and Rubio getting more of the Tea Party support there.

And then, finally, among white evangelicals, pretty evenly spread. I guess Paul Ryan a little bit out ahead, and Chris Christie, Jeb Bush behind -- but, really, pretty evenly spread -- so no clear frontrunner, really, among white, evangelical voters who lean Republican.

So, I'm just going to wrap it here. I'm looking forward to the discussion with everyone up here, but, you know, I hope that this will provide some nuanced portrait. It's something of a group that we've had really spotty quantitative data for, and will help us kind of think through not only the midterms, but things maybe in closer hand, like the upcoming Virginia election -- which we will probably talk about.

All right. Thank you.

MR. DIONNE: As Richard Scarry would say -- for those of you who know the kids' books -- that was your best PowerPoint ever. That was awesome.

I do want to mention the hashtag for people who want to join -- it's #AVS2013 for people who want to join the discussion here.

Also, this is not necessarily a Libertarian thought, but it takes a hardworking community to put together an event and a survey like this. So, I do also want to reiterate our thanks to Ford and Cummings.

I'd also like to thank the PRRI staff who worked so hard on this: Emily Fetsch, MacKenzie Babb, and Joseph Goodman.

I'd also like to thank the Brookings staff who worked so hard on this: Anna Goodbaum, Christine Jacobs, Ross Tilchen, and -- she

always put her name last on these lists, but she doesn't belong there -- Corinne Davis. The first shall be last, if I may offer a religious sentiment here.

We have a great all-star panel to respond to this, representing, in some ways, different parts of the spectrum that Robbie just described so well.

Karlyn Bowman, whom I thank for participating in so many of our events on these surveys, is a Senior Fellow at the American Enterprise Institute. She compiles and analyzes public opinion on a range of issues. If you want to know American opinion on intervention in Azerbaijan, even though no one is thinking about that, Karlyn can probably find you data on it.

In addition, she studies the evolution of American politics, paying a lot of attention to demographic and geographical changes. She writes a weekly column for Forbes.com, and is a contributor to AEI's "Datapoints."

Brink Lindsey, whom we've been fortunate to have on a number of occasions here at Brookings, is Vice President for Research at the Cato Institute. His current research focuses on economic growth and policy barriers that impede it. In his years at Cato, Brink has served as Director of Regulatory Studies and Founder and Director of the Center for Trade Policy Studies.

He is the Senior Editor of *Regulation* magazine; the original

editor of *Cato Unbound*. He is also currently a Senior Fellow with the Kauffman Foundation.

And, Brink, they didn't put it on here; plug your two books, both of which are very interesting. Yeah, just mention them now, so that --

MR. LINDSEY: *The Age of Abundance*, which is a social history of the United States since World War II, and talks a lot about where the Libertarian impulse in American politics and culture comes from.

And then, more recently, *Human Capitalism: How Economic Growth Has Made Us Smarter and More Unequal*, which focuses on inequality -- and, in particular, skills-based inequality.

MR. DIONNE: Thank you.

Henry Olsen is a Senior Fellow at the Ethics and Public Policy Center, where he studies and provides commentary on American politics. I have to say, personally, I found his commentary on the 2012 election particularly enlightening. He did not believe that the polls were all skewed, as I recall.

His work focuses on how to address, consistent with conservative principles, the electoral challenges facing modern American conservatism. This work will culminate in a book, entitled *New Century, New Deal: How Conservatives Can Win Hearts, Minds, and Elections*.

And, finally, my dear colleague, Bill Galston, is the Ezra Zilkha Chair in Brookings's Governance Studies Program. He is a Senior Fellow at Brookings. He's also a College Park Professor at University of

Maryland.

He is the author of many books and articles in the field of political theory, public policy, American politics. He has also done a lot of work in government and politics. From 1993 to 1995, he was Deputy Assistant to President Clinton for domestic policy.

So, I invite Karlyn to kick this conversation off.

MS. BOWMAN: Thank you very much, E.J.

Last week, *the Wall Street Journal* ran a story about niche dating sites. There was a picture of a young farmer and his wife, who'd met on a site called Farmers Only.

But the lead of the piece was about a dating site called Atlasphere, an Ayn Rand appreciating site with a dating component. The 10-year-old site has 16,000 dating profiles, and it saw a spike in its membership after the two *Atlas Shrugged* movies were released.

Other straws in the wind that may indicate a nascent Libertarian moment are the wonderful Libertarian character played by Nick Offerman on *Parks and Recreation*, and the very positive portrait of Rand Paul and his wife in the new issue of *Vogue*. *Vogue* usually runs flattering portraits of Hillary Clinton, but the magazine described in the new issue the era of expectancy around Rand Paul, and its author described him as "intriguing and charismatic, an ambassador for Libertarian values" -- something I hadn't expected from *Vogue*.

These cultural touchstones are one reason to take a closer

look at Libertarians, but there are other reasons that I think are far more important. And here, as usual, PRRI and Robbie's team has its finger on the public pulse.

A group of current issues, high levels of mistrust of government, concern about government intrusiveness, wariness of U.S. involvement abroad, and growing social tolerance may be pulling the country in a more Libertarian direction.

Dissatisfaction with government is at an all-time high in recent polls, including those that were taken before the shutdown antics of the last month. Trust and confidence in government to do the right thing at home and abroad in Gallup's data is the lowest it's been in 40 years.

Concern about NSA spying and the Internal Revenue Service investigations are strong. The proportion saying that it's better for the future of the United States to stay out of world affairs is now higher than at any time since that question was first asked in the 1940s.

Support for gay marriage seems to be hovering around 50 percent in most polls today, perhaps plateauing for a time, but that's a significant change from a decade ago. And as we've seen in the preelection polls in the battleground state of Virginia, support for gay marriage appears to be one of a number of issues propelling Terry McAuliffe's candidacy forward.

So, this cluster of contemporary issues could pull more people in a Libertarian direction.

I confess that I started looking for a Libertarian moment many years ago, when AEI published a little magazine called *Public Opinion*. And E.J. was very involved in that.

I found polls from the 1960s asking people about mandatory helmet laws. A significant chunk of Americans who would probably never get on a motorcycle didn't like government telling them what to do. In the early polls on mandatory seatbelts, between 25 and 40 percent were opposed to requiring them.

The mandate in the Affordable Care Act to have health insurance has polled more negatively than almost any aspect of the law, and that may explain why 96 percent of Libertarians in PRRI's poll opposed the healthcare law, compared to 54 percent of the public.

Many Americans don't like being told what they can and cannot do by the federal government in Washington. And this is pure conjecture on my part, but the question about gay marriage -- which is a little bit different than I think what we might have expected in terms of responses on that question -- may stem from people's view that government is imposing this change on them.

Still, the Libertarian label doesn't seem to be catching fire. In fairness, we don't have many polls that try to measure the size of the group, and that's one of the many reasons that I think PRRI's new poll is so important. Let me just mention a few of them, to put Robbie's findings in comparative perspective.

In the Pew Research Center 2011 typology, they found nine percent of the population to be Libertarians -- what they call "Libertarians, free market, small government, and more secular in orientation."

In PRRI's newly-developed Libertarian orientation scale, a similar seven percent, as Robbie said, were consistent Libertarians, and an additional 15 percent leaned Libertarian.

In the September *Reason* group e-poll, eight percent described themselves as Libertarians again; almost perfectly in line with the PRRI results.

And in the polls they've done over the past several years, about 20 percent lean Libertarian, based on an analysis of three questions that they asked. The Libertarian candidate in Virginia is polling at eight percent.

In all of these polls, Libertarians were more likely than others in the population to be white and male. Pew described them as secular. PRRI's survey goes into more detail on religious orientation, but the Libertarians in the PRRI poll are less likely than the population as a whole to say that religion is very important in their lives -- and, as Robbie said, more secular, generally, in orientation.

In most of the polls, Libertarians leaned to the GOP. In most of these polls, they've had higher levels of formal education. In Pew's cluster analysis, 53 percent of them were under the age of 50. In PRRI's more recent analysis, as Robbie suggested earlier, slightly more -- 62

percent -- are.

These polls agree broadly that Libertarians are opposed to greater government involvement across a whole slew of economic issues, and that they have a distinctive profile that Robbie's described on social issues.

Gallup takes a different approach to this issue in its annual governance poll. They ask two questions that give us a sense of the size of the Libertarian ranks -- or what they described in one analysis they did with *USA Today* as "the keep governments small constituency."

The first question that they ask is, "Some people think government should promote traditional values in our society. Others think government should not favor any one set of values. With which do you agree more?"

Last year, for the first time, a majority -- 52 percent -- said that government shouldn't favor any set of values -- that slipped back to a strong plurality, 48 percent, in the new September 2013 survey.

My own analysis of many different polls suggest that people are moving in a more liberal direction on many values questions, such as gay marriage and marijuana legalization, even as they continue to say, for themselves personally, certain behaviors are morally wrong. The new non-judgmentalism probably increases the numbers of those inclined to give Libertarians a hearing.

Gallup's other question asks whether government is doing

too many things that should be left to businesses and individuals, or whether the government should do more to solve our country's problems. In the abstract, in the latest poll, 53 percent said government was doing too much, and 40 percent said that government should do more.

When Reason-Rupe asked people to tell them in their own words what came to mind when they heard the word "Libertarian" in a February survey, 14 percent volunteered positive answers, 15 percent negative ones, but nearly four in ten said that they didn't know enough to say. So, many people who might have Libertarian beliefs don't identify with the Libertarian movement.

As PRRI's analysis points out, most people don't have fully consistent sets of beliefs or a clear idea of what ideology means. Still, terms like conservative, liberal, and moderate are generally familiar to most people, and it's a steep uphill climb to get people to embrace new labels, whether it's progressive or Libertarian.

In the September Reason-Rupe poll, 30 percent identified themselves as conservatives when asked about their overall political philosophy, 16 percent liberal, 22 percent moderate, eight percent Libertarian, and five percent progressive. So, I think the general comfort level with the more familiar terms and unfamiliarity with terms such as Libertarian and progressive tend to keep those numbers low.

But as the cultural indicators I discussed and the current set of public concerns suggest, the political ecosystem may be changing in a

direction that's more favorable to Libertarians.

Thank you.

MR. DIONNE: I love the idea of a dating site of Ayn Rand readers. They could have a book group where they discuss *the Virtue of Selfishness*, one of her books, while talking about love. It would be a really intriguing experiment.

Brink Lindsey, bless you for joining us. Thank you.

MR. LINDSEY: I'm happy to be the one live specimen of the species under investigation today -- although I should say that one of the favorite games that Libertarians like to play is "you're not a real Libertarian." And plenty of people would say that about me, but I think I qualify for a Brookings crowd, for sure.

Just a few observations to put these really interesting results in context: First, it needs to be pointed out that there is no such thing as a Libertarian mass movement. There is a Libertarian movement of sorts, but it's an intellectual movement, confined to a statistically insignificant group of pointy-headed people like me.

And so there is an impulse in American politics, there's a streak in American public opinion, but it's not an organized, articulated, self-conscious force in politics. I would say that streak has been around since the founding of the republic, and it continues today.

I have no idea what these numbers would look like if you look back historically at different times. I know that the definitions of

liberal and conservative change a lot over time, so I'm not sure even what you would pick up from a historical look.

I do know one thing that's pretty depressing, which is that it seems like the Libertarian streak in American public opinion gets most vibrant and activated in political opposition, as opposed to in power. So, we didn't see the howls of outrage over socialized medicine when George W. Bush was rolling out Medicare Part D, anything like we have seen over the Affordable Care Act; likewise, on the left Libertarian side of things, the antiwar movement completely disappeared once Barack Obama was elected President.

So, there is this latent constituency, this impulse in politics. The Libertarian worldview that has been articulated by intellectuals is one that sees itself as neither on the left nor the right. But as a matter of sort of sociology and politics, the fact is that Libertarianism has been much more closely engaged with the political right than it has been with the left.

I think the main reason for that is that the modern Libertarian movement arose during the Cold War, when the big political question that it was engaged with was the contest between capitalism and socialism, and so Libertarian intellectuals naturally sided with antisocialists on the right. And so furthermore, the biggest names amongst Libertarian intellectuals have been economists, who have also been claimed as heroes amongst conservatives -- people like Friedrich Hayek and Milton Friedman.

So, we've seen much more Libertarians talking to, engaging with conservatives, writing for conservative outlets, speaking for conservative groups than you have seen engagement on the left. And so I think one should expect, in looking at this Libertarian element in American political opinion, to see it skewed a bit to the right because of that history of engagement.

And we do see that in some of these poll numbers, I think. The gay marriage results were the most surprising to me. I would have expected from movement Libertarians overwhelming support for gay marriage. But there is still a current of opinion amongst Libertarians that the state shouldn't be involved in marriage at all.

So, marriage itself is a discriminatory racket that favors married people over single people; why extend this injustice to another constituency? Just let people contract for whatever relations they want, and leave it at that.

So, I think that kind of attitude allows some Libertarian-leaning folks to not really focus on the current discrimination that's going on, and say they've got another answer for it.

So, maybe that's going on, to some extent, or maybe, again, it's just the relative proximity, sociological proximity, between Libertarian types and conservative types that has skewed those results a bit.

Likewise, with abortion numbers, the Libertarians were basically in synch with American opinion overall, but I would have

expected to see it in synch with liberal public opinion. So, here again, I think you have this right skew.

Also, there is genuine philosophical disagreement within Libertarians. They agree that the state exists to protect persons and property; the question is, who is a person? And Libertarian principles don't resolve that issue of when personhood begins, and so there are -- I know in the Libertarian movement -- certainly, prolife Libertarians.

And so Libertarianism is amenable to a prolife position -- more than you might think. But on the ground, most self-identified, self-conscious Libertarians I know are overwhelmingly prochoice.

So, what are the prospects for this group of people to be organized politically, and have an impact on politics? I would like to see a political movement that is economically conservative, socially liberal -- broadly Libertarian in outline. We don't have one in American politics right now, and there's no indication on the horizon that we're going to have one. I would chalk that up to the nature of politics, and the nature of the contemporary left and right.

Henry Adams defined politics as the systematic organization of hatreds, and it's certainly much easier to mobilize people to a political cause when you're angry and ticked off than when you're sort of vaguely satisfied.

And the way I told the story in *the Age of Abundance*, I said that the contemporary right grew up in reaction against the '60s -- wishing

the '60s had never happened; it's basically the fall of man, and everything's been going to hell since then.

And the contemporary left had an equivalent reaction to the '80s, and to the revival of small government, and lower taxes, and deregulation, and globalization.

And so it has, on its economic policies, organized people who are discontented with the new, more Libertarian economic dispensation.

So, as I've said before, you have this curious reactionary *entente* between liberals and conservatives: They both want to go back to the '50s, and the only difference is that liberals want to work there, and conservatives want to go home there.

But Libertarians -- at least these inferred Libertarians -- are people who are basically happy with the dynamism of American economic life, and basically happy with the dynamism of American cultural life, but the vaguely satisfied aren't a very tempting constituency to organize.

So, until something happens to activate outrage in this group of people -- as it has, to some extent; we're seeing Libertarianism talked about a lot more these days, because the economy tanked, and government has grown dramatically, and debt has grown dramatically, and that has gotten the Libertarian impulse on the economic side more front and center -- at least amongst Republicans -- than we have seen in the past.

And likewise, the exhaustion from long, unsuccessful wars, and fears of a surveillance state as we've gotten all these new revelations have brought out the Libertarian side on foreign policy -- and so the liberties issues.

But here, it's really circumstances, rather than some organization of this group that are doing the work.

And looking forward, I think that there are good reasons for believing that policy is going to move in a more Libertarian direction than you might think, when you see poll numbers that suggest only seven percent of people are genuinely Libertarian.

And that's because of just the constraint of circumstances. The constraints on the left are the growth, the U.S. economy is slowing down -- the only way to speed it back up again is to revive innovation. Reviving innovation means reviving entrepreneurship, which, I think, means a push towards more pro-market and more pro-competition policies.

So, deteriorating economic performance, I believe, will be pushing economic policy in a more Libertarian direction.

Likewise, we've run out of money fiscally, and so we're now in this agonizing, ongoing process of trying to reconcile how much government we want with how much government we want to pay for. I imagine that is going to put a lot of damper on bright, shiny plans to expand government in the future, and will, indeed, be constraining

government in a Libertarian way on the fiscal side for years to come.

And then on the right, lots of constraints, just in terms of the evolution of public opinion, as people are growing more socially liberal and more individualistic on a host of issues that have been passionately engaged on the right. They're on the losing side.

Likewise, demographically, I think, the changes in American population over the coming decades are not going to be favorable for groups who see the American ideal as the sort of white bread, Ozzie and Harriet 1950s.

So, circumstances, rather than a political organization of this constituency, I think, are more likely to do the work of pushing us in a Libertarian direction.

I'll leave it there.

MR. DIONNE: Thank you so much. I think we're all going to remember the '50s -- liberals want to work there, and conservatives want to go home. I was thinking Libertarians don't want to have to go home, and they want to make investments.

But thank you so much.

Henry Olsen, thank you so much for joining us.

MR. OLSEN: Thanks.

I was asked to talk about the effect of the Libertarian streak in American politics, politically, for the conservative movement, and for the Republican Party. And it's really two questions that I want to address as

part of that.

The first is, is Libertarianism or some hard form of it preparing to displace conservatism as the political heart of the conservative movement and of the Republican Party?

And then the other question is, does the GOP need to become more Libertarian consistently, in order to win general elections?

I believe the data in this poll, as well as the data in many of the other polls that Karlyn has cited, have a pretty clear answer to that, both questions -- and it's the same one: no.

Now first, with respect to the future of Libertarianism in the short term within the Republican Party -- just note what Robbie noted, which is the incredibly small size of the Libertarian consistent movement within the Republican Party. 12 percent of Republican bases are Libertarian, as compared to much larger elements of the other parts of the conservative base -- and, I might add, what's not mentioned here, which is the extremely large nonconservative part of the Republican Party that is actually the silent majority in most Republican electorates.

This is exacerbated by the geographic concentration of these groups -- that white evangelicals tend to have outsized power within the Republican Party, because they're concentrated geographically in the South and the border states, whereas Libertarians tend to be dispersed, and where they are more geographically concentrated, they tend to be in areas that are democratically dominated, so that even the smaller number

of Libertarianism as a political force, as opposed to an intellectual force, is minimized because of the way that they live, as opposed to the political force of, in particular, white evangelical Protestants.

So, then you have to ask a question -- is, well, are there missing Libertarians that a harder Libertarian stance could pull into the Republican Party? And there, you've got the 14 percent of Libertarians who voted for a third-party candidate in 2012, and the 15 percent that identify in some way with a third party. But, you know, that's 14 percent of seven percent, which is 1.98 percent -- which is curiously close to the 0.99 percent that Gary Johnson received. And eight percent of seven percent is 0.56 percent, which is, again, curiously close to the average of about 0.4 percent that the LP candidate has received since the election of Ronald Reagan in 1980.

So, there just aren't many people who matter electorally, to be pulled into a Republican Party by moving in a harder Libertarian stance.

So, then you've got the question of, if they can't influence the nomination through sheer numbers, and there aren't really ways to add to them by going to the right, what about Libertarian leaners? Note that they are 24 percent of Republicans. So, combined, that's 36 percent. Isn't that a great group to listen to?

The problem I've got with that is, as Robbie notes, they have a different ideological profile, which is why he didn't include them.

Let's think about going through the appendices -- what a Libertarian leaner means in Robbie's poll. It means somebody averaged between a three or a four on every one of those questions.

Now I've been in the Republican Party for 40 years, and if I went to a group of small business people, I could get a three or a four out of virtually all of those questions. What I think the Libertarian leaner group is, is the business establishment of the Republican Party.

And so, consequently, the Republican Party is already very attractive to those people -- people who generally but not intensely opposed to government expansion, people who are generally but not intensely supportive of personal social liberties, people who are generally but not intensely suspicious of intervention abroad. That is the center of the Republican Party, not the Libertarian Alliance.

Nationally, as long as exit polls have been done in presidential primaries -- which is going back to 1992 -- the Republican Party nationally divides very neatly into three. Even in 2012, at the height of the Tea Party mania, about 30 percent of Republicans who turn out in presidential primaries say they are moderate and liberal. About a third say they are very conservative.

And the rest say they are somewhat conservative. That group is the only group that always wins -- the somewhat conservative person, who I would argue is, the person who is a Libertarian leaner or somebody with mixed views on the scale is the center of the Republican

Party.

And that's why the Republican Party continues to nominate people who the big factions of the extremes -- whether the white, evangelical faction or the Libertarian faction -- find distasteful -- because they're the majority and the single-largest faction in the party.

So, from a nominating standpoint, Libertarianism, despite the enthusiasm of Ron Paul, despite the pyrotechnics of freedom works and so forth, is not going to be the political future in the near term for the Republicans.

So, then the question is, is that a strategic error? You know, is Republicans just missing the boat? Should they become more Libertarian, to attract people who are not identifying as Libertarians, but would if they only thought Republicans were more open to that? That's a standard argument you hear in Libertarian circles.

And I would argue that the analysis suggests not -- suggests not for a couple of reasons. One is, the Libertarian leaners that we suggest actually are not people who seem to feel very intensely about much of anything. They have inclinations, but they are not strongly passionate. If there's one thing that defines the Libertarian hard movement, it's passion.

Take a look at the numbers that are on intensity. If you look at, particularly, the intensity on the Obamacare question, you know, 71 percent of self-described Libertarians who are on the right for healthcare

questions said, one, you know, absolutely, the right of, you know, the individual, who should take care of their healthcare.

Now by definition, the intensity that produces Libertarian commitment is, itself, a bit off-putting to the person in the middle.

In 1984, I had a number of friends who were Libertarians in Los Angeles, and they were telling me the story of the then-LP candidate for president who was on a morning talk show. Remember, this is 1984, and, supposedly, the host breathlessly said, "Is it true that Libertarians believe that any two adults ought to be able to do whatever they want to in the privacy of their own bedroom?" And Bergland, without missing a beat, says, "Why do you limit it to two?"

So, that intensity itself, I think -- the thing that would make a Libertarian more excited is exactly the thing that would make Libertarian leaners a little bit more --

QUESTIONER: (off mic).

MR. OLSEN: Yeah. You may use it.

The other thing, though, is, you've got the people who think they're Libertarian, but they really aren't. And that, you can see in this poll from the group that is Libertarian self-identified. In the Pew typology, you see that in a group of people who they call post-moderns.

And the post-moderns, demographically, look similar to the Libertarians. I wrote about this in *National View*, in a piece called "Rand Paul's Party." And they're young, they're educated, they're wealthy,

they're secular, they believe in hard work, they believe in free trade, they are liberal on social issues; they just happen to love President Obama, like Obamacare, think that the U.N. is a great institution, and have no problem in the government regulating child obesity. They're social Democrats, okay?

And we see this in the PRRI poll. Take a look at the Libertarian ID on appendix three, page 35. You know, you ask the question on social issues, and you see making it more difficult for a woman to get an abortion. Well, Libertarians and self-identified Libertarians are pretty similar on that. Making marijuana legal -- it's page 35 -- pretty similar on that. The doctor-assisted euthanasia -- pretty similar on that.

Then you get to economics. Increase the minimum wage -- 28 percent more likely to say yes for Libertarian self-identified. Libertarians don't like the idea. Tougher laws to protect the environment -- 26 percent of Libertarians say yes; 52 percent of self-identified Libertarians say yes. Making it more difficult to access pornography on the internet -- 31 percent of Libertarians say yes; 58 percent of self-identified Libertarians say yes.

Again, there's a group of people who speak some of the language of Libertarians, but they do not have the consistent application and the intensity. In Europe, you would call them mild social Democrats; here, you might call them post-moderns, as Pew did.

But there's really no viability of the Republican Party to say, as some in the Libertarian movement do, "Just get rid of the Christians, and get rid of the social issues, and get rid of the warmongering. And all of these people love hard work, and they're educated, and they'll come."

No, they won't, because, then, you will take that off the table, and they will find other disagreements with you.

So, the future of the GOP is going to be tied not to the ability to stop speaking the language of power -- which characterizes the Libertarian intensity -- and start speaking the language of justice -- not who controls, but what's right. That's where people who hold mixed views exist. They are less concerned with who does it than what is done.

And so to that extent, I would argue that the Libertarian movement -- Libertarianism, as opposed to a liberty-fused conservatism -- is the apple in the political Garden of Eden. A lot of people in the Republicans may really want to eat it, but it'll get them kicked out if they do.

MR. DIONNE: Thank you so much.

And I want to -- at last, my colleague, Bill Galston.

MR. GALSTON: Well, in Judaism, apple-eating is equated not with original sin, but with opening one's eyes and beginning to understand the world. So, perhaps we can have it out.

But I want to proceed quickly, because I'm eager to see Henry and Brink take their jackets off, and really get to it.

I've picked out, you know, one subject for more extended treatment -- and that is the relationship between liberals and Libertarians on social issues, and the role that religion plays in that relationship.

And let me just put the facts on the table, as fast as I can. You know, consider the question the survey asks: Should we allow doctors to prescribe lethal drugs to help terminally ill patients end their own lives?

Libertarians say yes, by a margin of 72 to 25. Liberals say yes, by an almost identical margin of 72/29. If one folds in the religious dimension of this, white evangelicals are overwhelmingly opposed -- 29 to 70. Unaffiliated Americans are overwhelmingly in favor -- 79 to 20.

And what unites liberals and Libertarians, it seems to me, is a lower than average propensity to intense religiosity. And that fundamental similarity comes out here, and it reflects an underlying principle or a choice.

Do we own ourselves, or does God own us? If you believe that we own ourselves, then there is no principled argument against physician-assisted suicide. If you believe that we are the servants of God, and that, you know, the God who created us owns us, and only God has the right to terminate life, you come out with a completely different argument, and it tends to a different conclusion.

So, that's question number one.

Here's another question: Should the law make it more

difficult to access pornography on the internet? Well, here things get interesting. Libertarians don't think so, not surprisingly. You know, only 24 percent favor that course of action; fully 75 percent are opposed to it. For liberals, it's pretty much the other way around. 61 percent are in favor of making it more difficult to access pornography on the internet; that's what they say, anyway. You know, and only 38 think that we shouldn't do that.

Now what's going on here? I think there are at least two interpretations of the liberal/Libertarian split on this question. No doubt the audience can think of others.

You know, first of all, Libertarians distinguish between harm to self and harm to others. And if what we are doing harms only ourselves, then government shouldn't be in the business of regulating it. If it involves harm to others, then government should be. And it's possible that when liberals look at pornography, they see harm to self -- or, alternatively, harm to other people.

A standard liberal line is that pornography degrades women, makes women more vulnerable to all sorts of abuse. When Libertarians look at pornography, they see, at most, harm to self -- and they probably don't even see that. And they certainly don't see harm to others. That's one interpretation.

Here's the other interpretation: There is a fundamental disagreement between liberals and Libertarians as to whether government

should act when the issue is harm to self, and not harm to other people. And there's evidence in this survey to bear out that interpretation, as well.

So, consider the following: The proposition on offer is, it is not government's business to protect people from themselves. And, intriguingly -- but not surprisingly -- 94 percent of Libertarians endorse that proposition. Only 22 percent of liberals do.

Liberals are, in this sense, paternalists. They believe that part of the state's business is to protect people from harming themselves. This is a fundamental disagreement, and, not entirely by chance, only 22 percent of Democrats endorse the proposition that it's not government's business to protect people from themselves.

Who are the paternalists? I've been able to find three groups. First of all, Americans with postgraduate degrees; second, African-Americans; and, third, Hispanics. It is the ethnic and racial communities with the most direct and pervasive experience of people acting in ways that harm themselves who are most likely to endorse the proposition that government ought to intervene to prevent them from doing it.

And, I suspect, if you looked at attitudes on drug use, among other issues, you'd find ample confirmation of that proposition.

Now let's take a look -- and this will be my concluding point -- on the interesting relationship between Libertarians and liberals on the question of religion, and the role of religion in our lives, and what religion

is, anyway -- what it amounts to.

As we've already seen more than once, liberals and Libertarians are, of all the groups surveyed, the most disproportionately likely to be religiously unaffiliated. And many people who are religiously unaffiliated are unbelievers or disbelievers of one sort or another. That doesn't mean they're all Richard Dawkins, but some are.

What about more precise forms of religious behavior? If you ask what share of the general population attends religious services seldom or never, you know, 43 percent of the general population, but 55 percent of Libertarians and 60 percent of liberals.

If you ask about belief that the Holy Book is the Word of God in the general population, 58 percent; among liberals, 31 percent; Libertarians, 43 percent.

Here's a really interesting one -- religion is not important at all, or certainly not as important as other things. For the general population, you only get 34 percent endorsing either of those propositions. For liberals, it's 57 percent. Religion is not important, or not as important as the other things in my life. And Libertarians aren't far behind, with 46 percent.

Or what about the proposition that it's necessary to believe in God in order to be moral and have good values? The population is split down the middle on that point, but only 31 percent of liberals and 36 percent of Libertarians think that to be moral and to have good values, you

need to believe in God.

So far, liberals and Libertarians are walking down the road of, you know, non-religion together -- but then, a separation. And this'll be my concluding point.

Based on the results of this survey, Libertarians appear to be more open to religion than do liberals, even when the Libertarians themselves are not among the faithful.

So, consider the following three questions: Religion causes more problems in society than it solves. Liberals endorse that proposition, 54 to 45. Libertarians reject it, 37 to 62.

Or what about the proposition that was litigated all the way up to the Supreme Court -- that the two words "under God" in the Pledge of Allegiance violate separation of church and state? More than four in ten liberals endorse that proposition. Only 15 percent of Libertarians do.

Here's a particularly intriguing one: It is important for children to be brought up in a religion so that they can learn good values. 67 percent of the overall population endorses that proposition. Only 44 percent of liberals do, but 65 percent of Libertarians endorse the proposition -- essentially identical with the general population.

What's going on here? Well, here's my sociological answer: Libertarians, regardless of what they now believe, tend to come from families that were more religiously believing and observant than do liberals. If you look at questions such as praying once a week or more at

family meals, attending religious education once a week or more, or attending religious services once a week or more with your family, on all of those questions, Libertarians are much more likely to provide an affirmative answer than liberals are.

So, oddly, Libertarians, although about as unreligious as liberals, appear to be more open to the claims of religion -- dare I say more tolerant of it.

MR. DIONNE: Thank you so much, Bill. It sounds like what you're saying is that Libertarians lost faith, and liberals never had it.

By the way, the instant availability of data -- Robbie and I here were intrigued by your finding on pornography and liberals, and we discovered, in the process of doing some very quick data analysis, that on the question "make it more difficult to access pornography on the internet," 27 percent of men strongly favored this view; 49 percent of women strongly favored this view. There's an enormous gender gap -- and if you look at overall agreement, 57 percent of men, but 73 percent of women.

And I'm curious if that inflects some of the ideological answer, as well.

This is a great panel. I do want to see the brawl between Brink and Henry -- not because I like to divide the right, but just because I think it would be intellectually fascinating.

But I do want to ask -- maybe kick that off by asking Robbie a couple of questions that I think were raised by the discussion already,

and, also, want you to reply or comment on what you've heard. But I was intrigued by the distinction between Libertarians and Libertarian leaners. And I'm wondering if you can enlighten us on that.

And then, I am also intrigued by the communalists. And one of the focus of this report today is not on the communalists. They really seem -- I don't know which bad metaphor to use -- Libertarians turned on their heads. I mean, they seem -- or the exact opposite of the Libertarian constituency in so many ways.

So, if you could sort of talk about those leaners, and talk a little bit about the communalists -- and then I'd like to invite Brink and Henry to a little bit of argument.

MR. JONES: Great. Yeah, let me talk a little bit about the leaners.

You know, whenever we create a scale, you know, one of the things we do is try to figure out where the right cut points are on the scale, and who is in which category.

So, we were kind of playing around with this, and looking at the dividing points. And, basically, what we found is that there actually is quite big gaps -- you know, as Henry pointed out -- between Libertarians who we call consistent Libertarians and these Libertarian leaners.

So, you can see it, for example, on questions of vote. You know, 22 percent of Libertarian leaners voted for Barack Obama; only five percent of consistent Libertarians voted for Barack Obama. You can see

it in the third-party vote; 14 percent Libertarians, only six percent Libertarian leaners in that third-party category.

You can also see it on a range of issues, both economic and social. So, it's not just the social issues where you see the gaps. So, like, on the minimum wage question, for example -- as we said, 2/3 -- 65 percent of Libertarians oppose increasing the minimum wage from \$7.25 to \$10 an hour. When you look at that Libertarian leaner group, it's only 39 percent oppose raising the minimum wage.

So, you clearly see -- even though that's sort of lower than general population, it looks about like Republicans overall, rather than looking like a group that's sort of more Libertarian-leaning on that.

And then just one more example in here that I think will make the point -- on the abortion question, where we had 57 percent of Libertarians in that consistent Libertarian category oppose making it more difficult for a woman to get an abortion, that is about where the general population is. When you look at that Libertarian leaners group, they're evenly divided on that question, all right? So, very different than Libertarians.

So, we do have, actually, a different group in that Libertarian leaners group, where, on some questions, they look -- and I think your characterization, actually, as kind of the business establishment is maybe not far off on that. That seems about right. They look like Republicans overall, on a number of these issues.

And the other question you wanted me to --

MR. DIONNE: Just tell us a bit about the communalists.

MR. JONES: Yeah. So, the communalists -- I mean, we didn't do a lot of analysis here, but stay tuned, right? We have a whole set of stuff here to cut our teeth on. And it is a really interesting group. Not surprisingly, it is much more racially diverse. So, whereas this was on the Libertarian end, where, you know, more than 9/10 white, non-Hispanic, we have a high number of African-Americans. It's also older, interestingly enough. The communalist group -- it's a little more Catholic than the Libertarian end of the scale.

In terms of vote, it is a high Obama constituency -- so more than eight in ten communalists voting for President Obama; 13 percent for Mitt Romney.

So, it is, in some ways, sort of turned on its head. But, again, it's, you know, not quite the kind of straight left/right constituency, either.

And give me a minute; I'll come up with some other examples on, like, a couple of these issues. I think I'll tell it, but I'll come back to it while we're --

MR. DIONNE: Speaking personally as a Catholic, I would be very disappointed if there weren't a lot of Catholic communalists.

But, Brink, I'd like you, basically, to reply to Henry, in terms of the future.

MR. LINDSEY: Sure. I will reject your characterization of any disagreement between Henry and me as an intra-right disagreement, because, as I said at the outset, the best conception of Libertarianism is not of it as being on the right -- and, certainly, I myself do not consider myself on the right -- but perhaps dissent on the non-left; we can put it that way.

And I don't think I have fundamental disagreements with Henry. I strive to avoid the kind of wishful thinking that the blogger Matt Yglesias has named "the pundit's fallacy," which is that the best way for politicians to win is to adopt the policy ideas that I think are substantively best. So, this conflation of good ideas with popular ideas is something that's a great temptation for Washington pundits -- and almost always leads them into error.

So, I don't want to assert that the Republican Party would profit handsomely by a huge turn in a radical Libertarian direction, because I know many of the views that I have are not popular -- or, at the very least, are not so attractive as to be the basis of a winning political campaign.

Nonetheless, I would say that, even if it's not terribly realistic to think that the Republicans are going to win by amping up their Libertarianism to 11, I do think that you can say that Libertarians can get into trouble when they veer too much away from the Libertarian traditions on economics -- and, also, if they deviate too far in military adventurism --

that is, they can alienate Libertarian and Libertarian-leaning Republicans that usually vote for them.

So, we see in the results published today, an overwhelming identification with Republicans, relative to Democrats, amongst Libertarians. So, there's no way that Libertarians are part of the Democratic base. But they are not a reliable part of the Republican base, either.

And I think you can see that more clearly if you look not just at this current snapshot, but you look at things over time. Here, I'm going to lean on some studies that were done -- one of the coauthors is in the audience -- by David Kirby and Mike Olig; at Cato, David Boaz. One's called "the Libertarian Vote," and the other is called "the Libertarian Vote in the Age of Obama." They're two studies published by the Cato Institute. I think one was in 2006; the other was in 2010.

But they did a similar exercise of inferring a Libertarian constituency from polling data, and then examined how that constituency voted in different elections. And the general rule was for Libertarians to vote for Republican presidential candidates or Republican candidates for Congress -- around 70/30 -- but it didn't always hold that way.

So, on the presidential side -- so in 1988, it was 74/26 for the Republican, but in 1992, it was 35 for the Republican, 33 for Perot, 32 for Clinton -- so a big move away from George H.W. Bush, who was not at all popular amongst small-government conservatives and Libertarian-leaning

conservatives.

Likewise, Libertarians went big for George W. Bush in 2000 - 72 to 20. But by 2004, that support had retreated to 59/38.

For House candidates, Senate looks the same. In 2000/2002, it was 73/23, 70/23. But then 2004/2006, as the Iraq War dragged on, as spending was going through the roof, et cetera, now it was Republicans 53/44, 54/46. So, those are big 20-point swings away from the Republican, and here, this group was something in the 15 percent of the electorate. So, 20 percent of 15 percent is, you know, three percent.

That often is the margin of a presidential election, so I would say that this is not an irrelevant constituency. It's not so tucked into the base that it's so inframarginal that nobody will ever court it; on the contrary, the fact that it is not a reliable part of the Republican base means that there are incentives, if not to actively court it, at least not to push it away.

MR. DIONNE: And, Henry, what I wanted to ask you is, A, to reply to that, but, B, at times, from your presentation, I can't quite tell whether your warning to Republicans is, "Don't move too far away from social conservatism, or you'll blow up a big piece of your constituency," or, "You need to embrace a bit more government interventionism on behalf of the less well-off, or you're never going to win an election."

Maybe you're saying both things at the same time, but I'm trying to -- if you could tease that out, with reference to some of this data --

MR. OLSEN: Let me just quickly respond to Brink, which, again, I don't think we have a lot to disagree about.

The one thing I would say is, I've read the Boaz and Kirby reports, and I think what you note at the end is that what they come up with is a 15 percent Libertarian share, which is significantly larger.

The reason they do that is because they base their characterization on the answers to either -- I think on one sphere, they did two or three questions; and the other, three or four. But they were very broad, general, theoretical questions that didn't get into practical applications of them.

So, I think somebody basically said that they were the sort of questions that you would understand why a Libertarian would answer all of them, but they were at the theoretical level.

And I think what happened there is, because they were at that theoretical level, you attracted the sort of Libertarian leaner who, in fact, is very different from the hardcore Libertarian.

So, again, when we use the term -- what I was trying to say was, don't talk about liberty. No, don't be stupid. What I was trying to say was, there's a particular consistency and intensity that characterized the person who was a full-throated, consistent Libertarian -- that the Libertarian leaner -- or, in this case, part of that 15 percent -- do not share that.

So, to say that, as here in Washington, most of the people

who argue that they're Libertarians are, in fact, consistent Libertarians -- and they are -- although you're not, many of the people who share your background are saying, "Be more like me."

And what I'm trying to say is, that won't win you votes.

There may be policy reasons, but if you're doing it for political reasons, the people who are Libertarian sympathizers are, in fact, substantively different than Libertarians -- and that means that you need to think about how to talk to each group separately, as opposed to thinking that they're all dumped together, in, like, some big, untouched pool of voters that we were never aware of before.

To answer your question, E.J., you know, I do a lot of writing, and I'll be fleshing this out more. What I think the Republican Party will need to do to win national elections is to have an understanding that it is not theoretically inappropriate to be where you're going to end up practically -- which is to say, no Republican candidate actually runs on a platform -- not even Rand Paul -- that would substantially dismantle in a short period of time the advances of the New Deal and the Great Society.

They may fundamentally transform the nature of those programs, but they will not fund, you know -- so a Republican says, "I'm against redistribution." No Republican runs on a program that is consistently against redistribution. School vouchers is redistributionist. Premium support in Medicare is redistributionist. Social Security private accounts is, depending on how you define it, in some way,

redistributionism.

Again, that would depend on whether it's a topped-off private account or, you know, a blended, you know, two percent, plus -- you know, Bush's thing of two percent into private accounts, plus another smaller benefit is, in fact, just a smaller form of redistribution.

So, if the Republican conservative movement is, in fact, going to be talk about a government that -- one of the things I said at Heritage to amplify this is that if you take the Paul Ryan and the Heritage Foundation budget -- they differ in one percent of GDP; I think Heritage was at 18, and Ryan was at 19 -- and you take government the size of Texas -- that virtually everybody in the conservative movement would stand up and say, "Yeah, I want my government to be the size of Texas."

That gives you a government of 27 percent of GDP -- because Texas's state GDP share is about eight or nine percent, and 18 percent at the federal level. That's big government. It's lots of redistribution going on.

So, if that's where the right is, perhaps we should think of a theory that actually lets us govern that 27 percent and in a way that lets people know that we have their interests at heart, and that we're not really uninterested in the thing that we purport to be reformed.

MR. DIONNE: Bless you.

I want to bring in Bill Galston, who has a comment. I've got to excuse myself in just a second; Robbie will take over. I'll be right back.

MR. GALSTON: Well, you know, Henry almost buried the lead -- but not quite. So, you know, let me put it back on the table, because I just think it's an extraordinarily interesting proposition.

I think we all know how the Pledge of Allegiance ends: "with liberty and justice for all." And I take Henry to be arguing -- and I'm just going to restate what he said -- that the right has spent too much time talking about liberty, and too little time talking about justice.

And, you know, the idea of a theory of one's actual practice, if one's actual practice is incontestably redistributionist, is the cashing out of that general proposition.

So, here is my question -- and I think it is a question to Henry -- okay, if Republicans ought to be talking less about liberty -- or the right ought to be talking less about liberty and more about justice, then what is the right's theory of justice -- or what should it be, in your view? And how does that theory differ from the left's?

MR. OLSEN: Well, first, I'll refer you to my book.

MR. GALSTON: Yeah, but that's you.

MR. OLSEN: But I was at the Reagan Library over the weekend, and so what I realized was that, while I was sobbing away, watching beautiful California sunset nine years ago, as his casket was being left -- that was actually at the Reagan Library, so I got to visit that site, and I took a picture of his epitaph.

And I'm trying to read it here. It says, "I know in my heart

that man is good, and that what is right will always eventually triumph. And there is value and worth in each and every life." Okay, that's Ronald Reagan's final words to all of us.

And what I would say is that's a conservative theory. That is a conservative argument. And if you look at the words and actions of Ronald Reagan, from the minute he stands up on the stage in 1964 to the minute he died, he was somebody who talked about that.

And one of the things I say is that if you look at the '64 speech of Goldwater that made him a conservative hero, he endorsed the expansion of health insurance through federal power for poor seniors. He said he opposed what would become Medicare, because it was a one-size-fits-all program, but he was for a federal program to make sure that anyone who was old and couldn't afford it would be able to afford health insurance.

Now what comes out when you read Reagan is that there's a theory of desert, and effort, and liberty that combines together into what would be recognized as more of a non-socialist soft welfare state, as opposed to the top-down, regulatory command-and-control Wilsonian American or a social Democratically-inspired approach in Europe.

That is distinctly a different philosophy. It is one that enhances. It believes that the producer has innate value, and a consequently confiscatory tax rate and regulations that seem to be punitive, rather than dealing with some legitimate public problem hurts that

person's value.

And they're also turning to the side and saying that we have no responsibility to collectively help somebody who can genuinely help themselves, but has fallen on hard times -- that is also not treating that person with appropriate value.

It is something that combines different conservative intellectual strands, but has something I think is uniquely American, and that would actually give clear policy direction to the different strands of the Republican Party.

MR. DIONNE: Thank you. Robbie wants to add a point. I want to repeat, by the way, that the hashtag is #AVS2013.

There are some questions that have come in. I'm going to ask questions that come in that way, but Robbie wanted to make a point, and then I'm going to go to the audience.

MR. JONES: I just want to make one point that came up about the scale. I just want to make sure I -- this is clear from the appendix, if you want to dive into it. But one thing that we deliberately chose to do when creating the scale -- and, hence, the definition of what counted as a Libertarian -- is that we did not include measures of abortion or same-sex marriage in the scale itself, right?

And one of the reasons why we chose not to do that is because this has become so partisan and so polarized in the current debate that we wanted to let those issues fall where they would, using the

scale.

So, that's one of the reasons why I think they may be skating a little differently than we see, but I think it's also a window into how the left/right movement skews, right -- what might be a consistent Libertarian world view. There's a gravitational pull, I think, that our conservative-to-liberal politics plays, even on, you know, a Libertarian constituency or impulse -- I love that word, "impulse" -- that's, in many ways, swimming against the current, right, of this kind of left/right pull.

And then only other thing, just to flesh out, and then we'll get some questions in -- on the communalist, mentioned sort of that they're more, I think, diverse, but the two religious groups that make up a majority of communalists are Catholics and African-American Protestants, right? So, that's a kind of division among communalists, versus white, mainline Protestants and the unaffiliated anchoring the Libertarians.

And then, finally, they're older. And then the other thing is just gender is playing a huge role here, right? 61 percent of communalists are female, right? 2/3 of Libertarians are male. So, there's a huge gender divide running right through all the dynamics that we're talking about here today.

MR. DIONNE: I told Robbie I was grateful for his survey, because it confirms something I had been telling my Libertarian friends for many years, which is, Libertarianism was the perfect ideology for a reasonably well-off white male in his 20s. And there's quite a bit of

support for that view in the data.

Let's go to the gentleman in the back, right there. You're just the first hand I saw.

Again, #AVS2013, for those of you out there in Twitterland.

MR. GRINDSTAFF: Hi -- Hugh Grindstaff.

The Libertarian view I noticed on the use of military force is limited; the communalists, a little bit more expanded. But did you survey the thought of military service by the Libertarians?

Thank you.

MR. JONES: Yeah, no, we don't have a question on military service. We were actually talking about this beforehand, and one of the things we see in the data is that there's not much appetite in the American public overall for a kind of large interventionist, you know, footprint. And we're sort of seeing the public opinion skew generally that direction.

And military service would have been a really interesting one to ask about, but we don't have a question about it.

MR. DIONNE: That lady in the -- right there. Please, yes -- you.

MS. GROSSMAN: Hi -- Cathy Grossman, from Religion News Service.

MR. DIONNE: Yes; welcome.

MS. GROSSMAN: Thank you.

The question about the sort of outline position on gay

marriage -- it was proposed that perhaps this is because it's not about the gays; it's about the government. They don't think the government should be legalizing marriage of any sort.

But does the gender gap also explain this? I don't know, overall, what the male/female breakdown is in society about gay marriage.

MR. DIONNE: I'm going to pass that to Brink while Robbie looks up that breakdown.

By the way, one of our tweeters, Michelle Diggles of Third Way, had a question along these lines. She wrote, "I don't understand how Libertarians can square their political views with opposition to marriage for gay couples."

So, if you could deal with both those questions --

MR. JONES: So, I got -- the gender split in the general population on allowing gay and lesbian couples to marry is -- men are basically divided on the question -- 48 to 47, 48 favor. Women are 55 in favor and 41 opposed. So, yes, there's --

MR. DIONNE: Women more pro?

MR. JONES: Yes, yes. Yeah, yeah.

MS. BOWMAN: That's been consistent historically.

MR. JONES: Right. And we see that, actually, in age groups, too. Even among millennials that are 18 to 29-year-olds, who are overwhelmingly in favor, there is still a gender gap -- even among millennials -- on this question. That's maybe playing some role here, as

well.

So, we got young men in this group, but there's still a gender gap, even amongst the youngest Americans, on this questions.

MR. LINDSEY: Yeah, so I think that's probably a big part of this, is that it's not the right skew; it's the male skew of the Libertarian group being asked the question about gay marriage.

But, again, just to play this out a little bit more -- there are people doing Libertarian stuff on the left all the time -- people pushing for drug legalization, Colorado and Washington people fighting against the building of a wall on the Mexican border, and fighting for freer entry of people into our country, people who were up in arms about military adventurism in the last decade. But they never call it Libertarian. So, they just say they're being liberal or progressive.

The time the word "Libertarian" is used is when conservatives are doing Libertarian things -- or at least talking about Libertarian things.

And so, to the extent that word has entered in the vocabulary, it's got a right-of-center valiance, and I think that, therefore, people who sort of come under the sway of that impulse are probably skewed to the right these days, because there's more appetite for that term on the right than there is on the left.

MR. DIONNE: Why don't we do sort of a couple -- this gentleman right here on the aisle, and then the gentleman back there, and

this gentleman here.

MR. ALTMAN: Hi. I'm Fred Altman.

I wonder what economic data you have. In *the Post* this morning, it indicated that a lot of the support for the Tea Party and related activities comes from areas of the country that are more economically distressed than the rest. And I wonder how much of this data would be interpreted in terms of the economics of the respondents.

MR. OLSEN: Thank you.

I read that story a little differently. I'm not sure they said it comes from areas where there's economic distress, but, rather, a lot of people in those areas who are Tea Party explained the distress in terms of Obama -- although I think it is -- you know, because I think the red states - - I'm trying to remember; are the red states doing better or worse than the blue states?

And on balance, I think, the blue states tend to be better off, but I'm not sure they're better off in this recession.

So, there may be truth to it accidentally. But, anyway, Robbie can pick up on that question.

MR. JONES: Yeah. Well, one of the more interesting things, I think, from the survey is that we did not see huge regional differences. So, in the West, there weren't great, you know, Libertarian concentrations in the West. They looked pretty evenly distributed, as Henry mentioned -- sort of, you know, evenly distributed across -- so not

heavily concentrated in the South.

There are also --

MR. OLSEN: Tea Partiers are more Southern, yeah.

MR. JONES: A little more in the South, yeah, but Libertarians, much more evenly spread out across the country. That goes for urban/rural divides, too. We looked at those, as well, and not huge differences, urban/rural, either.

MR. DIONNE: The gentleman right there, next to you.

Yeah, thank you.

MR. BRODSKY: Hello. I'm Mark Brodsky, retired physicist and CEO.

Brink Lindsey mentioned an intriguing word when he was talking about rules about marriage by government, or God, or otherwise. And he mentioned contracts. And Libertarians believe in letting it just be a contract.

My question is, how do contracts fit into Libertarian, in the sense of, who enforces them?

MR. DIONNE: Thank you -- a classic question.

MR. LINDSEY: Yes. So, the Libertarian view is that that's the state's job. The state's job is to protect private property, protect persons from bodily harm, and to enforce contracts.

There is then the group that says, "You're sellouts. You're wimps," and that's the anarcho-capitalist group who thinks that contract

enforcement and justice provision can be done by private agencies, as well.

So, again, from my own perspective, I think that the legal status of marriage is so deeply ingrained in our society, and there are so many implications to that status that that's the question we have to deal with today -- is that status being made available to people in a discriminatory or nondiscriminatory basis? And I'm for it being made available in a nondiscriminatory basis.

But, again, there are Libertarians who object to the whole idea of state involvement in marriage, and would like to see it handled on a purely sort of *ad hoc* basis, that whatever couples or groups of people who want to bind themselves in some sort of long term, legal relationship, they ought to be able to do it as they wish.

MR. DIONNE: This gentleman -- thank you.

MR. WEBBER: Yeah -- Doug Webber.

In looking at these numbers here, recognizing that 73 percent of the conservatives, 61 percent of liberals, and 65 percent of all Americans, plus 58 percent of Libertarians would like to see pornography access curtailed, I'm wondering, do you see any possibility of having a U.K.-type opt-in/opt-out policy, or since the majority of members are male in Congress, does that throw it out?

MR. DIONNE: Somebody explain the question. I'm naïve about pornography, I guess. The opt-in/opt-out --

MR. JONES: Yeah, David Cameron has brought something that, rather than having pornography automatically accessible, you will actually have to opt-in in order for it to be accessible, which is different from simply curtailing it from the national level.

MR. DIONNE: That sounds politically very shrewd to me, but I don't know if there are any views on this.

MR. LINDSEY: I've not heard anything about someone proposing this for the United States. I imagine it would meet a buzz saw of opposition from a whole bunch of different fronts.

So, in general, I think people tell pollsters stuff about sex that makes them feel good about themselves, and maybe it's not exactly what they're going to think when changes in laws are being discussed.

But, at any rate, I would think that here's an area where the Libertarian streak in American politics is going to probably carry the day.

MR. DIONNE: The great line during Prohibition is they pray for Prohibition, and then they vote for beer. And there's a lot of that going on.

This lady way in the back has had her hand up for a while -- yes, ma'am. There's a mic for you.

QUESTIONER: My name is (inaudible). I am a Harvard University Ph.D. and Arabic Language Fellow -- returned Peace Corps volunteer from Uzbekistan.

And my question is, for those of us who (inaudible) a

Libertarian concern -- if we get sued, CDT4, what does the party now recommend?

MR. LINDSEY: I'm sorry; I didn't understand the question. If you get sued, what?

QUESTIONER: For those of us who come in and take a look at big government for the U.S. Catholic Church, it's hell. If we get sued, a CDT4, what does the Libertarian Party recommend?

MR. LINDSEY: Okay. I have nothing to do with the Libertarian Party, and I don't know what CDT4 means.

QUESTIONER: Okay, thank you.

MR. DIONNE: Right there -- the gentleman right over there -
- yeah, with the glasses. Just -- your hand shot up so fast that -- yeah, right -- yes, that -- the glasses behind. Yeah, there are a lot of glasses around. I'm a gentleman with glasses.

QUESTIONER: For the regarding the tougher laws and regulations to protect the environment -- 73 percent of Libertarians opposed that, and 75 percent of liberals support it -- almost an exact opposite.

But climate change, by definition, would be harmful to others -- something that Libertarians would usually come out on the side of the state to protect. Is it such a partisan issue, as far as left/right goes, because of that, or does it have to do with the fact that, like, Al Gore, the guy who propagated the whole idea was a liberal himself? That's been

argued.

What is the Libertarian view on curbing climate change?

MR. LINDSEY: Asking what is the Libertarian view on anything is never the right question. Put 10 Libertarians in a room, and you'll have 13 different versions of Libertarianism, at each others' throats.

So, in general, Libertarians are suspicious of the need for expansive new regulatory regimes and taxes, and, therefore, are sympathetic to readings of climate science, which find that there isn't a need for such dramatic action in the here and now.

Likewise, people who are generally cool with the need for government to keep things in line may be much more likely to think that climate science is offering a reason for big government involvement.

So, I think, basically, out there in the public, you know, people have their ideology first, and then their science follows from that.

But even if one accepts -- and I have no reason to contest the scientific consensus that there's anthropogenic global warming -- I still think that the proposed means for doing anything about it in the United States have a lot of problems.

So, in particular, we had the whole carbon emissions trading scheme, which looked like a real Rube Goldberg device that was going to be shot through with exceptions -- that was going to be a lot of actually favoring particular industries and disfavoring others, without having, really, any discernible impact on global climate, because it's just affecting the

U.S. economy.

So, I think you don't have to get to the scientific questions to have a policy view on these questions. So, I'll just say that.

MR. DIONNE: By the way, just on this ideological question - or the loading of Libertarian that you mentioned -- in this survey, what's so interesting is, Libertarians kind of look like America. 32 percent of self-described Libertarians also call themselves conservative, 36 percent call themselves moderate, and 31 percent call themselves liberal. So, they are scattered almost perfectly.

Sir -- Mr. Mitchell?

MR. MITCHELL: Thanks. I'm Garrett Mitchell, and I write *the Mitchell Report*.

And I want to say that my first reaction in the sort of topline reading of this survey was -- as opposed to Brink's observation about Libertarians kind of relatively happy with things the way they are, et cetera -- was that this must have become a terrible place for white evangelicals to live. You look at their scores on everything, and they're really very unhappy about almost everything.

The question that I've been sort of thinking about, in terms of the litany of opinions expressed here is, I was thinking about the work that Michael Sandel has been doing recently on justice, which Henry mentioned.

And in particular, the important observation, I think, that he

makes about how we are migrating from being a market economy to a market society, which adds an important dimension to this notion about, you know, the genie factor, and what's happening with wealth in this country -- that it is giving people access to everything from HOV lanes to, now, upgrades in prisons, et cetera.

Where the -- not just Libertarians, but the groupings that you've talked about this morning -- would see themselves on that issue, or on that question that Sandel is raising about the move from a market economy to a market society, and the implications to what that means to a democracy? I mean, what would Libertarians -- having said there's no such thing as a position -- but I'm just interested to get a sense of where Libertarians and the others measured in this survey might be on that Sandel question.

MR. LINDSEY: Yeah, I'm not sure I've got a concrete answer for you. I mean, I have to try to think a little bit more -- and maybe more than I can do on my feet right now about what all is loaded into -- what it means for it to be a market society, right -- from a market economy to a market society. I'm guessing that could mean a whole lot of things.

I don't know -- if you could help me sharpen it up to, like, okay, that would mean this. I don't know -- Bill, you got a take on this?

All right; pass it to Bill, then.

MR. GALSTON: Well, I mean, you know, the core idea of a market society, as Sandel construes it, is that, almost without exception,

everything is for sale, right -- that everything is within the sphere of exchange, and its worth is equivalent to its value in the market, period, full stop.

And I think a lot of people have an instinctive aversion to the idea that, for example, transplant organs should go to the highest bidder -- just to take a classic Sandel example.

But here's the problem: You know, the late comedian Henry Youngman asked what I think is the single most important principle of politics in a politically incorrect joke, which I will now take the liberty of repeating. It's a two line joke.

Line one: "How's your wife?"

Line two: "Compared to what?"

And compared to what is always the right question. And if people have to choose between a market society and a government society -- if those are the two choices on offer -- and if government remains as unpopular as it is now, I think the center of gravity of American politics would lead us toward a market society, willy-nilly -- a trend that I'm unhappy about. But I think that's what's going on right now.

If the alternative to exchange is government regulation or government prescription, government is going to have to get a lot more popular and a lot more effective and efficient in order to come out the systematic winner in that trade.

And there is, of course, an additional view -- that neither

coercion nor exchange is the right principle for society. But there has to be a third motivating principle -- you know, call it "unforced reciprocity," or something of that sort.

But that is in very short supply, regrettably.

MR. DIONNE: This gentleman over here, and then I want to ask a -- all the way in the front; I'm sorry.

MR. ARVOS: Actually -- sorry.

MR. DIONNE: Go ahead.

MR. ARVOS: Can I answer a question?

MR. DIONNE: Yeah.

MR. ARVOS: All right -- Matthew Arvos. I have a question.

I believe the Virginia gubernatorial election was brought up, and it's kind of going back to the demographics -- the fusionism. Mr. Cuccinelli tried to combine the Tea Party social conservative Libertarian wing -- and, yeah, he was endorsed by Ron Paul/Rand Paul, and it sort of backfired.

And Mr. George Will wrote a column endorsing Mr. Robert Sarvis, saying he's the true conservative Libertarian. And it appears that Mr. McAuliffe, the Democrat, is going to win next week, and it's kind of that split happening.

I was wondering if you have any comments on that.

MR. DIONNE: Can we hold that? I want this gentleman to come in, and then I want to ask a closing question that's related to your

question. So, thank you.

MR. de JANEIRO: Raphael de Janeiro -- briefly, Karlyn, could you speak to the Libertarian gender gap? I think it was kind of extraordinary we took half the population off the table at the very beginning of this event.

And for anybody -- to what extent are these snapshot poll results amenable to conversation? I'm not a Libertarian; I'm not a Ron Paul supporter, but I think he did an incredible service in just standing up in the Republican debates in 2012, talking about interventionism.

One could argue that the fact that we're not at war with Syria right now is a result of what he did. And some of these things can be changed by people being educated.

MR. DIONNE: Thank you, sir. Let me just -- in terms of the Virginia race, put the question I wanted on the table.

I mean, just briefly, I think that Cuccinelli is so identified with social conservatism that that has been a primary reason why he's running so weakly -- although it's worth nothing that he's also being hurt by other kinds of conservatism, like gun control, and that I think that in Northern Virginia, if the party goes too far to the right -- either to the Tea Party right or the Libertarian right -- I think it threatens itself among middle-of-the-road, suburban voters.

But that leads me to what I was going to add to this list, which is -- I found your numbers on 2012 really fascinating, and, before

we go, we can't lose the punditry opportunities.

MR. JONES: 2016, you mean?

MR. DIONNE: I mean 2016; thank you. See, I'm still trying to work in the '50s. I've still got that in my head -- particularly revealing -- and I'll let you go last; I'll just go down the panel, because I know Bill has to leave -- is the split between the Libertarians and the Tea Party folks.

The Cruz/Paul split was really interesting. And Christie having relatively equal support across the board -- there was something very interesting about that. I'd just like you to explore that.

Can I start with Bill for any closing comments on these questions or anything else, so that you can get out in a timely fashion?

MR. GALSTON: Well, since you asked about 2016, E.J., let me just share with you some very remarkable candidate-centered findings from this survey -- specifically about Chris Christie.

You know, there's always been a question as to whether the kind of support across the board that he enjoys in New Jersey could be taken national. And according to this survey, the answer would appear to be yes.

I mean, consider the following: Among Democrats, Christie enjoys 38 percent favorable to 35 percent unfavorable. You can't find a lot of other Republicans, you know, who are going to enjoy those sorts of favorables among Democrats. Among liberals, he gets an even split -- 41/42.

If a candidate like that were able to make his way through a Republican primary, said candidate would be a formidable foe in the general election.

MR. DIONNE: Thank you.

Why don't I just go right up the line, and anybody -- either on Virginia, or on this gentleman's question on Paul -- or anything else. Henry?

MR. OLSEN: Yeah, on the 2016 question -- it didn't surprise me too much. You know, Libertarians can see where Ron Paul's heart is. The Tea Party, if anything, is characterized by anger and a willingness to fight at all costs -- and, certainly, Ted Cruz has, in the last few months, jumped to the forefront on that.

But, you know, don't forget that when we actually see a nominating process, momentum is important, positioning is important, and there are two factions of the Republican Party -- the moderates and the evangelicals -- who do not have an obvious champion right now.

It wouldn't be shocking to me if there was not somebody who would be an evangelical first choice, since every four years, somebody comes out to claim that mantle -- whether it's Mike Huckabee or, oddly enough, the pre-Vatican II Rick Santorum became the evangelical choice in 2012.

So, when that happens -- right now, everybody is competing either for the Republican establishment, the Libertarian faction, or the Tea

Party faction -- that basically leaves 45 to 50 percent of the Republican Party unrepresented. When somebody comes up and grabs that mantle, all these numbers will change.

MR. LINDSEY: Nothing surprising about Rand Paul coming first amongst Libertarians in 2016, handicapping. He's certainly, amongst those potential candidates, the one most sounding Libertarian themes, and most trying to inject new Libertarian themes into the Republican Party.

On the Virginia election, I'll confess I haven't been following it very closely, because, well, I have a sensitive stomach.

But I did read something in Slate yesterday that said that the McAuliffe campaign was saying that Sarvis was a net negative for them. So, I don't know if that's true, but that's interesting that it's not just that this is a straight defection from the Cuccinelli camp -- that Sarvis is drawing from both sides.

MR. DIONNE: And, Karlyn, I'd love you to take up the male question -- and female.

And if I can just add to that real quick -- it struck me, looking at polls for a long time, that these are, in some ways, artificial dimensions, but if it's liberty v. compassion -- men tilt liberty; women tilt compassion -- if it's individualism/community -- men tilt individualism; women tilt toward community -- is that sort of broadly right?

MS. BOWMAN: That's absolutely right. I mean, the gender gap is a hardy perennial of our politics. You see it in virtually every

demographic group, but I've never seen it as large as this Libertarian gender gap. That's just huge in terms of the gender gap overall.

Quick question -- Henry mentioned momentum and positioning, and he contends that these are also really important in these early primaries. And I'd say, at this point, Rand Paul and Ted Cruz look to be at least leading candidates.

MR. OLSEN: Thank you.

MR. JONES: Well, one of the things I love is that we get to talk about Michael Sandel and other kinds of, you know, big ideas. But, you know, one other one I'll just throw out here is this (inaudible) on the gender gap -- it's back to the kind of Kohlberg/Carol Gilligan debates in psychology, and what counts for sort of justice, and what counts for, you know, right treatment of others.

And the gender differences in those studies that had, you know, to do with women taking -- or, you know, girls in those studies taking relationships and the context more into account, and men were like, "No, this is right. It's always right. This is what it is; doesn't matter about the context."

So, some of this may -- in that whole sort of nature/nurture debate about all that -- how much of it is, you know, born, and how much of it is learned?

The other one I just want to point out to so I don't completely skip your question about the market society -- one question we had that

was a big general question that I found astounding -- it's a seven-point scale, and on every point of the scale, the country is evenly divided. So, there's nearly as many ones as there are sevens, as many twos as there are sixes, as many threes as there are fives, as many fours.

Right in the middle is this fundamental question that has two options. The government in Washington should see to it that every person has a good job and a good standard of living, and that's one option. The government should just let each person get ahead on their own is the other option, right?

35 percent -- if you can find all the one through threes -- the government in Washington should see to it that every person has a job and a good standard of living. 37 percent -- the five through sixes -- the government should just let each person get ahead on their own. 25 percent right in the middle, on number four -- so this kind of fundamental divide on this very, very basic question.

And then the last thing -- in Virginia, the last poll I saw was Quinnipiac University of likely voters last week -- had Sarvis polling 11 percent of Republicans and two percent of Democrats in Virginia.

MR. DIONNE: I just want to thank one tweeter -- Daniel Rothchild -- who wrote, "If the questions at #AVS2013 are any indication, Brookings Institution could profitably host a whole event called 'Ask a Libertarian.'" And so I want to thank Brink for being as close as we could to playing that role here.

I want to thank Karlyn, and Henry, and Bill, and, above all, Robbie for providing so much food for thought.

We will keep digging through this data, and hope to have more from you shortly.

So, thank you all very much. Thank you all for coming.

* * * * *

CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

I, Carleton J. Anderson, III do hereby certify that the forgoing electronic file when originally transmitted was reduced to text at my direction; that said transcript is a true record of the proceedings therein referenced; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which these proceedings were taken; and, furthermore, that I am neither a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

Carleton J. Anderson, III

(Signature and Seal on File)

Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Virginia

Commission No. 351998

Expires: November 30, 2016