

THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

2016 PRESIDENTIAL AND CONGRESSIONAL PRIMARIES

Washington, D.C.

Friday, February 26, 2016

PARTICIPANTS:

ELAINE KAMARCK, Moderator  
Senior Fellow and Founding Director, Center for Effective Public Management  
The Brookings Institution

ANNA GREENBERG  
Senior Vice President  
Greenberg Quinlan Rosner Research

AMY WALTER  
National Editor  
The Cook Political Report

DAVID YEPSEN  
Director, Paul Simon Public Policy Institute  
Southern Illinois University, Carbondale

JUAN WILLIAMS  
Political Analyst, Fox News  
Author, *Muzzled: The Assault on Honest Debate*

\* \* \* \* \*

## P R O C E E D I N G S

MS. KAMARCK: Good morning, everyone. I'm Elaine Kamarck. I am a senior fellow here at Brookings and the director of the Center for Effective Public Management. Welcome to this forum today or this discussion today with some truly smart people on the presidential primaries.

We are one day before the South Carolina primary for the Democrats and we are four days before Super Tuesday, the first really big contest in this race. I know it probably seems like this race has been going on forever, but the fact of the matter is that on next Tuesday it really begins in earnest. So far only a miniscule portion of the delegates in either party have been allocated to presidential candidates.

And some people may not know this, but there actually aren't any delegates yet. There aren't any real people yet who are delegates. There's only allocations. There's only awards. So we know that at some point down the road in Iowa, Donald Trump will get a certain number of delegates, but we don't know who they are. So bear that in mind. We are allocating delegates, but we actually don't have real people. This is important because I think one of the things that's probably going to come up today is whether or not we have a brokered convention.

So we're on the precipice of really finding out where this race is going. And we've got some fabulous people here to talk to us about this.

To my immediate left is Anna Greenberg, senior vice president of the Greenberg Quinlan Rosner Research group. They are a longstanding company in Washington, who have been involved in many, many congressional races. Anna was also on the faculty with me at the Harvard Kennedy School not too many years ago.

MS. GREENBERG: Fifteen years.

MS. KAMARCK: Fifteen years ago.

MS. GREENBERG: Not too many.

MS. KAMARCK: Not too many.

MS. GREENBERG: I was a teenager then.

MS. KAMARCK: Not in my life. (Laughter) To her left is David Yepsen.

He's now the director of the Paul Simon Public Policy Institute at Southern Illinois University in Carbondale. And, of course, many of us know him as the premier political reporter for the Des Moines Register for many years, the fountain of all wisdom about Iowa and presidential politics.

To his left is Amy Walter, national editor of The Cook Political Report, one of the most respected political reports out there. And Amy has brought a new energy to the place and we're pleased to have her here.

And then on the very end we have Juan Williams, political analyst of Fox News. You see him often on television. He is also the author of a fantastic book, which I would recommend to you, called *Muzzled: The Assault on Honest Debate*.

So we've got quite a crowd for you this morning. And I'm just going to open it up with a quick question to each of our panelists and then we will have a little discussion and then we'll quickly get to your questions in about 20, 25 minutes.

Let me start with Juan, okay? I thought that one of the best lines from this morning was from Marco Rubio, who said we are not going to turn over the conservative movement to a con artist. What happened last night and did it matter? Will it matter on Super Tuesday?

MR. WILLIAMS: Good morning to everyone. I thought Marco Rubio had a great night last night on the political stage. Finally, he brought the fight to Donald Trump, but it's a matter -- and I think, Elaine, your question suggests this -- of is it too little, too late? Has the horse already left the barn here? And is it possible at this point to

try and mute the Trump effect? And the Trump effect is such, and I think the best quote of the morning, Elaine, is not anything from Marco Rubio, but came from Senator Lindsey Graham, who said the Republican Party has gone, I believe, bat-blank crazy. (Laughter) Is that right? Is that the quote?

MS. KAMARCK: Yes, that's from last night.

MR. WILLIAMS: That's from last night.

MS. KAMARCK: Yeah.

MR. WILLIAMS: But it's all over this morning, even on Fox News, that the Republican Party in the opinion of a stalwart Republican leader is no longer really the party that he knows. So, to my mind, the question then becomes are we living sort of in the age of Trump and is Trump now in charge of the Republican Party? And on so many levels I think that's true.

I think the place I would start is to say that when you see Trump challenged last night in the debate, he's challenged on basic Republican policies. And the question is are you a Republican, Mr. Trump? Are you in line with Republican policies, for example, with regard to free trade? Answer, no. Are you in line with Republican policies as advocated by Speaker Paul Ryan? And, of course, when it comes to issues such as cutting Medicare, Social Security to take care of the debt, answer from Mr. Trump, no. And on and on.

You know, what are you going to do about Obamacare? He says, oh, I'm not going to repeal it. I'm going to get rid of it, but then I'm going to put in place something much better. Well, what is that?

MS. WALTER: Beautiful.

MR. WILLIAMS: Beautiful?

MS. WALTER: Beautiful. It's beautiful.

MR. WILLIAMS: It's going to be beautiful. (Laughter) But I don't know if it's going to be Republican, Amy. That's the thing. I don't know. I don't know.

But I would say this in short, Elaine, that after New Hampshire, South Carolina, Nevada, and going into Super Tuesday, I think the Republican Party is now the party of Trump. I think we're living in the age of Trump. I don't think it's possible to see Donald Trump challenge President Bush on weapons of mass destruction in clear contravention of Republican thought on this issue, and say the man was a liar, say the President was a liar, and have no effect on his political prospects. Not only does he survive what others would see as a fatal misstep, he thrives, he is continuing to thrive and to grow.

I am often reading these days that he is something of New Age Andrew Jackson. Back in the early 1800s, the outsiders President. I've seen people refer to him as William Jennings Bryant, who spoke up for the poor American farmers as victims of Wall Street. Some people like the idea of a businessman, the Henry Ford. Ford was anti-Semitic in the way that Trump is anti-immigrant. But the most recent analogous figures in my political lifetime would be Ross Perot, who talked about that giant sucking sound taking jobs across the border down South, or Pat Buchanan, who also appealed to sort of white, working-class anxiety and discontent and talked about his pitchfork brigade.

Typically, you know, these kinds of populist, angry movements do not end up with someone taking residence on Pennsylvania Avenue. The one exception I would point out, though, would be I think that in the aftermath of the Great Depression FDR, with help from some unlikely characters, you know, Father Coughlin, who was taking control of the radio at that time, really had a strong populist message that became the New Deal, that became an effort to speak against Wall Street, to speak against the banks, even speak against the Supreme Court and say that the system was rigged, and

that he spoke for the people. And in so many ways, of course, FDR remade the Democratic Party of that era. I think that the Democratic Party today is still pretty much in his image. And Trump is, right now, transforming the Republican Party. It's just that at this early stage, it's hard to say is he remaking it for all time?

MS. KAMARCK: Thank you. That was great, including the history.  
Thank you.

Amy, continuing on this same theme, what is it that you know about Trump now that you didn't know when this began?

MS. WALTER: Okay. Well, thank you again for having us. Here's the thing that has struck me the most about Donald Trump and this entire campaign. I've been covering campaigns for a long time and what's the most unique about this isn't just the fact that you have a reality show person dominating the discussion, but I've been most struck by how flatfooted his opponents and the media have been to his rise.

And, again, campaigns aren't really particularly complicated. Your job is to define yourself and define your opponent before they do it to you. There we go, that's how you run a campaign.

We started this campaign and we saw Donald Trump's numbers in a terrible place. He was already defined. He had 100 percent name recognition and he was seen very unfavorably, even among Republicans. I think it started when we started seeing polls first come out in this race when he announced back in June, 60, 65 percent of Republicans thought negatively of him. So, of course, we didn't take him seriously as a candidate. The other candidates didn't take him seriously. It's 65 percent negative and 100 percent name ID. That's called you're not going anywhere. Right?

But then his numbers started to -- as he became a candidate and started saying things people liked and people were attracted to him, his numbers started to turn

around. And even as his numbers started to move up, nobody reacted again. And we're running the campaign, if this were a House race, a Senate race, any other race, you say, gosh, your opponent, who is a billionaire, who's getting a lot of airtime, whose numbers are now starting to turn around, we should probably stop that. We should probably go on the attack. We should probably, I don't know, dump out the 400,000 pages of opposition research there is on this person and the many, many outrageous things he's said and done.

But they didn't because it was, oh, we've got to fight our lane -- we've got to win our lane, then we're going to go after him. He can't win, so we're going to win the establishment vote. I'm going to win the conservative evangelical vote. And then we'll be one-on-one with Donald Trump.

Well, the entire time Donald Trump continued to make the race in his image. I agree with Juan, which is he has made them react to him. And what's remarkable to me is that they let this happen.

And, again, I'm not running. It's easy for me to be in the bleachers and yelling out onto the field. But the very first focus groups I sat in with Republicans thinking about Donald Trump -- or actually let's say this, thinking about this race, two things were very clear.

One, Jeb Bush was not going to be the nominee. He went into this race, much like Donald Trump, with perceptions about him that were already pretty hardened. And this is not the candidate that voters were looking for. In fact, in the very first focus group we sat in that Peter Hart did in October of 2015, Republican candidates when asked who they liked, just looking around, like of all the politicians who would you like to see as President? These are Republicans. They picked Rand Paul and Elizabeth Warren. Okay? (Laughter) Republicans, Elizabeth Warren.

And that goes to Juan's point about the populist, but I think it also went -- they didn't even know their policies. They just knew they were different and they seemed to be authentic. And whatever it was that they were saying, they don't know really what it is, but they seem to believe it. So you could see the seeds sown then for somebody like Trump. You could also see why Bush and his profile were going to be problematic.

But as we moved through this process and Trump started getting more popular, the one thing that kept coming up for voters was I just don't know that he has the temperament to be President. We like what he says and it's kind of funny and we believe him, but finger on the button? Uhh. Unifier? Mm-mm.

Instead, what Republicans did as the way to attack him was, well, he's not a real conservative. Well, he doesn't really believe this. That's okay, but nobody really believes you either because you're a politician. So it doesn't matter. You're the worst messenger of that.

So instead of going after the temperament issue, like, again, we're talking about President, let's go to the temperament, let's go to the ways in which he hasn't helped the little people, let's go to the ways in which his business failures have hurt regular people like you, they went after abortion, the traditional -- again, they ran and were like let's do the traditional conservative issues. That's not enough.

And I agree that it may be too late. Maybe it's not. I mean, the thing I have long thought about Trump was that he had a very solid floor: 25 percent of Republican voters. There was nothing you could do to persuade them. And he was right when he said I could walk down 5th Avenue and shoot somebody and people would vote for me. It's true, 25 percent of voters were never going anywhere. There's nothing you could say to dissuade them.

But there was 75 percent looking for another alternative, and the other

candidates didn't provide that alternative. So as he starts winning, those voters say, well, I don't know, he's a winner. I like winners. Let's get on the bandwagon. The question from this debate is whether he -- "he" meaning Marco Rubio -- can stop the bandwagoners. Not that he's going to make Trump collapse, not that he's going to lose that 25, 30 percent that are with him, but whether they can stop the rest of those voters who right now are sitting at Cruz, Rubio, undecided, and move over to him. And the only way we're going to know the answer to your question about what mattered is -- it's as much March 1st, but really much more the 8th in Michigan and the 15th in Illinois and Ohio and Florida.

MS. KAMARCK: Right. One of the things just to add for our viewers and those in the audience who might not know is that come March 15th, the Republican Party allows for winner-take-all primaries. So March 15th is a big day to watch because if it's still a multi-candidate field, the winner, even a plurality winner, could really rack up a lot of delegates.

David, I wanted to go to you and ask you, you spent many, many years in the first in the nation contest in Iowa, and the early primaries and caucuses, you know, usually what they do is they clear the field a little bit. Can you talk about how that has or hasn't happened this time? Because a lot of people think that, gee, Trump wouldn't be doing so well if there was only one other person in the race.

MR. YEPSEN: Well, I think the early states have cleared the field. There's a lot of candidates who have dropped out, so I think part of the traditional role of these early states to winnow the field of weak candidates and also to elevate some candidates out of obscurity; that process has happened. It's just such a large field.

The second thing, though, is I think the great winnower of this, unfortunately, has been polls. Because the important events of this campaign have been

the debates. The decision of who got into which debate was made by polls and networks. And when you have a celebrity candidate like a Donald Trump, that automatically elevated him to the head of that pack of candidates. So I think the effect of the use of polls, and all of us here especially know the limitation of polls, did sort of supplant the role of grass-roots voters looking at candidates and then rendering a judgment.

Did the debate last night have an effect? Yes, I think it did. And I think we should remember how late a lot of this is breaking. Maybe you can speak to some of this, how many late deciders there are. And there are people who watch that and who will react to that. And it's not -- particularly we think of millennial voters, if they're paying attention at all, I see it in my students, they aren't very engaged, but then they get real engaged at the end. So I think that that is still a question yet to be played out. I'm not quite as -- I don't think it's over with yet.

And I'll just conclude by this. One of my favorite movies is the movie *Bridge on the River Kwai*, 1957. Alec Guinness plays the British colonel who builds the Japanese a bridge. And at the very end of the movie, you'll recall he says, oh, my god, what have I done? And I have a feeling the Republicans have got to have that Alec Guinness moment here and it may come here in the next few weeks. (Laughter)

MS. KAMARCK: Oh, goodness, thank you.

Anna, there's a lot of other races going to happen this year, okay, congressional races, Senate races, gubernatorial races. We're not hearing anything about them. I mean, this presidential race seems to have sucked the air out of everything. Talk to us a little bit about the other races and about the potential impact of the presidential race on those races.

MS. GREENBERG: Thanks. I actually want to follow up on a couple

things that David and Amy said. When we talk about Trump and sort of his rise and not being challenged and the race being defined by him, you left out the media.

MS. KAMARCK: Yes. No, I (inaudible).

MS. GREENBERG: And so you talk about the Republican candidates and then you talk about polls, but polls are not just organic entities on their own. They're used by some people to do something. In this case, I'll give you an example, an early debate at CNN, they changed the criteria for the percentage that candidates had to have in order to get Carly Fiorina into the debate and then ask questions of Carly Fiorina about Trump and what he said about women, and then Carly Fiorina got a bump for three days after that. That was completely manufactured by CNN, so there's a complicitness on the part of the media in sort of helping elevate him. I think he's gotten an unprecedented amount of free airtime. I think people have calculated how many dollars that would be. So I just wanted to make sure we don't leave the media out as being complicit in the rise of Donald Trump.

But, yes, you're right, there are a lot of other races. There is a good chance that Democrats can take back the Senate, which is a big deal if there's no Supreme Court nominee, for example, until the next President is elected. There are competitive races in Pennsylvania, New Hampshire, Illinois, Wisconsin, possibly Ohio. It depends a lot on what happens at the top of the ticket.

And while it's really difficult to take back the House because of gerrymandering, there are seats that there are a lot of people retiring and opening up competitive seats, seats that Republicans hold that Obama won, like, for example, in New York, 19, the Hudson Valley; Pennsylvania, 8; Minnesota, 2; Nevada, 4. So there's a bunch of places where there are open seats or one-term Republicans where Democrats have a chance to pick up some seats, though, again, tough to win it back.

And the other thing I would mention is state legislatures. Republicans hold an unprecedented number of houses and numbers of legislators across the country. Why that matters, in 2020 we'll have redistricting again. And so who holds the state houses and the legislatures is hugely important for what happens in Congress. And presidential years are the best opportunities for Democrats to win back some of those houses, to flip some houses. So there's a lot that is happening.

I would expect all of these races to be very competitive. Now, even though presidential, your turnaround generally favors Democrats, for a couple of reasons. One, there's less enthusiasm by Democrats this year, so turnout in the two caucuses and the one primary so far on the Democratic side have had a -- it's between a 20 and 30 percent drop in turnout. And everything I'm hearing about, you know, for example, the ballots that are being requested in Texas on the Democratic side is that they're at 2012 levels, not 2008 levels. So Democratic turnout is down, Republican turnout is way up.

It's hard to know if that's a function of the fact that -- I did a survey recently where we asked people what are you hearing about the presidential race? And, you know, the vast majority of Democrats and Republicans are hearing about Trump. So it's hard to know if the Republican enthusiasm is because all the attention is on the Republican primary or if it's something that endures through to November. But if it does, that's obviously a big problem for Democrats.

The other piece is that we still have 62 percent of people saying the country's on the wrong track. Democrats are discouraged just as Republicans are about the economy in particular, but also kind of insecurity around the world. But many Democratic base voters feel that this recovery has not lifted their boats and they're a little bewildered at how we could have had a Democratic President for eight years and such a weak recovery. So even though presidential turnout years generally benefit Democrats,

there are some countervailing, I think, factors, particularly around turnout and enthusiasm, that may dampen Democratic turnout, which makes a lot of these places that are states that Obama won highly competitive even in the presidential context.

I also think the thing that we don't know is what the top of the ticket does for down ballot races. I believe a Trump-Clinton match-up is helpful in terms of Democratic turnout. Obviously Hillary Clinton herself has pretty enthusiastic support among minority voters. And I think that there has been an attempt on the part of the Sanders campaign to suggest that it's not enthusiastic and strong, but it is and you'll see that in South Carolina on Saturday and in a lot of the Super Tuesday states. So I actually think there is a well of some enthusiasm for Hillary Clinton, even though she's very well defined and has negative ratings in the general electorate.

But I think Trump also I think will create enthusiasm among Democrats for turning out. In particular, if you look at Latino voters, Latino voters tend to be a little bit -- know a little bit less about politics, a little less interested. They're much less likely to register to vote than whites and African-Americans. But if you look at their level of interest over the fall into the winter, their level of interest in the race has gone up, which I think is probably a function of the racism and xenophobia in the Republican primary contests, particularly as it relates to immigration.

So a Trump-Clinton match-up at the top of the ticket I think potentially works against some of those issues I just raised around turnout and enthusiasm, and potentially helps the down ballot races that I think will be competitive to maybe lean Democratic. On the other hand, a Clinton-Rubio -- and note that I keep saying Clinton because I do not believe Bernie Sanders is going to win the Democratic primary -- a Clinton-Rubio match-up I think is potentially harder for Democrats. Even though Rubio has repudiated his work with the Gang of Eight on immigration, I expect him to go right

back there in the general election. And I think he has a shot at picking up some Latino support. I also think that potentially some millennial support.

I mean, a lot of this depends on how he positions himself for a general election because he's had to move to the right. He already is very right wing. Right? But it's sort of relative. To some other folks on this stage, he seems moderate, but he's not. So, you know, he's going to have to figure out how to -- whether it's on social issues or on issues of race and ethnicity and tolerance and acceptance. On a whole range of different issues where millennials are actually quite progressive, he would have to figure out how to position himself in a general election context. But if he can, and I do think someone of color is better able to do that than someone who's white running on the Republican side, I think that he makes the top of the ticket more competitive and, as a result, the down ballot somewhat more challenging for Democrats.

MS. KAMARCK: Okay. Before we turn to the audience I'd like to just ask everyone in whatever order, maybe starting with Juan, just one simple question. Is Donald Trump the new Ronald Reagan? (Laughter)

MR. WILLIAMS: I think David was speaking about this earlier, so I'm going to cede my time to Dr. Yepsen. (Laughter)

MR. YEPSEN: Well, I don't think so because I think Reagan was a candidate of hope. I think FDR was a candidate of hope. The people you mentioned -- Perot, William Jennings Bryant, Father Coughlin, Huey Long -- these are people in American politics who spoke to anger, fear. I think much of what's going on here with the Trump voter is fear. As Anna said, they've been left behind. People are afraid, afraid of terrorists.

So I think that the formula still works that a successful candidate for the American presidency has to have a hopeful message, an uplifting message, one that

speaks to the angels of our better nature. And so I don't think that Donald Trump is another Ronald Reagan. I do think he's having an impact and he will have an impact as all of these other people we just mentioned have had on American politics. But, no, I don't think so.

MS. WALTER: I also want to just go to the number piece. I completely agree with the optimism piece. And, in fact, if you look throughout history, even recent history, and polling about what Americans say the most important thing to them for the person that they actually end up voting for is the person that they see as the most optimistic. Okay? So there is still, in good times and bad, that underlying issue.

But the most important reason I think that he's not Ronald Reagan demographically is that America looks a lot different today than it did in 1980. So Ronald Reagan did, in many ways, what Donald Trump is doing, which is peeling off white, working-class voters from Democrats. In 1980, it was on cultural and social issues. You had those so-called working-class Democrats who felt like the Democratic Party was moving too far to the left on those issues, and they moved over to Ronald Reagan.

Today, it's more economic, but it's also cultural. But the number of white, working-class men in this country is a lot smaller than it was in 1980, and their percent of the electorate is not as significant as it was in 1980. So in 1980, Ronald Reagan carried 56 percent of the white vote total and he won by 10 points. Mitt Romney won the white vote by 59 percent and he lost by 5 million votes. So just on raw numbers, just the white vote alone, and then you get to white working-class, the number of people who have -- white Americans who had a four-year degree back in the '80s was like 30 percent, it's now closer to 50 percent and climbing.

So the shrinking percent of the electorate is what Donald Trump is going after. And if you win those voters, even if you turn them out at record numbers, you can't

make up for the fact that you're also turning out -- to Anna's point, you know, every action has an equal and opposite reaction -- you're going to turn out more Latino voters against you. You're going to turn out more college-educated voters to vote against Republicans. So every Western Pennsylvania, upstate New York voter that Trump is able to move from D to R, he's likely to lose a suburban Philadelphia mom who would have voted for a Republican or would turn out Latino voter in Florida who might not have been interested in this campaign.

MS. KAMARCK: Great. Anna, did you want --

MS. GREENBERG: Yes. Well, I think another thing that's different is that we're more polarized so that there aren't actually lots of Democratic voters who are available to vote Republican and vice versa, so about 90 percent of Democrats vote for Democrats, about 90 percent of Republicans vote for Republicans. And there are -- even Independent voters who lean towards one party or the other are very reliable voters for that party. So that there's only about 10 percent of people in this country who are what we think of as pure Independents, who really don't lean towards either party. So this persuadable or swing vote is quite small.

And I think that in 1980 there were just a lot more opportunities for someone with an optimistic vision to win. I just don't think that -- I just think that there's very few voters in play and actually turnout ends up being, in some ways, more important than persuading people to vote one way or the other.

MS. WALTER: Yes, and that's the one thing to look at, too. And I'll just make a pitch for my colleague, David Wasserman, put this tool together on 538.com. And it's fun to play with, you can get addicted to it. But basically, it looks at four major ethnic groups, how they voted in 2012, and it allows you to play with that turnout and the percent of the vote that goes to Democrat or Republican. And when you move those

numbers you see which states flip D or R.

It's very rough. I'm sure that the, you know, pollster in you would look at that and go, oh, my god, you're making some big assumptions. But the point being what you see, the very first thing you notice, is that white, college-educated voters turn out at almost 80 percent, at least in this last election they did. White, working-class voters turned out more at like 55 percent.

So it's conceivable that Trump is going to turn out a whole bunch of people, not that they're persuadable, but they never have been engaged in the process, and that would be important. And that he could actually maybe move them 2, 3 points more Republican, not 50 points, but just 2, 3 points. And that would, if nothing else changed, move that turnout up that would flip the Electoral College. But that's assuming that those other things do not change, and that's the danger in that strategy.

MR. WILLIAMS: One last point, Elaine, to come back to your initial point about the Republican Party and is this now the party of Trump, is to say that Ronald Reagan was involved with the Republican Party for a long time.

MS. KAMARCK: Right.

MR. WILLIAMS: I mean, going back to Barry Goldwater and a time to choose, and then the fact that he was challenging Ford in the '70s, and then he comes and I think pushes out another Bush, the Bush at that time, from the nomination to take the 1980 race. But the key point to me is that Reagan at the time was defining conservatism in his image. Trump is trying to now just I think push aside this argument of am I conservative enough. It's that instead that he is the voice of people who are disaffected, people who are angry, people who feel arguably betrayed by the Republican elected officials of our time.

If you look at what happened to John Boehner in this town. If you look at

what continues to happen in terms of Paul Ryan and even Mitch McConnell, I think they live in fear of being primaried by the far right. I don't think Reagan had that trouble. Reagan was defining conservatism in his era.

MS. KAMARCK: That is a great point. And off that point, Juan, I get asked a lot about will there be a brokered convention? And, of course, it is always possible that the voters don't decide and someone will go into Cleveland without a first ballot. The interesting question then is when you have real people who are delegates as opposed to just allocations, will those delegates be Republicans first or will they be a completely new breed of people who are die-hard Donald Trump supporters?

And I think that this question of what's happening below this top level in the Republican Party is sort of a big question. We don't quite know yet until we see who is getting selected as those convention delegates. And, of course, they aren't selected yet.

Let's start with some questions. Oh, boy, we have a lot of questions. And let's work from the back forward. How about the young man over here in the blue-and-white striped sweater? Yes. There should be somebody with microphones around. Right, okay, good.

MR. JOHNSON: Hi, thank you. Demarquin Johnson. I've enjoyed this discussion. Thanks for having it. And I'm interested in your views on polling and how it can become more valuable for campaigns, voters, and yourselves. What are your thoughts on second choice polling? Do you think that would have benefited some of the presidential campaigns to know where they could find more voters, who they should try to push out, and where they can strategize there?

MS. KAMARCK: Anna, you want to take this, being a pollster?

MS. GREENBERG: Sure. Well, I think there's been a lot of discussion

about the polls this year and whether or not they're accurate and whether or not they'll ever be accurate again. And I think there's an important distinction you have to make between polls conducted by the media and reported on by the media and polls that are actually conducted for campaigns, and they are quite different from each other and their purpose is quite different. And you'll have to take my word for it, but the polling that we do for campaigns tends to be much more accurate because we tend to mostly work from voter lists when we conduct our surveys, and a lot of these media polls don't. They do random digit dial and somebody answers the phone and they say are you a voter? Are you going to vote? And so you have a lot of non-voters in those media polls, which is one of the reasons why they sometimes look pretty wacky and sort of different from outlet to outlet.

You also have lots of different methodologies being used in the media polls, so there are IVR polls, which are the automated surveys. You also have a lot of -- more and more online polls. Those samples have really big problems, another reason why you're seeing kind of strange results from place to place and lots of volatility.

But on the campaign side, we tend to conduct our polls on the phone through landline and cell phones. And we use voter lists and we actually use people's actual vote history, so that we talk to people we know actually voted in the last presidential election because that's public information, it's on voter lists. So the campaign polling pretty in-depth and pretty accurate and very strategic. It's the media polling that, in my view, is mostly useless and is there to drive coverage of the race.

MS. KAMARCK: Anybody else have a comment on that?

Okay, right here.

MS. ORCHOWSKI: Thanks. I'm Peggy Orchowski. I'm the congressional reporter for The Hispanic Outlook.

I'm wondering if this is kind of the end of ethnic politics here when you see the diversity of the Republicans. But even more, and this is what I'd like you to speak to, are the millennials. Forty percent of Hispanics now are millennials, and they seem to be what you were talking about in general. Are they millennial first or are they Latino first?

MS. KAMARCK: David, you want to --

MR. YEPSEN: We have seen in the Democratic race that young African-Americans behave a little differently than older African-Americans. Millennials are also -- the millennial of the Obama era, some of them aren't millennials anymore, so there's a constantly changing mix.

MS. KAMARCK: (inaudible)

MR. YEPSEN: I suppose it's a little of both. I mean, people can't escape their heritage nor can they escape their age. So, in some ways, they're going to behave maybe differently than their elders, but, on the other hand, they still are who they are.

And I saw this watching in the Iowa caucuses early, watching Marco Rubio and to a certain extent Ted Cruz. They were aspirational to a lot of younger Republicans. They liked seeing -- thinking of themselves as being tolerant. The same thing we saw in the Democratic Party in 2008 with Obama, the first African-American. I was always struck by how a lily white state like Iowa helped elevate Barack Obama, the first African-American President, in 2008. And in this cycle the Republican electorate in that state helped to elevate two Latinos in Cruz and Rubio.

MR. WILLIAMS: I just wanted to jump in there and say that in Nevada, you might remember that Trump said he won the Latino vote. But once you dive down, you realize it was I think 8 percent, right? And if you then ask the question about the

universe of Latinos in the state, well, gee whiz, I think it's 85+ percent are Democrat. Right? So we're talking about a small group of a small group.

And overall what you see among Latinos in this time of strong anti-immigrant fervor in the Republican ranks is a movement away from identifying as Republicans. When Reince Priebus, the chair of the Republican National Committee, did his autopsy after the '12 election, he talked about the need for greater outreach and in specific to the Latino community because of potentially shared values with regard to family, business, entrepreneurship, and the like. I think that the strong anti-immigrant refrain has essentially nullified all of those efforts and especially in the person, in the campaign of Donald Trump, which right out the door said, you know, so many of these Mexican immigrants are rapists and thieves and the like.

But to me, it comes back to almost a personal core issue, which is that even as you see higher rates of intermarriage for Latinos than you would for blacks and, therefore, you see greater emphasis on assimilation and, again, great potential for someone to say, oh, that's another white person, not a Latino or a Hispanic, you certainly could say that about Cruz and Rubio, it's also the case that people will say that's my grandmother you're talking about that you want to deport. That's my family that you want to break apart. That becomes very personal and I think, no pun intended, that trumps (Laughter) the instinct that millennials might have to say, well, you know, I identify with this other struggle.

MS. KAMARCK: Let's see, right here. Right here.

MR. MILBANK: Thank you. I'm Dana Milbank. I'm president of the David Yepsen Fan Club. (Laughter)

So this Anna Greenberg, with whom I'm not familiar (Laughter), takes a very dim view of the media and says that we've been complicit in the rise of Trump and

we use a lot of lousy polling. So I wanted to ask the others on the panel for their view and how they would grade the media in this cycle. I particularly wonder if Juan wants to be so bold as to venture how his outlet has covered it and how you all view the others.

MR. WILLIAMS: Sure, why not? I step in it all the time. (Laughter)

I was interested in listening because I think that was it Gallup last time, Anna, that just, you know, had a terrible go. Terrible go. In fact, say that they no longer will do this kind of polling because they had such a terrible go. Well, they are not a media outlet. Right?

But you're talking about polling that's done for the candidates, is that what you're saying?

MS. GREENBERG: There's two categories. There are polls that are commissioned directly by media outlets, so Fox commissions its own research, et cetera. And then there are the institutions, like Quinnipiac and PPP, that push out poll after poll after poll, which are breathlessly reported on without any questions about the source of the sample, are you actually talking to primary voters? So both those kinds of polls are kind of I think sort of all over the place in every outlet.

MR. WILLIAMS: Well, I agree with you and I think like Rush Limbaugh will have, you know -- here we are. But I'm saying to my mind I think that it's in the question. So to the president of Anna Greenberg -- oh, is it David Yepsen fan -- I would say, sir, that people ask question from points of view. And I know at Fox you will see questions that, to my mind, are more to the point and from a perspective that you would identify as conservative and, therefore, you get certain responses.

Recently, I'm blocking on this, so maybe someone can help, but there was a question and it got very different responses based on the question, the way the question was worded is what I'm trying to say. And people were confused by this, but,

again, I think that's a reflection of an era of niche media in the American marketplace and then how it plays down in terms of polling.

MS. WALTER: I am definitely not going to defend the media's handling of Trump and I think much of it has been, what's the word, irresponsible and ridiculous. And I think that the rush for clicks and eyeballs has been a big part of this.

At the same time, again, this isn't new. Okay? Guess what, again, campaigns. Guess what, the media likes to cover controversy. Guess what, the media likes stardom. Guess what, the media will take whatever little shiny object you put in front of them. Guess who manipulated that brilliantly? Donald Trump.

So the media would start with a, oh, my god, can you believe this Muslim thing? Oh, that's crazy. Let's ask all his opponents how they feel about the Muslim thing. So we talk about that for a second. And then Donald Trump's like actually I don't want to talk about that anymore. Let's talk about something else crazy, and then we all ran over to cover that crazy.

Instead of the candidate saying you know what? I'm not going to talk about that. You know what I'm going to talk about? Let's go one more, let's make Donald Trump answer about his taxes. Answer your taxes. Just go over and over and over. They could have manipulated it, too. There was so much stuff out there. Oh, Donald Trump, you wanted me to answer Muslims? Fine, this is how I answer Muslims. I'd like Donald Trump to answer for this. Then put that into the media stream. The media would have eaten it up in a minute. Great, let's ask Trump more questions, yay.

Instead, there was this passiveness, like, well, certainly his mocking people, that's going to catch up with him. No, because then he just changes the subject. Do you really believe this? I don't know. I don't know what I was thinking.

Somebody called it -- who was I talking to recently? It's called the dead

cat theory. Right? Like if you are in a conversation and we're talking about something and somebody throws a dead cat in the middle of the table, that's what you're going to be talking about is the dead cat. You're not going to talk about whatever else anybody wants to talk about. And Trump just kept throwing that dead cat in there, we all kept talking about it.

MS. KAMARCK: Yes, David?

MR. YEPSEN: Just real quickly. I think one of the things that hasn't been mentioned here in the media business, and that's certainly where I come from, is reporters make news judgments about who's viable and who isn't. When you have who's going to go somewhere, if someone looks like they might be President, they're given more scrutiny. Early on we, most media people, dismissed this Trump thing. This guy isn't going anywhere. He can't be President. I mean, he's a great celebrity, but we're going to focus our attention on candidates who might be going somewhere.

And so, for example, you saw a lot of early scrutiny of Scott Walker. And he started being vetted as a serious presidential candidate. That process, I don't think, went on as much with Donald Trump. The media narrative has gone from Trump's this kook, he can't possibly win, to, oh, my god, he's inevitable. (Laughter) And at no point in this has there been that normal vetting of his position on issues that has a scrutiny that has gone to other candidates.

MS. KAMARCK: Let's see, the lady right here with the red hair.

SPEAKER: Thank you very much. I'd like to ask about the role of big money and PAC money and the evolution of PACs based on different kinds of reporting. In particular, the sort of Karl Rove, Adelson, names out there, kind of money going into paid advertising. It doesn't seem to have worked very well, but there are also reports that in Iowa and other places increasingly PACs have become sort of parallel campaigns

doing data mining and door-knocking and blah, blah, blahing. So I'd like to ask about the role of big money and how it's evolving from what you've seen so far.

MS. KAMARCK: Let's see, David, do you want to (inaudible)?

MR. YEPSEN: Well, I agree. It's actually been kind of encouraging to me to see we're all fearful that, oh, my gosh, *Citizens United*, we're just going to be awash in money. What will be the effect of that? And, boy, there's sure been a lot of it that was just wasted because it was turned into TV ads, wallpapered these primary states, and a lot of it didn't have effect.

What was almost encouraging to me is some of the most effective money was spent on what? Shoe leather. Using data mining techniques, finding out likely voters, and sending a human being out to actually see another human being and say will you think about this candidate or will you vote for this person, that seems to have had some effect. But the overwhelming amount of money has not had the impact that I thought it would.

MS. GREENBERG: I think on the big money issue, the presidential election's a little bit irrelevant because the amount of attention presidential candidates get rivals anything that they can get from paid ads. I think we have to look below the level of President and that's where it's much more insidious.

Certainly Senate, gubernatorial, congressional, but also -- right, and also recently the state legislative level, and increasingly they mostly carry the negative and they sort of do that job for a campaign, so they can carry the positive and the IEs can carry the negative. But it's also the case that they're -- and David alluded to this -- they're building a sort of field operation funded by the Kochs that could rival what labor unions do. They're investing I think something like \$50 million and building a field program that'll be the shoe leather, the door knocks, the phone calls, which is something they have not

really done before. Traditionally, Democrats are much better at the field, the get-out-the-vote operation.

So it's encouraging that at the presidential level it seems to have no impact. What's less encouraging is it has a big impact below the presidential level and, of course, Republicans outspend Democrats significantly on the Independent side. So when I was talking earlier about what these down ballot races look like, another challenge for Democrats is that below the level of President getting massively outspent.

MS. KAMARCK: And let me just say one of the things we've seen this year is the Democratic bench is not very deep. We just don't have the sort of numbers of people even that could be President. We don't have a lot of governors, et cetera. And I think that's an issue of some concern.

We are, unfortunately, I know this has been a great -- there's lots of interest here because we've got this terrific panel who knows an amazing amount, but we are at the end of our time. So I want to thank Anna and David and Amy and Juan for a terrific panel. (Applause)

\* \* \* \* \*

# 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