

THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

FALK AUDITORIUM

PROGRESS, NOSTALGIA, AND CULTURAL CHANGE:
FINDINGS FROM THE 2016 AMERICAN VALUES SURVEY

Washington, D.C.

Tuesday, October 25, 2016

PARTICIPANTS:

KARLYN BOWMAN
Senior Fellow and Research Coordinator
American Enterprise Institute

E.J. DIONNE, JR.
W. Averell Harriman Chair and Senior Fellow
The Brookings Institution

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

ROBERT P. JONES
Chief Executive Officer
PRRI

HENRY OLSEN
Senior Fellow
Ethics & Public Policy Center

PERRY BACON, JR.
Senior Political Reporter
NBC News

* * * * *

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. DIONNE: Thank you, everyone, for coming today. I think you are about to see this is a fascinating and exciting survey. I'm E.J. Dionne, a Senior Fellow here at Brookings. And on behalf of myself and my friend, colleague and Fellow, Senior Fellow, Bill Galston, I want to welcome you all here today.

This is the sixth year of our partnership with PRRI, on polling, what you will find, I don't want to preclude Robbie Jones' patented excellent PowerPoint, but I just want to say that this survey is extraordinary for showing both how divided we are as a country, and why we are divided, and how much we are going to have to deal with after this election is over. And I'm only hoping that when we, perhaps, do our ninth year together, Robbie will be able to present a survey about how we have come together as a nation. Someday, I'm praying for that, but it's also a side of my confidence in this great partnership.

Bill will introduce our very distinguished panel. I want to thank all of them. I always like to say thank you at the beginning. So that all the people who were so helpful to us to make sure we get thanked. Obviously from our end of Brookings, thanks to Robbie Jones and Dan Cox, they've been wonderful partners. We've had a great time working with them.

I want to thank over at PRRI, Joanna Piacenza, and Jessica Walthall for their support in coordinating the rollout. Robbie, will probably thank some other folks here at Brookings. I want to thank the entire Governance Studies and Events and Media Staff, also our Vice President; and the Head of Program, Darrell West; and thanks to Anna Goodbaum and Liz Sablich; my colleague, Bill; Adam Waters and Mo Batal, for doing a fantastic work.

Robbie Jones is the CEO of PRRI, a leading scholar on religion, culture

and politics. He is the author of *The End of White Christian America*. If you haven't bought Robbie's book yet, you should. It's a really excellent account of -- and it kind of presages a lot of things that are happening in this campaign. He is the author of two other books. He writes a column for the *Atlantic* on politics and culture. He appears regularly in *Faith by the Numbers*, that's a theologically interesting concept; *Faith by the Numbers Segment on Interfaith Voices*.

He is a frequent guest on CNN, NPR and *New York Times*, *Washington Post*, all over -- and many other places. And he is the Co-Chair of the National Steering Committee for the Religion and Politics section at the American Academy of Religion. It's a real joy, once again, to welcome Robbie here to Brookings, to present the findings of this fascinating survey. Robbie Jones? (Applause)

MR. JONES: Well, thanks everyone. Great to see everyone here, on a beautiful day when you could be sitting out in the park, but now you are here. And also I want to congratulate everyone on your stamina for wanting to hear more about the election at this time in the election season.

I want to just begin with a few thank yous of my own. First, to kind of return the gratitude to E.J. and Bill; I think this is actually our seventh year, 2010 to today, so I think it was number 7.

SPEAKER: It's supposed to 2016 minus 10.

MR. JONES: Yes. So we have one more year, right. So, I think we are in our seventh year, this partnership and it's been a really fantastic, one of the things, I think we all agree, one of the most fun things we do every year. I mean, there's a lot of work that goes into this, but the partnership is really fantastic.

I want to thank on our end, the Research Team, Betsy Cooper, Rachel Lienesch, Dan Cox, and also on our Communications Team, Harmeet Kamboj, Jessica

Walthall, and Joanna Piacenza for that.

And then I have a special shout-out here for our cover image today, which I think is maybe fitting with the way this election cycle has kind of gone, the kind of craziness of the election cycle. But I want to credit Robbie Pieta, great name, who is 13 years old and we get this image of Flickr, and what he has been doing is he set up Lego images of the entire primary debate, and would narrow it down every time somebody dropped.

And so this is where he was left with his Lego image staging of the election, so he's up in New Hampshire, and we are going to send him a few copies of the report that he can pass out to all his middle school friends. But anyway, we are saying thank you for this great image. Yes. It's worth a hand. (Applause)

Okay. So, I'm just going to dive in here, and I do want to say one remark before I get started about what this survey is and isn't. This survey, we have done some portrait surveys, but this one was really not designed to be the latest in the horserace, but really was designed to take a step back and look what the bigger picture of the underlying dynamics that are kind of informing where the horserace is and isn't going.

What we would really want to do was to kind of step back from the frenzy and look at what we think is going on underneath, where these divides are coming from, and also because we think this may set the stage pretty well for think, as E.J. said, what we all have to do after the election whoever wins. These divisions will still be living with us, and we'll have to figure out from elections to governing how that transition happens with these divides still with us.

So, with that, let me just jump in to some of the main findings today. There is a kind of classic question that pollsters always ask, they usually kick off their surveys with: Is America headed in the right direction, or is off on the wrong track? This

is about where the country is today, you can see only about a quarter of Americans say that we are going in the right direction, big partisan divide, but notable that we only get to 42 percent among Democrats saying that things are heading in the right direction.

The twist that we added here is among those who said we are going on the wrong track, we asked them a follow-up question about whether this had happened just in the last few years or whether we had just been on the wrong track for a long time. And you begin to see some differences when this all gets filled out. I mean, basically the country is more likely to say we've been on the wrong track for a long time, than just in the last few years.

And Republicans though are more likely to say, wrong track just in the last few years, than they are to say a long time. It's the Independents overwhelmingly saying, we've been on the wrong track for a long time, and the majority, in fact, say that; whereas Democrats are a little more divided, but still are more likely to say we've been on the track, wrong track for a long time. And we can come back and revisit this a little bit in the Q&A, in the discussion part of it.

But that's a kind of a more nuanced picture that we usually get from this wrong track question. Despite that, we saw -- This is one interesting thing we found, is that when we asked about whether the current generation is better off, about the same, or worse off financially than your children's generation will be, we actually found slightly, less pessimism in this survey, which is a little bit surprising to us. So, in June of 2013, kind of the majority in the country saying that their generation will be better off than their children's generation will be, it's dropped a bit down to 39 percent now.

I didn't go that far. You know, they basically moved from more pessimistic to kind of neutral on the question. So not much difference on the other side, right, that they were kind of worse off, meaning that the next generation will be better off

here. So, that's one notable, maybe caveat to the pessimistic mood in the country.

We also see huge partisan divides on many, many issues about which ones are critical issues in the country. I'm going to show you two slides now, they are both sorted in descending order by Republican priorities, right. If you look at this you can see the red dots are sliding, and the Democratic dots are bouncing around, depending on where they are. But it's sorted by Republican. So, up at the top what's notable here is that there's a sort of bipartisan agreement that terrorism is really at the top of the list here.

So both parties, very, very high, two-thirds of Democrats, more than 8 in 10 Republicans saying that terrorism is a critical issue; on the deficit, big, big party divides, the parties come back together again on jobs and employment saying these are very high issues; immigration, another big 20 point plus partisan divide, and then crime really about the same. So, basically what you see here is Federal deficit immigration, and where you see the big partisan divides on this slate of issues here. Now, here is the rest. If I keep going down, this is the first slide; here is the second batch of these.

And kind of, again, in descending by Republicans priorities here: fairness in presidential elections, it's up there but not -- doesn't reach majority really with either party as a critical issue. Trade, another big difference here, but look at race relations and the growing debt between the rich and the poor. Democrats actually rank these among their issues, right. So, 6 or 10 or more, or they are the very bottom of the list for Republicans. So this is like one of the biggest areas of difference here, work relations, the growing gap between the rich and the poor.

I mean that is 40 points, 30 points here, these are really big partisan divides, in terms of priorities, and then where the country is going. So, let me say a little bit about, kind of what we found in the horserace numbers, so just to kind of give you a little bit of a flavor, we did go back in the field. So this survey, most of the data in the

survey was from a field period in late September, and then we went back in the field with a follow-up survey just to ask questions about the horserace numbers to kind of update where they are.

This is what, so PRRI tracking polls are showing. Really, from late September all the way up into last week, through mid-October, and we've basically shown Hillary Clinton opening up a double-digit lead. They were dead in our polling among likely voters in late September, now in the double-digit lead into mid-October. The religion in this election has been pretty interesting. For the longest time, what we basically have seen is this pattern of White Christian voters leaning toward Republican candidates, and essentially everyone else leaning towards Democratic presidential candidates.

And so here is where we are today, as this is the kind of overall members. I want to kind of bookend these two key things on the end of the religion world. So, on the one hand, White Evangelical Protestant voters, these have been the bedrock of Republican constituencies over time. They tend to vote at the exit polls when the final vote is round 8 and 10 for Republicans candidates. Religiously unaffiliated, on the far other side of the thing tend to vote about three-quarters or more for Democrat candidates.

And these two groups very, very different, right. So these, they were religiously unaffiliated, obviously not attending churches that often, White Evangelical Protestants, attending religion services very, very often, and having really different political views here. We did not have enough to break out minority Protestants, or like Latino Catholics in this particular survey, so that's why they are not here. But you can see the main line is still leaning to Donald Trump, that's about where they've been in the exit polls historically, versus Reagan.

And then Catholics, Hillary Clinton with a healthy lead among Catholics; the really interesting thing about the Catholic vote though, is not the overall Catholic vote, but the White Catholic vote. Mitt Romney won White Catholics by 19 points, and in our last survey, White Catholics are running even between Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump. So that's a real interesting one to vote -- to watch, particularly because places like Pennsylvania, 30 percent of Pennsylvania's voters are White Catholics, and even in Ohio, 1 in 5 are White Catholics. So, in some of these battleground states, this will loom very, very large.

Here I think is one of the more shocking findings that we found, kind of tracing these numbers over time. We asked the question in 2011 that said: An elected official who commits an immoral act in their personal life, can still behave ethically and fulfill their duties in their public and professional life. So, in 2011 here is basically what we saw. Less than half of Americans agreed with the statement, the group most likely to -- are least likely to agree with the statement were White Evangelical Protestants, were most likely to agree with religiously unaffiliated. Now that's 2011.

So, today, this is what that number looks like. So, White Evangelicals have gone from being the most of the least likely group to agree with the statement, to the most likely group to agree with the statement. And what's interesting is that religiously unaffiliated haven't move on this question, right. They are exactly where they were before, but the country as a whole hasn't been moved by this election on this question, right, into seeming, more accepting of this divide between the politicians' personal life and their public life.

We have one other piece of evidence of how this has changed really, particularly White Evangelicals, over time, and we ask this, you know, thinking about your vote for President, how it is for a candidate to have strong, religious beliefs. Here is 2016

versus 2011 among White Evangelicals, right. They've gone from two-thirds saying this is very important to them to less than half saying this is very important to them. Again, it's sort of like gravitational effect of the Trump campaign on White Evangelicals, in this election cycle.

We are still showing, by the way, White Evangelicals support Donald Trump even after the release of the tapes, at 69 percent, 7 in 10 supporting Donald Trump. And then you get somewhat important, it's still a little bit lower, and here's the, you know, not so important, but what really matters here is I think is this real intensity around just important it is, for a candidate to have strong religious beliefs.

So just let's go a little bit down about the candidates themselves and about parties. So, we ask this -- the survey asked a whole range of attributes of the two candidates, which candidate does this attribute do you think apply more to Hillary Clinton or Donald Trump? So, other than that you can't quite read in the back. It's from left to right, he's honest and trustworthy, is a strong and decisive leader, has strong religious beliefs, cares about people like you, will use American power responsibly, understands the problems of poor Americans, has the right temperament and personality to be President, has the right experience to be President.

So, here are Donald Trump's numbers among likely voters all across here. You can see basically there's basically there's a crack 50 percent on any of these candidate attributes, this is among everyone. And here are Hillary Clinton's numbers across this. So, essentially what happens is, on the two issues that he's and trustworthy, and is a strong, and decisive leader, they are essentially tied. But then on every other issue, there's a significant lead for Hillary Clinton in perception on these particular candidate attributes.

One of the things we tried to figure out is just how segregated in terms of

candidate preference, the American public was, and we asked the question, whether people had a close friend or family member who was supporting either candidate, to try to get a sense of just how isolated voters were. So, among all Americans, it's not that interesting about -- more than 6 in 10 say, yes, they've got someone in my network who - or my close friend or family network who supports one or other of the candidates. But it gets a little more interesting when you start unpacking by demographics.

So Partisans are about equally as likely to elect some, and Democrats about 4 in 10 say have a close friend or family member supporting Trump, it's about the same among Republicans. You get a little dispersion by social class among Whites, not that much actually, among White college-educated Americans, almost as many say either candidate. But among White working class Americans, only half say they know anyone who supports -- have a close friend or family member supporting Hillary Clinton.

When you break it up by race, you know, you see, again, Whites, not a lot of difference there, it starts becoming more lopsided among Latinos. When you get to African Americans, only 20 percent of African-Americans say they have a close friend or family member who is supporting Donald Trump. So that's a pretty overwhelming, you know, kind of social segregation on that particular question.

One of the things that's probably not going to surprise too many people, give the mood in the country, is that we had a question that we tracked back to USA Today poll back in 1990, that basically says: neither political party represents my views anymore. The country was basically divided on this question in 1990, and today, not so divided, right; 6 in 10, say neither political party represents my views, only 4 in 10 disagree with that statement. So, pretty high dissatisfaction with the current party set up.

So among the things that really -- a couple of other questions that have been grabbing headlines lately about how much confidence do Americans have in the

election, if the elections are going to be fair, that their votes are going to be counted accurately. And we find, actually, that less half of Americans say they have a great deal of confidence that their vote will be counted accurately. Only 43 percent in fact, and there is a huge gap, right, between those who are likely voters supporting Trump, and likely supporting Clinton, on this question 30 -- basically 30 points here.

We are only 41 percent of Trump; likely voters say they have a great deal of confidence, but 70 percent of Hillary Clinton's supporters say they have a great deal of confidence. When you add -- another 4 in 10 Americans say they have some -- only some confidence, and then there's not that many that say they have hardly any confidence, but it's 1 in 5, depends on what kind of -- you know, you look at this glass half empty, or half-full, 1 in 5 Americans say they have hardly any confidence that their vote is going to get counted accurately in the upcoming election.

So, we also see some real polarization on concerns about this basic question about, we ask Americans: What do you think is the bigger problem in the U.S.? People casting votes who are not eligible to vote, or eligible voters being denied the right to vote? So essentially these two sides of this question, and among all Americans, about 4 in 10 say they are pretty divided about 4 in 10 on either side, but when you look at the Partisan divides, you begin to see this very, very different view, right.

So, Republicans, two-thirds saying it's people casting votes who are not - - so essentially voter fraud is the bigger problem. And Democrats 6 in 10 saying eligible voters being denied the right to vote, voter disenfranchisement, so this polarized view of what the bigger problems of the country are; Independents talk about like the rest of the country on this question.

Also one of the candidates put this up by race, and you can begin to see the differences here. So, among African-Americans, two-thirds saying there's voter

disenfranchisement, that half of Latinos saying that, and you look at Whites, here. And what's interesting about this is, I was actually expecting there might be a class divide among Whites on this question, and there really isn't that much of a class divide. So it really is race more than class driving attitudes on this particular question.

One other question around race that I want to again raise, because we are seeing some interesting patterns, is on the question of police officers generally treating Blacks and other minorities the same as Whites. There is a huge partisan divide on this question, right. 80 percent of Republicans agree with that statement, that police officers do in fact treat Black and the minorities the same as Whites, only 32 percent of Democrats agree with that statement. And you can see it kind of filling up, this way. Two thirds -- they are really mere opposites of each other by party, and then -- By the way, I don't have African-Americans up here, but only 19 percent of African-Americans agree with this statement, right, that police treat African-Americans the same Whites.

But here I want to break out Whites by party, and look at what has happened over time. What's interesting is just between last year and this year, the agreement with the statement among Whites has gone up. And it's gone up, not just among Republicans, but it's gone up among Democrats as well, 10 points even among Democrats, so it's Whites across the political spectrum, agreeing with the statement more than they did just a year ago. We are having kind of a racial, you know, the divide is opening up even more over this past year with African-Americans. They are moving a little bit, but really within the margin of error; and Whites moving significantly on this question.

All right, so down the homestretch here, one of the ways, you know, we have discovered, and kind of thinking about, what's the big picture of this election, and what's it mainly about? We haven't had a lot of grand issue debates, right, in this

election, so far. So, what's going on, what's behind it? And one of the things we heard a lot about, early on in particular, was this issued of political correctness, right. Now my suspicion is this stands in for a whole lot of things, but we decide to act -- tried to get question that might get at this a little bit.

And it's a little bit wordy, but here's what we said: Which of the following statements come to your own view? We offered people two statements. Even if certain people are offended, it is important to speak frankly about sensitive issues, and problems facing the country. Or, it's important to avoid using language that is hurtful and offensive to some people when discussing sensitive issues.

So, among all Americans actually, 6 in 10 agree with the first statement, that even if certain people are offended, it's important to speak frankly about sensitive issues, and problems facing the country. What we see though is that it's really White men who are more likely to agree with this statement. There's a big gender divide here on this question. It also shows up even among non-White and women, so it's both gender and race a bit here.

So, non-White men, the majority agree with the first statement, non-White women the majority agree with the second statement, but look at the White men here, 7 in 10 agree with the first statement. White women, actually, in the majority vary about but at 52 percent, and then it looks basically the same by class. Again, no big class efforts on this question, we are thinking we might see a much bigger class difference among Whites on this question.

A big gender divides on the question of whether the country would be better off if we had more women in political office; 6 in 10 Americans agree, but men are divided while women are coming off the charts on this questions. Maybe not a big surprise, but it is interesting to see the men who were basically evenly divided on this

question, while women are basically 2 to 1 on this particular question.

And then the other place where we obviously have seen a lot of rhetoric and a lot of divides between the two parties is on the issue of immigration and immigrants, and what role immigrants play in the country? Do they make a contribution to the country? Are they a burden on the country? And on this question, again, a two-statement question, which is closer to your view. The growing number of newcomers from other countries threatens traditional American customs and values, or the growing number of newcomers from other countries strengthens American society.

So, among all Americans we basically have a divide here, but this, again, massive partisan difference, right. 73 percent of Republicans agreeing with the first statement, the growing number of newcomers threaten traditional American customs and values, only 29 percent Democrats agreeing with that statement. And here you see the other side of that question. When it comes to particular policies on this question, we have questions here about favor/oppose building a wall on the U.S.-Mexico border, temporarily banning Muslims from other countries from entering the U.S.

Less than half the country agrees with those -- or favors those policies, but Republicans were overwhelmingly in favor. Actually these are Trump -- sorry -- These Trump supports, Trump voters, overwhelmingly in favor. Clinton likely voters like - - nowhere near in favoring these less than 1 in 5 of Clinton voters favoring these policies. Again, there's this huge divide by party and candidate support.

I'm going to end on this question. If you've been at these events before you may have seen this question. We've asked this question over the last two or three years, but I think it continues to be really salient for what's happening in the country today, you know, we title the report of the divide, and target 1950 to 2050. And this question that we've asked is: Since the 1950s, do you think American culture and way of

life has mostly changed for the better, or has it mostly changed for the worse? As you can see, the country is right on the line, actually, but is divided right down the middle on this question, about whether it's changed for the better, or hanged for the worst.

And I'm going to put the two strongest change for the better group, coming out here out on the sides, these are not mutually exclusive groups across the bottom, and I'll flag them in the case you can't read them. But basically two-thirds of Democrats and he religiously unaffiliated over there, the two, big, strong groups that stand out and saying things that mostly change for the better; and if I do that on the other side, we end up with, White Evangelical Protestants and Republicans, on the other side.

So, again the kind of -- Some of the most religious White Americans on the one hand, some of the least religious White Americans on the other -- Mostly White Americans on the other hand, and the two political parties on opposite sides of this question. And literally mirror images of one another. So, you know, I think it's not really a stretch to say that one of the things happening in this election is, it really is referendum on the future. You know, does the future look, like -- we are going to reach back to something in the past. Or we are going to lean in to the cultural and demographic and all other kinds of changes that are happening in the country, even celebrate those changes.

Is there more good there than bad? You know, I think those are of the bigger questions. If I fill the rest of it in, I'll just read them because I know they are kind of small, but on this side mostly change for the better, and we have Hispanic Catholics, African-Americans as a whole, Americans under the age of 30, Hispanics as a whole, and White college-educated Americans on that side. And fill in the rest over here, on mostly change for the worse. It's Whites overall actually, and those Seniors, mainline Protestants, White Catholics, and White working-class Americans over on the other side.

You can see, you know, something of a pattern emerging with these

differences. So, I'm sure we are going to unpack this a little more in the discussion. I'm going to kind of leave it right there with this question about nostalgia in the 19050s, for you. So, thank you. (Applause)

MR. GALSTON: Well, good morning everyone. I hope you are all as dazzled as I always am, by Robbie's whiz-bang presentations. I'm Bill Galston, as Senior Fellow in Government Studies here at Brookings, and the E.J. Dionne's coconspirator, on the Brookings side for the past seven years.

There are full biographies of the panelists in your packet, and I'm not going to waste time reading those bios, suffice it to say that, you know, Karlyn Bowman is a Senior Fellow and Research Coordinator at the American Enterprise Institute. And I think she has the entire history of survey research in her head. She is the national cache in resource.

Next, Perry Bacon, making his Brookings debut. I have learned but he's anything but a neophyte, a longtime Political Journalist, he is currently serving as Senior Political Reporter at NBC, I think I got to know him first when he was still at The Washington Post all those many years ago.

And finally, Henry Olsen, a Senior Fellow with the Ethics and Public Policy Center, and increasingly well-known, commentator on American politics, wrestling with the problems of the future of a conservative moment, consistent with conservatives principles which, these days, is a pretty significant caveat, I would say.

You know, each of the panelists has a maximum of 10 minutes, which I will quickly enforce, because otherwise we are not going to get in to layer some opening remarks. Then E.J. and I will stimulate a little bit of cross talk among the panelists, and then it's over to you. Karlyn?

MS. BOWMAN: Thank you very much, Bill. And I thought I'd begin this

morning just by congratulating E.J. and Bill on Brookings' 100th Anniversary, which they are celebrating this month. We came on the scene at AEI in 1943, and I think over the years there's probably been a lot of competition between our think tanks, but probably much more collegiality.

And because I've been at AEI forever, I decided to look back this morning at our Board books from the '40s and '50s to see if I could find the first collaboration between AEI and Brookings. And it actually happened in 1947, I have no idea what the results were, I've never seen any paperwork on it, but we were asked by the Lodge Brothers, Senator and Representative to look into the Satellite Peace Treaties in Western Europe. And, again, I don't know what happened to that, but that was our first collaboration.

But I'd also like to, of course, congratulate Robbie and his team on this new poll because I think he's helped us to drill down, to understand not only the election, but the broader public mood, and I think it provides many clues why Hillary Clinton's lead has been expanding, while her appeal has not. Her massive 28 percentage lead on having the right temperament and personality to be President, and her 33-point lead on having the right background and experience, I think explains a lot of her lead at this point.

As they note neither candidate's favorable ratings have changed much since the nomination, though more recent data suggests that Hillary's supporters' enthusiasm about her is beginning to grow. That, in a nutshell, I think these findings that explain why most people in this poll and other recent polls expect her to win, but not by a landslide, by a narrow margin.

Robbie mentioned White Catholics, and we pay special attention to White Catholic, because they are one of the few groups in American politics that has a near-perfect of voting for the winner, and they are solidly in Hillary's camp at this point. I

was especially impressed about what Robbie called the new twist on the right track, wrong track question, as he said, they asked whether the country has been on the right track for only a short period of time -- or on the wrong track for only a short period of time, or for a longer period. And the results were 44 percent for a long time, 30 percent said that we've been on the wrong track only for the past few years.

If I could make another suggestion about adding a new question to this, I'd like to go back to a time when we were uniquely optimistic about the country at the very end of Bill Clinton's Presidency, and that question was asked 25 times by Fox News: Are we on the right track, or headed in the wrong direction? And in almost every one of those questions, majority said the country was on the right track.

But Fox followed up that question with a second question; they said, well, what about the moral climate in the United States? Is the country headed in the right direction, or seriously off on the track? Every time they ask that question, the majority of respondents said the country was seriously off on the wrong track in terms of its moral climate. I think that question may be a lot more about morality, than it is about politics overall, and that maybe explain one of the reasons why it's been so negative for so long overall.

Many things stood out to me in this poll, but the distance that ordinary people from key political institutions and politicians I thought was especially great. And narrow plurality in one question, 39 percent said that neither candidate understands the problems of people like me. Of the remainder slightly more, or 35 percent said that Hillary did, 25 percent said that Trump did. 61 percent in another question, and this is one of the ones that Robbie mentioned, said that neither party represents their views, up from 48 percent in 1990.

Not surprisingly 77 percent of Independents gave that response, but 54

percent of Republicans, and 46 percent of Democrats did. I thought that was really a stunning response. I think that may be one of the reasons that people feel that Frank talk about the country's problems is necessary, and Robbie mentioned the question that they asked about political correctness, but I'd like to point you to another new survey that I believe Bill was on the Board of, and this is one done by James Davidson Hunter and Cark Bowman -- no relation -- at the University of Virginia. They do a big survey every four years, and occasionally more often than that.

And they asked another question about political correctness, and they found that 73 percent agreed that political correctness is a serious problem in our country, making it hard for people to say what they really think. And 40 percent agreed strongly, that's a level of sort of strong support. Robbie touched on the nostalgia impulse, and it's long been a prominent feature of the polls and our politics, it's certainly alive and well. And again, the country is divided about whether our best days are ahead or behind.

In the UVA poll 48 percent said that the U.S. was in decline as a nation. A third thought we were holding steady, and only 19 percent that we were improving. 68 percent in another question, and that poll said that in general, Americans live more and more on ethical lives 50 years ago, and that's a theme that we see in the polls about nostalgia.

I want to speak a little bit more about the question in Robbie's poll on confidence in the vote and the election result. And there's a new ABC/Post poll this morning that asked two questions about this. These are questions asked of likely voters. Trump has said that he thinks the election might be rigged so that Clinton could be elected through vote fraud. Do you think this is a legitimate concern? Or do you think that Trump is trying to make excuses in case he loses the election? 39 percent said it

was a legitimate concern, and 59 percent said that he was just simply making excuses.

They asked a second question: Trump has refused to say whether or not he would accept the election's outcome if Clinton wins. Do you approve or disapprove of Trump indicating that he may not accept the election outcome? Again, overwhelming opposition to the Trump position, 64 percent in this new poll, including 52 percent who felt strongly about that, very similar to your own results; the strength of opinion on that question overall.

But what I want to point out is that concern about an accurate vote count clearly predates Donald Trump, when Pew asked about confidence, if your vote will be counted accurately in 2004, two-thirds said that they were very confident, that their vote would be counted accurately. In 2008 that response declined 10 percentage points to 57 percent. And this August when the question again, only 49 percent said that they were confident that their vote would be counted accurately.

In Gallop's question that has a slightly different twist, 81 percent of respondents were very confident, or somewhat confident their votes would be accurately cast and counted at their neighborhood polling place, and again, but that was 81 -- excuse me -- 81 percent in the new poll, that's down from 91 percent in 2006. In the ABC News/Post polling, in the poll that they released yesterday, confidence in an accurate vote count was down 10 percentage points from 2004. So this is not new and it has been building.

Of the 28 percent of voters in Pew's poll -- oh, excuse me. Of the voters in Pew's poll, only 28 percent were very confident that votes across the country would be counted accurately. While Trump is clearly exacerbating this sentiment, it's part of a larger problem of democracy, it's not just the election system. Poll after poll show that Americans believe our economic system is rigged in favor of the wealthiest Americans,

73 percent in the UVA poll gave that response.

There is also a consensus about who the economy is rigged to benefit, and the majority of respondents and new marketplace survey said the economy was rigged for the rich, for politicians, for the media, for banks and bank executives and corporations. In the poll a quarter said they completely distrust the economic data reported by the federal government, including statistics like the unemployment rate and the number of jobs added.

In PRRI's new poll 57 percent said politics and elections are controlled by people with money and big corporations so it doesn't matter if I go. More than 60 percent said the leaders in American corporations and media, universities and technology, and this is in the UVA poll, care little about the lives of most Americans. So cynicism about our politics isn't new, but the sense of powerlessness is pervasive and extends across many, many areas of American life.

I'd like to take you back very briefly to the 2000 elections and concerns about the legitimacy of that vote overall. In all of the polls asked in the 34 days after the election before the Supreme Court decided that election overall, there was no time in which American saw the situation as a crisis. They consistently said it was a big problem for the country, but it wasn't a crisis. Confidence in the Supreme Court to reach the right outcome was high at that point

And people continued to say that whoever won would be the legitimately elected President, and in the surveys by CNN immediately after the Court's decision, a solid majority said they accepted Bush as the legitimate President. I don't think that would happen today, in a close election, and I think that shows how much the polarization that this survey document so well, has grown in a short period of time. And I'll end there.

MR. GALSTON: Karlyn, thanks so much. Perry, over to you.

MR. BACON: Thanks, William. Can you hear me okay?

MR. GALSTON: Yeah.

MR. BACON: I guess, first of all I wanted to say Robbie's work, his book, I highly recommend, it's been very helpful to me. You know, I cover the election, I play election expert on television often, and I have learned -- I've been humbled a lot by this process, because I have piece that I usually read when I come to speak to people, that the day, you know, the (inaudible) that Donald Trump announced candidacy, I wrote a piece very much -- I was asked to write a piece about each candidate when they announced, would they win, would they not win.

I was very confident about Donald Trump. I said four different times he would not win a single primary. Maybe five times in fact, that he would not win a single primary. So I was wrong about that. But Robbie's book and his work since then has helped me kind of understand this question about why Trump did so well. And I think this question of the future and nostalgia is very important to think about as we go forward. There's a lot of commentary right now about, I'm kind of in the after-Trump mood myself, to talk like -- to assume Trump is not going to win.

And so there's been a lot of commentary, but in the beginning of Trump's rise, and a lot of talk about he was the candidate doing well because of economic problems, people feeling like their wages were down, the economy was stagnant and so on. So, you had that argument for a while. And then you've had the argument for a lot of Liberal writers recently saying this is really about racism they were saying. So the debate about whether Trump is popular because of the economy problems, or because of sort of a racism question, and I find this framing to be unhelpful. I want to get into why a little bit as we start to talk here.

I mean I think that Robert's framing of a future versus past is a much

more useful framing. And I'll start by saying; E.J. has this great idea, so E.J., E.J. Dionne, my colleague here, and David Brooks for doing the On Being Podcast, which I recommend you all listen. They were on that together, and E.J. talked about the idea that Hillary Clinton should go to Appalachia. After she wins the election, go there afterward, I'm stealing E.J.'s idea, and giving it as my own.

But anyway, she could go to Appalachia to kind of speak to the Trump voter, and do it as a way to reach out after she wins -- if she wins -- after she wins, I would say. That's a good idea, but I want to give you a little sense that the Trump voters not necessarily person from Appalachia. And I'll explain why a little bit here.

Nate Silver wrote about this, after the South Carolina Primary. In South California the median Trump supporter had a household income of \$72,000, while the median Clinton supporter had a household income of \$39,000, just think about that, as you think how the overage of the years has been. One thing, another data point to think about is that a lot of coverage says, Trump does well among the non-college-educated Whites. Clinton does well among the college-educated Whites. One thing to keep in mind is, 45 percent of the electorate is non-college White, so it's like saying Trump is popular among men. That's a really high number of people who are non-college Whites are the electorate, and they are a very, very portion of the electorate versus college Whites are 25 percent of the electorate. This is a way to think about that.

And the third point I want to make about the economy, and to think of in terms of thinking about Trump, is that Pew did a breakout of voters who -- voter choice by income. So, they looked at the fact that about 23 percent of the electorate has about 30,000 or below income. So, \$30,000 or below income cause (inaudible) generally, is way to think about maybe a low-income person.

So, 23 percent of the electorate like I said is people who are below

\$30,000. What the data showed from Pew is that about 28 percent of Clinton supporters had income below \$30,000, and about 14 percent of Trump supporters did. So, I'm making the case that when you think about the Trump supporters, not necessarily -- you should not think of them as a person who is laid off from their factory job, or some Appalachians, it's not exactly the right way to think about it.

But I do think it's the data from Robbie gets into is a little bit, if you think about it in terms of nostalgia, or you think about it in terms of -- Like one of Robbie's questions is: How do you feel about America compared to the 1950s? And it's not surprising that Blacks and Latinos, like their opportunities were higher than the 1950s. Of course they should obviously feel that way, and it's not surprising that some Whites do not feel that way, if you look at the economy.

So you think about it in terms of trend lines, if you think about the question, not of -- Trump supporters maybe in terms of stagnation as opposed to poverty, that might be the right way to think about it. And then the race question I wanted to get into a little bit too. In part because I find a lot of the commentary, you know, particular on the left, so that you get to Trump supporters are, you know, racists in some ways. And I think that term is sort of not true, and also kind of unhelpful.

We think about racism in the country in terms of kind of Bull Connor, or the 1960s, and we -- You know, there are some examples that, if you look at North Carolina's Voter ID Law, that it was passed three or four years ago, I would argue that's pretty close to the sort of old style kind of racism, but we don't really have that as much in America. So I think that's not a helpful framing about it, and Robbie's book, and it's also here gets in his idea of cultural change. And I think that's a much more useful term.

I mean, I'll say in my own, like we talk about political correctness, a lot. I'll say in my own life, I've had to learn -- I think one of the words we use when we find a

Black or Latino person who speaks well, we say they are articulate. That is something we should stop doing, and it may sound politically correct, we tend to call women who are supervisors, bossy. Those are things that I try to learn in my own life, you know, I'm thinking of someone who is fairly tolerant, but I've had to learn how to say those things differently.

I think we are in an era, if that's political correctness, I think we are in an era in which people's words and behavior and certain cultural ways are examined more than ever, and I think that is -- but I think that's more useful. I think of it as cultural change than necessarily if you call your boss, your female boss bossy, I think that -- you might be sexist, but I'm not sure how useful it is to call you that. And I think that's useful to think about what we are really experience as a lot of cultural change at a really rapid time, and I think that's useful to think about.

And the other thing I think about in terms of the race issue is, Hillary in one of the debates tried to talk about implicit bias, I don't think she did a particularly good job of talking about that, but I do think that's a way in which we can move the conversation in a more intelligent way about racial issues, that will be helpful. The idea being, people don't necessarily choose to go to schools with only people of their same race, it ends up there's a lot of factors involved in property values and so on. So I think if we think about -- We think about like the racial issues in a more complicated way that will bring us to a better discussion about what's driving the electorate.

And so my final thoughts are about, and I mean, looking forward to sort of after the election, I think the two things for the political system to think about are one, is there a way to create a system in which everyone is moving forward. Like the data suggests Blacks, Latinos, people who went to college, like they have a chance to move forward, and in our today's economy.

Is there a way, if you re Hillary Clinton, particularly, can use a way where you can think about how do we move everyone forward? And the second thing I think about is like, how do we make sure that people know they were moving forward? Like there is some evidence that they economy has improved the last two or three years, it's not clear that people feel that way, and I do think there's a broader discussion about my industry and how we cover things in America. And whether this is the best time to live in America as some of the data suggest, or that the news we give people all the time convinces them that they live in a society that's collapsing all the time.

I think that there's something that the political leadership and the (inaudible) around the country has to think about, how do we make sure that we create broader prosperity, and how do we make sure people know that they are in a place that has broader prosperity. And I'll leave it there.

MR. GALSTON: Perry, thank you. You packed a lot into a very circumscribed time period. Thank you very much. Henry, over to you.

MR. OLSEN: Thank you very much, Bill. I'd like to kind of combine a little bit of what Perry and Karlyn were talking about in my comments, because I'd like to focus on the nostalgia and cultural change, and try and ask how we, as Americans, deal with these feelings, especially since we are in a place, and of a background where we are highly likely, if I look out on you, I would guess that well more than 66 percent of you would say that America has mostly changed for the better.

It's very difficult to get outside of yourself, and understand how other people can view things. But yet what we see from the data is that there's a very widespread feeling that is very different from the views that tend to be the way we are -- that tend to be reflected in our circles. It's understandable looking at these groups, why some of these groups would feel that America has changed for the worse.

Take a look at White working class, 65 percent say that America has changed for the worse in the last 60 years. Well, I think, look, and I think if you grew up with an out-of-college degree, and you are old enough to remember that time like my father is, you could take a look and say, that you would not have the same opportunities today.

You know, my dad dropped out of college, learned a trade, was able to go and buy and 1,600-square-foot home, and his wife didn't have to work. And had a middle class or lower end of middleclass lifestyle, based on the job that he could have. There's no way he could do that today where we grew up in California.

There's no way he could have the income appreciation that he's had over the last 30 years. There's no way he would have the capital appreciation that he had over the last 30 years. And then imagine people who have similar backgrounds, who have even less environmental success and in the sense that you grew up in Scranton or Jones Town, where the future happened yesterday decades ago. It's easy to understand why somebody would think that America was better 60 years ago.

Why the Evangelical Protestants who define themselves politically by their culture can easily look back and say, 50 years ago most Americans shared our viewpoints. Our viewpoints on sex roles, our viewpoints on marriage, our viewpoints on the role of religion, where the center of America, and today we are not only out of the center of America but we wonder whether or not we are going to have safe spaces left. That's what religious freedom and religious liberty is about. It's not so much what people were concerned about 30 years ago, it's whether they would exert their control over us, but rather, will you give us safe spaces where we can live our own lives and viewpoints, and they feel that that's not likely to happen.

But I'd like to say, it's not just an American phenomena. Lord Ashcroft in

England took a poll after the Brexit vote and asked, why did Britains vote that way? And he asked a question about whether Britain was better -- life in Britain was better today than it was 30 years ago. And 57 percent of Britains said it was better, 30 percent said -- or 43 percent said it was worse. Of those who thought it was better, three-quarters voted remain, 58 percent of those who thought it worse voted leave.

The same sort of people who think that America is better off than our Clinton supporters, the higher-educated, the urbanites, the less religious voted remain. The same sort of people who are voting Trump, the lower educated, the less economically well off, the people who are outside of the major urban areas that are growing, voted leave. What did they think was worse? He also a number of questions Robbie didn't ask. Which of the following is a force for ill? As you would expect the immigration people voted thought it was a force for ill were overwhelmingly for leave. People who thought it was a force for good, overwhelmingly for remain.

Social liberalism was as important a divider as immigration. 80 percent of the people who thought that social liberalism was a force for ill voted leave. Feminism, 74 percent of the people who thought that feminism was force for ill voted leave. The Internet, 71 percent -- Yes, that's my point about saying our life and our experience is different. That, you know, Brexit got 52 percent of the votes, 71 percent of those people, or 36 percent of all Britains voted both leave and thought that the Internet was a force for ill.

One of the problems and challenges we face is if the answer to the future is lean in without listening, what we get is a sort of violent inarticulate or somewhat what is perceived to be inarticulate reaction to the future that we are seeing in America, that we saw in Britain, and what we are beginning to see in other countries as well. That when Karlyn is talking about the sense of pessimism, the sense of, I can't even say that.

It's one thing to say we are going to have a debate and you lost. It's another thing to say, it's not even proper to express your concerns. To even express your concern, that's so far out of my understanding, is to say something that we consider beyond the pale, that is a recipe for social division.

That is a recipe, if not for violent revolution, for the sense that the system is rigged and that the appropriate response is to burn the place down. So, it's incumbent on us, I think, those of us who want a responsible stewardship for all Americans, and not a victory on behalf of some Americans to look at people who think differently than us and think: How do I bring them into a conversation that they feel a part of? If the answer to our future is to lean in without listening, we will eventually see a violent revolt that will shock everyone, certainly in the way that leave shocked Britain.

I'll leave with one thought that I encountered in Australia. Where, Australia has not had a recession in 25 years, they are a vastly prosperous country, but yet they are experiencing many of the same concerns that we are. There was a poll taken about a month ago that ask, do you think that Muslim immigration should be banned? And the majority of Australians thought it should. They have their own version - - when I go to Australia, I say that, you know, they had a populist politician five years ago called Clive Palmer, who is a big businessman who created a populist protest party. And they have a woman who just did well in the last elections, named Pauline Hanson, who doesn't like immigration. I'd say Donald Trump is somebody from Clive Palmer's background with Pauline Hanson's views.

And everybody in Australia, ugh! Because if there's one thing that you could agree on, if you are in a league in Australia, and you say, you don't want either of these people. But right now she is -- her party gets 6 percent of the vote in the House of Representatives Election in a country that has seen no economic downturn in a quarter of

a century. And when I was over there in August, I went into their state broadcaster, the Australia Broadcasting Company. And I went up one elevator, and it had a big sign, a big picture on the back of the elevator and it says, "The Face of the New Australia." And it was a Muslim woman. Okay, that's fine.

There's a lot of Muslim immigrants they just elected their first Muslim Member of the House of Representatives out in Western Australia. So then I went in another elevator, and I saw another sign, and there was another face of the new Australia. This one was a Muslim man. Okay. When the face of the new Australia includes no faces of the old Australia, you are creating social division.

When the face of the new American includes no representatives of the face of the old America, you are creating social division. And I think if we don't want increasing polarization, and we want more people to think they are represented, and we want to see more discussion and less hatred, less segregation based on viewpoint, I think we need to look about the United States that looks like all of our citizens, and not simply the part that we particularly live in.

MR. GALSTON: Thank you for those sobering thoughts, Henry. We are running about 10 minutes behind schedule, so I'm going to make a proposal. And that is I'm going to turn -- I'm going to turn the podium over to my colleague E.J. Dionne to pose a question to the panel, as a whole. The panel will respond. If, and only if there's time, will I pose a question, and if there isn't time, we go straight to you. So, over to you E.J.

MR. DIONNE: Thank you very much, Bill. First of all, I want to thank Henry. He has given me a new personal slogan, lean in but listen and hard and respectfully to those who don't. And it actually that is going to be very, very important after this election is over. And if I may take 30 seconds, two fascinating things Robbie didn't get to mention. One is asking Democrats and Republicans, who is your favoring

President, on page 18. Democrats were all over the lot, Republicans were overwhelmingly pro Ronald Reagan on that answer. Republicans would say, they don't have one single good one, and they are all divided. Democrats would say, we have lot to choose from.

I think that's a fascinating thing to look at, analytically. Secondly, and this goes to my question. Bill Bishop, as some of you know, wrote a great book, or many of you probably know, called The Big Sort, not to be confused with The Big Short. Robbie's poll shows how powerful this is just on page 26 more than 8 in 10 Trump supporters who attend religious services at least weekly estimate the most of their fellow church members are supporting Trump, three-quarters of Clinton supporters who attend religious services, at least weekly, estimate that most of their fellow church members are supporting Clinton.

So we are divided everywhere, even at prayer, in terms of whom we know. And that's what I wanted to get at in my question, and it really builds on what Henry said. By the way, I also want to welcome my friend, Perry Bacon, who has been a double colleague at the Post and NCB, and it's so great to have you here.

You know, we argue about whether we are divided by class, race, gender or religion. What's really scary about this poll, is that we are divided by all of the following, class, race, gender and religion. We are deeply divided by these things. I think it was Kevin Phillips who first observed that, who hates whom, and who hates whom the most, may be the most important question in any election. And in this election, boy, do we have a lot to choose from, in trying to answer that question.

I'd love to ask, Henry has already given a kind of answer. I'd like to ask our other panelists, what in the world can we do after this election is over that might ease some of these divisions? We are not going to get rid of them all, we are going to argue

about a lot of things. I'd just be very curious, and maybe I'll start with Robbie, who is an ironic sort of person, likes to bring people together. What do you see in all these numbers, where we might focus some of our attention, not as liberals, conservatives, progressives, libertarians, as Americans in trying to pull us together a little bit?

MR. JONES: So, you know, I'll start with saying, I think it's worth saying. I really resonate a lot, Henry, with what you had to say here, and I think I'd like to think of polling done well, as an exercise in empathy, right, and kind of understanding, you know, views that aren't your own, and having the numbers sort of bring them to the surface, and sometimes there is just like head scratching moment, right, where you see this number and you -- but I've always thought like, that's a moment to take seriously, right, where you see this number and you don't really know what it means; that there is something going on there. And I think a lot more of that is worth doing.

I do think also that it's worth saying that we -- the divide in the country and the cultural changes, right. I think the speed of cultural change that we've had in this country is enormous and worth noting, and worth, like saying, wow, it's not so confusing when you really take serious the kind of change we've had. Just two quick numbers that are sort of out of my book, and are reflected here, though, is if we look at the percentage of country that's White and Christian, that number has gone from 2008 from being 54 percent of the country to be 43 percent of the country, just as 2008.

If we look at the support for same-sex marriage, right, this other issue, that Henry is right, was a flagship issue for conservative Christians in this country. When Barack Obama was running for President in 2008, only 4 in 10 Americans supported same-sex marriage. That number today is 62, right. So just in the last election cycles that is an enormous amount of demographic, religious and cultural change. So the sense that there is just like, vertigo, among many, particularly who are on -- the losing side of

this change, and the feeling left behind is not so surprising, I think.

And I do think one of the real challenges is, you know, as a couple of pass here, I mean, one is we can come up with some empathy, and we can sort of follow maybe the reaching our across the lines. But I think the real threat here is that, particularly without this kind of cultural center that White Protestants held in the country, they left kind of a vacuum there as they slipped from the center. The real threat I think is the kind of tribal America, right, where all of these forces, race, gender, social class, geography even, right, kind of glum together, and then you end up with these kind of factions that are kind of fight-to-the-death factions, right.

Because once something becomes kind of a tribal identity, you can't really debate anymore, right. It's like part of who I am, and that's part of who you are, and the question is who is going to win. Right? It's not really a matter of compromise anymore, and I think that's the real danger we are facing in the country, and finding some ways to diffuse that sense of tribalism, and trying to find a way to kind of, you know, put things back on the table as issues, who is going to actually talk about them, and have that -- Even the process of having a conversation about some controversial issues, not be seen as an act of tribal -- you know, betraying your trade, I think, is really going to be a challenge for us going forward.

MS. BOWMAN: I confess, I'm not very optimistic about Washington in this regard, but I am growing more and more optimistic because of things I'm seeing in polls, about a sort of bottom-up change. Where I think we are having a lot of these conversations with respect, whether it's about race and the police, and other things overall. It's interesting that -- I don't think politics is essential the most important preoccupations, the most people I think they go about their daily lives, and take the kids to the soccer games and all the rest, and politics is peripheral, and not central, it's

become so central in Washington, that I think it's become poisonous in many ways.

But at the local level, problems are being solved. If you look at the Institute of Politics Harvard polls that they take of young people every quarter, young people are much more interested in going back now to their local communities and trying to make a difference there. When I came of age, I wanted to come to Washington to make a difference. And I actually think more change will come from the bottom up, where I think there is a lot of evidence that we are more respectful of other people's views. So, I'll stop there.

MR. BACON: I feel like E.J. asked us how we are going to unify the country, and I guess the answer is, I don't have a great answer to this either. But I would say, Hillary Clinton is going to win the election with this very low, very, very low numbers with non-White college men particularly. Paul Ryan's party will have lost the election with very, very low numbers. They both know this information, so I do think they will take steps to address that. I'm not sure how successful they will be, but I do think they will -- I think you are already hearing that, in some of both the rhetoric and the fact about they are going to try to do that. I'm not sure how.

And also I think -- I think a lot of change happens top-down, so I don't think you might see some of the things I'm hearing about, I mean, I work in MSNBC, there's been some effort to bring more public things on air, I would say. I think -- When I hear about what's happening at Fox, and that there will be some effort to maybe make it some more, and I don't want to use the wrong terms here, but maybe more neutral or more a commenting of Democrats in some ways. Though I think you will -- I think those kinds of changes could help.

I'll have to say I'm not totally (inaudible) for the same reasons that Karlyn was in terms of some policy changes. I think I would imagine three years ago, we would

have talked about body cameras being on police officers, in a broad sense. But we had this new technology, videos saw that. I know people say they are divided about, you know, how the police should be have, and whether they are treated well, but I think there is broad, there is some broad agreement there, that there is some sense that there can be change on that issues.

The polling aside, I mean, Nikki Haley signed the Body Cameras Law in South Carolina, you've seen a lot of changes in policing, you've seen some discussion about policing. Newt Gingrich, you know, talked about the fact that if you are Black maybe there is something going here. So, I'm not totally, I'm not totally pessimistic about every change in the country. I am pessimistic about changes in Washington.

MR. GALSTON: Well, as I very much expected, the response to E.J.'s question has consumed across our time. So it's now time to go to you and there will a roving microphone when the microphone reaches you, please state your name, if there's an institutional affiliation that you want to mention, that's fine, and ask a brief question. No speeches, please. There is no time for them. I'm going to start in the back and move forward, so I see two hands on the aisle back there, and a woman about the third aisle over there.

MS. STEENLAND: Hi. Two quick questions. I'm Sally Steenland. There is -- Robbie, your numbers for Evangelicals voting for Trump are pretty high. There have been press stories about how Evangelicals are pulling away. I'm wondering what the real story is. And the second thing about the political correctness in talking about important issues even if they offend people, when I heard that, I thought of Black Lives Matter, and talking about that even if it offends people, and I wonder if political correctness is a response to talking about things on the left that offend people?

MR. GALSTON: You know, you just past it, and then go over there,

please.

MR. TOM OLSON: Tom Olson. The biggest issue that you talked about at the beginning of the presentation was terrorism, and that hasn't even come up in the conversation. I happen to think that it is a phony issue but if everybody thinks it's really important, why do none of you think it is?

MR. GALSTON: And then this woman, yes, right there.

MS. HARRIS: McKenzie Harris from Network Lobby. I'm just curious. I appreciate your explanations on political correctness leaning in without listening, like regressions, and social division. However, I'm interested in hearing your thoughts about whether White privilege affects that viewpoint? Thanks.

MR. DIONNE: And could I invite my friend, Bill, to say something thoughtful in all of these answers, because I really wanted to hear from you, too.

MR. GALSTON: I have many opportunities to speak, and the people in the audience have many fewer. So, I may say a little something at the end if there's time, but thanks for thinking of me. So, I'm going to take them in batches of three, so now is the opportunity for the panel to respond.

MR. JONES: I'll take the first one off the top, the White Evangelical numbers. So what we've seen among White Evangelicals is very interesting, basically we've seen, even as the country has been moving away, or the support for Donald Trump has been sort of moving downward, White Evangelical support in all of our polls of likely voters, and we had four straight weeks that crossed the tape release, which is kind of the more seismic event here in particular and with relation to White Evangelicals, we've seen no movement among White Evangelicals.

Two-thirds, the 7 and 10, right in that range, straight across the four weeks among likely voters for White Evangelical Protestants, so we've seen the -- The

one thing I would I would like to say here too, though, is that I am, meaning White Evangelical Protestants, there are non-White Evangelical Protestants, and I want to make sure that I sort of put that number in, they are mere opposites of White Evangelical Protestants, 7 in 10 are supporting Hillary Clinton among non-White Evangelical Protestants.

So there's just like a huge divide in the evangelical capital community at large, between White Evangelical Protestants and their non-White brethren in churches across their community.

MS. BOWMAN: I'll quickly take the terrorism question. I was surprised that it came up as a top issue in most polls that the economy/jobs is the top issue, but terrorism almost always ranks number two followed by health care in most of the national polling overall. I think it is something that's on the back burner always for Americans and part of their larger foreign policy concerns overall. It rises to the front burner when something happens and comes to a full boil, but there is still is deep concern in the land about it, and a lot of agreement about how we address terrorism overall, I think, more so than some of the other issues.

But this has really been -- I wouldn't say it's been an issue in this campaign, but we've talked much more about personalities and temperament and those kinds of things, and we've talked about issues throughout this campaign. So that may be why we didn't touch on it earlier.

MR. GALSTON: Perry? Henry? Okay. The next three, please? There's a gentleman over there, and then, there are a bunch of hands on the aisle, here.

MR. CUTLER: My name is David Cutler. Could you say something about different age groups? There seems to have been very little in the polling which has focused on different age groups. For example, in England it's very clear that the Brexit

vote was carried by elderly people, by the older generation.

MR. GALSTON: There are a couple with their hands in the aisle, let's take the first two hands in the aisle, coming forward, and then we'll get back in the next tranche of questions.

MR. CUMMINGS: Yes. John Cummings. And just to follow up, to dig a little deeper on that White Evangelical character. It seems -- I would think some of this is unshakable value, and I was somewhat shocked probably, at the most shocking question where, that moral and ethical core so easily flipped in the matter of a couple of years. And if you could just dig into not so much the what, but why you feel that's so shakable as a value.

MR. GALSTON: Then the gentleman right in front of the gentleman who just spoke, and then we'll come forward into the next batch.

McBRIDE: My name is John McBride. And I'm thinking about the comments about White privilege implicit bias, and how difficult it is to get outside of ourselves, to see how others see. And my questions around -- the daughter of a friend of mine, undergraduate at Princeton called and said, her professor asked to go around in the room, each say what the impact of your race has been on your life. Dad said that must have been very interesting. She said, Dad, I didn't realize I had a race. How do you get to that sort of implicit bias that people aren't even aware of?

MR. GALSTON: Okay. Reactions from the panel?

MR. OLSEN: I'll talk about the age, you know, take a look at the nostalgia question, and it was pretty much what you would expect. That the younger group was 60 percent mostly for the better, the oldest group was 57 percent for the worse. In America the one thing that you have to think about is how much of that, is driven by the different racial and ethnic compositions that the 18 to 29 group is probably

about 40 percent non-White, where as the 65-plus group is over 80 percent, 85 percent White.

I would be interested to see if we were to look at that as breaking that down by race, which is to say, how do the 18 to 29 year-old Whites feel about America 50 years ago, versus 65 to tease out an age effect. But the data that we have would support exactly what you are suggesting, which is that young people are optimistic about the future are likelier to back a candidate who would lean in, to use Robbie's term; whereas older people are more pessimistic and are more likely to want to make America or Britain great again.

MR. DIONNE: Could I say something on the White privilege question which came up twice. I think it's very important to be candid about when looking at this poll, and a lot of it could be rewritten, if you wanted to do a completely different report to emphasize how deep the racial divide is in the country, and we shouldn't sort of pretend that's not there. I also suspect when I looked at some of the data, that if you look by region, there is a divide particularly say between Southern Whites who are much conservative on a lot of these questions, than Whites in the Northeast or on West Coast.

So that's another sort of nuance there and, you know, I talk about the empathy. The empathy needs to go all the way around. I mean, Henry and I were talking because we were talking primarily about those we think are going to lose this election, basically the Trump voters, it doesn't mean that that empathy, that you can't talk about empathy toward African-Americans or minorities who are also very angry about a lot of things.

And the last quick point. Deindustrialization has hit both African-American in the inner city hard, and working class Whites in communities all of the country hard. And when I try to think about how to bring us together, one way is to

address those problems in tandem, because in many ways they are very similar problems, that if in fact Clinton wins the election, one of my hopes is that she addresses both of these at the same time, and very consciously so.

MR. GALSTON: This is Bobby -- This is nostalgia for Bobby Kennedy.

MR. JONES: Can I say one quick --

MR. GALSTON: Please.

MR. JONES: Just to riff on this. The voter fraud question, I think, casts some really interesting light on this kind of White privilege question. I also want to say, I'm guessing Henry will amen me on this, that this is also a class privilege, it kind of play within the White community, and I think that's often really important to help unpack this. And I think it's part of why White working-class Americans feel such resentment, because I think they often get told that they are a privileged group, and the lives they live, I think don't reflect that very often. I think that part of that slippage is part of what breeds some of the resentment.

But I will say that voter fraud, the question about what's the bigger problem, voter fraud or voter disenfranchisement, I think cast some interesting light on this with all of the best data we have, shows that voter fraud and the U.S. is negligible problem. The best studies that we have that have really looked at this, and yet, you know, the country is sort of divided on this, and Whites think that's a bigger problem than voter disenfranchisement. Where we have solid evidence in history, right, that showed the voter disenfranchisement, particularly for minorities and African-Americans in the South, has been a pretty open problem that we've had in the country.

And I think that the huge divide, I mean, African-Americans like 2 to 1, actually disenfranchisement is the bigger problem, and Whites are sort of leaning the other way is a classic case of kind of -- you know, this kind of racial perception gap that

we have in the country. And did you want to address the Evangelical flip, you wrote about this.

MR. BACON: I've had my say.

MR. JONES: Okay. All right, there's a great piece Bill wrote in the Brookings Fiscal blog, actually on this Evangelical piece, yeah.

MR. BACON: I think there are four terms used, implicit bias, political correctness, White privilege, Black lives matter. We didn't do a poll --

MR. JONES: We didn't unpack all that, right.

MR. BACON: We didn't do a poll on that. My sense is people don't even agree on what those terms mean, so that's like -- So it's much deeper than just, we don't know how we feel about them but I suspect we don't really know. Where with the Black Lives Matter Activists think they are saying, versus how it's being heard, is a totally different thing. I think the term White privilege is a -- If you read in Hillary's you know, the (inaudible) of the emails actually there's a debate on Hillary's staff about, do we use the term White privilege, and one of her Black advisors is like, don't do that, no one knows what that means, and it's going to be somewhat unpopular.

So, there's a lot of -- These terms are very -- I think it's good we are having a more open discussion about -- like, racial issues, but that's said, we are at the early stages of the -- Sorry, we've had a long contribution -- the history of the country has been long. We talk about race all during it, but these last couple of years we've had a more focused conversation. I feel like people are still learning the right terms, learning how to think about it.

I think this great professor asked that question, I'm not surprised people don't necessary have a -- I'm not sure if you asked exactly how does my race affect my life, I'm not sure I'll have a great answer myself, and I guess I'm assumed to have a better

answer than most people in the room, but I don't think I have that answer either. I think it's a hard question, but I'm glad we are thinking about these questions.

MR. GALSTON: Very good. So, continuing our march forward, there is a woman right on the aisle there, and then I'm going to bring it forward on this side, and then I'm going to turn to this side.

DR. POPLIN: I'm Dr. Caroline Poplin, I'm a Physician. My question is for Mr. Olsen, and it's White Evangelicals again. If they are concerned by this rapid change in morality, of the LGBT thing, and the fact that they have to (inaudible) for same-sex couples; why didn't Ted Cruz beat Trump?

MR. GALSTON: Yes? Next question, please? Okay, there's a woman here.

SPEAKER: There is a segment of Evangelical Christians, who are concerned about climate change, believe in stewardship, the responsible, moral stewardship. And I wonder -- And there's nothing on the environment, at least in the handout we received. So, I'm also wondering, looking forward, is there a way with infrastructure spending on national parks, on clean water to bridge sort of across the strain of the American public?

MR. GALSTON: Yes. Let me just deal with this final question back there, and then we'll come forward in the next set.

MR. BLANTON: My name is James Blanton. I'm a Historian and a Writer based here in D.C. And so I wanted to go back to what Robert was saying about, you know, voter fraud, as an example of what I'm going to talk about. So let's say, you know, I have a PhD, I live in Washington, D.C., I grew up in rural Alabama. And what I see from my friends back home is an intense distrust of experts. And so if I were to go there and say, well, you know, studies show that voter fraud is a minimal almost

nonexistent problem, they will reject that right away. And so my question is basically, you know, from the position of an expert, how do you talk to the non-expert, and just get them to participate in the dialogue?

MR. GALSTON: Well, all right. Panel?

MR. JONES: I'll answer the one directed to me. Evangelicals like any other group can be divided in to subgroups and there are people who care more about cultural issues, and people who care less about cultural issues. The data suggests that among the Republican Evangelicals who care most about social issues, Ted Cruz did win. He attempted to beat Donald Trump among very conservative voters in the South that had high concentrations of evangelicals. Even in Indiana, which is probably the most evangelical primary state outside of the Deep South, he won very conservative voters while losing by 16 points across the state.

Ted Cruz had no appeal whatsoever to the person who was not a very conservative voter. He got annihilated among the 20 percent of Republicans who said they were moderate. He lost handily among the people who told pollsters they are somewhat conservative. He lost, kind of annihilated among Republicans who said that that they were neither Evangelical Protestants, nor among those who didn't attend -- where they might have said they were Evangelical but they attend services.

Basically he niche-marketed to the very conservative, fiscal and social conservative, and discovered surprise, that they are not a majority of the Republican Party. Some of us had only been saying that for a year-and-a-half. But that's pretty much the answer of why. They may have had those concerns, but when it came to social issues, for these other things, that they tend -- there was that division on social issues, Conservative Evangelicals, whether with Ted Cruz, the person who may have shared the concerns but prioritized them as far as the (inaudible).

MR. GALSTON: Other reactions.

MS. BOWMAN: In response to your question about how do you convince people the truth of expert analysis? I was reminded of an essay that Dan Yankelevits, the great Sociologist wrote years ago in which he said that journalists, people with PhDs, they think that the accumulation of factual information is the royal road to judgment. He said, publics rarely every think that way.

You've got to start those conversations, with values, not with facts. Because first of all we are factually challenged in so many ways, I mean, all of us are, and he said, he actually thinks the public's approach through values in terms of understanding public policy issues, fairness, honesty, accuracy, is a much more successful approach than the approach of the elites. And that essay has stuck with me for a very long time.

And just a second quick point, Bill, I don't know what you said about the flip of the White Evangelicals on the character issue, for me it partly trumped their religious values overall. And I think we saw the same thing, I hope I'm not being politically incorrect here. We saw the same thing in the 1990s when for decades feminists have told us that the personal was the political, and all of sudden during the end of Bill Clinton's presidency everything flipped, and the personal was no longer the political; and so I think because Party was more important than the issue for feminists overall.

MR. GALSTON: Well, when I was a teenager, I was involved, much to my surprise in some of the early experiments on cognitive dissonance. And it seems to me that human beings and voters are human beings, even though I sometimes doubt it, that human beings, will work very hard to minimize cognitive dissonance. And if it means starting with your conclusion, and working back to your values, people will do that. And if

people have decided they are going to vote for Donald Trump despite the fact that his sexual behavior is, if I may use the word, deplorable, then they are going to -- then they are going to retrofit their other beliefs to be consistent with that conclusion.

Perry, you look as though you want to say something.

MR. BACON: It's okay. Let's go to the next question.

MR. GALSTON: Fair enough. Okay. This regrettably -- Oh, I'm sorry, Rob.

MR. JONES: Just the climate change. So, you know, I think the unfortunate news if you are a climate change advocated is that that issue almost always ranks at the bottom of priority lists. Like when we put it up, that big list I have, we didn't have on the survey, but if I had it would be down at the bottom, and it would down at the bottom for Republicans, it would down at the bottom for Democrats, it would be down at the bottom for young people, it would be down at the bottom for older Americans. It just hasn't really taken off as a kind of critical issue.

At least the way we measure it in surveys, the other thing to say about White Evangelicals is the great hope here had been that younger White Evangelicals would be the ones who would sort of stand up. And of the things that we've seen though, is that -- For example, we don't see any generational differences in support for Donald Trump between older and younger Evangelicals. Now that is going to be surprising to a lot of people in the room, but one of the reasons why we are not seeing that, is because the more liberal younger evangelicals left, right.

They left to become -- And most of them left to become nothing. They left to -- And they left to balloon that group of religiously unaffiliated people that will now make up 39 percent of Americans under the age of 30. Right? So that's what has been happening that the kind of more liberal cohort that would have brought those issues in,

has migrated out of the category.

MR. GALSTON: Because this is a panel on survey research, I'm going to do a quick poll of my own. Is there anybody on the panel who cannot stay for an additional 15 minutes?

MR. OLSEN: Fifteen, but only 15, I have a 12:30 conference call.

MS. BOWMAN: Me, too.

MR. GALSTON: Okay. Well, I found the sweet spot, and I ask that because I'm a veteran observer of crowds, and this is a full room and I can count on the fingers of one hand, the number of people who have gotten up and left. That tells me that there's still a lot of interest, and a lot of questions. So, now, I'm going to go to this side of the room. This gentleman with the clerical collar, right there, and then we'll move forward.

MR. REESE: Tom Reese from the National Catholic Reporter. Granted, the divisions that this study has found, and also granted the concern about political parties the disillusionment with political parties and the political process. How scared are you by the response on authoritarian leadership? The fact that I think it's 46 percent of the respondents said that they would like to see a leader who is willing to break to the rules in order to get things done.

MR. GALSTON: Yes, this woman right here, second row.

MS. CABRAL: Hi. Kristin Cabral with Progressive Democrats of America and the Women's National Democratic Club. This is primarily for E.J. Tom Hayden died yesterday. Given this survey, are we living yet in a true participatory democracy, something he fought for his whole life?

MR. GALSTON: Then there is a young man with his hand raised, in the fourth row I believe.

MR. JOSEPH: Noah Joseph. Indiana University student, and a participant in the Washington Leadership Program this semester. Charles Barkley, NBA Basketball Player, recently came out and stated that rather than race relations, the real problem facing America is the gap between the wealthy and the poor that is stemming the frustration in America. Robbie, this is in particular for you. Is there any data to support that statement?

MR. GALSTON: I think we've had three questions now. So I'll take the remaining questions in the next batch. That's a promise.

MR. BACON: I'll take the Charles Barkley question quickly. I mean it's sort of a -- This is why we don't ask that, so can we stop that comment. Wealth and race are highly correlated, so I mean, I find that statement to be not super helpful. In that that the -- Yes, there is a huge gap between the wealthy and the poor, and there's a huge gap on race, and part of that is that Blacks and Hispanics have a much net wealth, less lower household incomes, but I mean, et cetera, so I mean, it's not surprising that -- so those things kind of correlate with each other in some ways, in some ways they don't, I mean, but in a lot of ways they do.

MR. DIONNE: Just on the Tom Hayden question, briefly. Thanks for that question. If anybody -- probably most people in this room never read the Port Huron Statement which was the -- But you did of course -- Which was the founding document for SDS before SDS went absolutely bonkers in the late '60s. And it's a really remarkable document, where some of the sentences I suspect would appeal to Trump voters, in its emphasis on a democracy of participation.

Just two sentences really on Tom Hayden -- on where Hayden was coming from. On the one hand, I always sought the challenge for the new left was it emphasized a kind of participatory democracy, and where it wasn't clear what the

connection was between that notion of democracy and representative democracy, and I think one of the fascinating things about Hayden's life, is that he later, himself, realized that you needed to link participatory democracy to the traditional political system, that you couldn't stay outside of it.

It's the way I think of Occupy Wall Street versus the Bernie Sanders Campaign. Bernie realized electoral politics was a necessary route to change. And I think that's an insight that people who, on the progressive side, constantly need to keep in mind. But, yeah, an (inaudible) that was spoken about in that statement, well it tended to be, and was quite candid in being the alienation of upper -- middle class students, even though Hayden himself was very working class in his background.

There's something there that's worth revisiting because I think the spirit of the Port Huron Statement still has a lot to teach us about some of the shortcomings of our politics even if I think there were holes in its analysis.

MR. JONES: Well, I'll jump on the authoritarianism question, so thanks, Tom, for raising that question. It is an interesting question, so the way the question read, it's on page 16, if you've the report. But it read this way, "Do you agree or disagree. Because things have gotten so far off track in this country, we need a leader who is will to break some rules if that's what it takes to set things right.

And it turns out the racial divides on this question are fairly modest. But the class divides are very big. So if you look at the difference between White college-educated, and White working class Americans, the majority, 55 percent of White working class Americans agree with that statement, only 29 percent of White college educated, American agree with that statement. To me, I think -- you know, I see this as a -- It fits very well with this portrait of Americans who see a very nonresponsive political system to their situation, right.

And so when you feel like there's a -- parties aren't attuned to you, the government is not attuned to you, nobody has got your back, this kind of sentiment I think is what you get right. And if you get a strong leader who is promising to sort of come in and shake things up, I mean, I do think that has been part of Trump's appeal, really. As someone who has said, I'm the guy, only I can solve this problem. When he's made those kinds of statements I think it's appealing to this kind of sentiment.

But it's the people who feel like the system has largely failed them, and they don't see many paths working within the current channels to changing things.

MR. OLSEN: And that gets to the importance of listening which is to say that when people feel excluded from a normal process and from a society they will endorse extreme measures in order to ensure that they get part of that society. And I think there is a segment that we don't often come into contact with except through data that very much feels that way, and they find Trump's authoritarian demeanor reassuring than frightening.

MR. DIONNE: I think the answer, my answer to Father Tom is, we should be scared by this, and it does show a breakdown in our system. And for those by the way, just on Tom Hayden. Anybody who wants to read the Port Huron Statement I tweeted it out in his honor yesterday. So if you look at my Twitter feed, even though I have, as I say, it's imperfect but it's admirable in a whole lot of ways.

MR. GALSTON: Okay. I'm sorry, Karlyn.

MS. BOWMAN: I saw that question just much more of an expression of deep frustration, and not as sort of a willingness to have an authoritarian leader. I think a lot of Hillary Clinton's supporters could agree with some part of that statement, but the system is working for people in my college group. It's not working for the others, and so it's that deep frustration that we don't seem to understand.

MR. GALSTON: Okay. Final batch of questions; I'm going to take -- Okay, I'm going to take four. There are a couple of young women back there, and two gentlemen up here, and I'm sorry about everybody else, I've tried my -- I've done my best.

MS. SHIRLEY: Hi. My name is Betsy Shirley, I'm at (inaudible). Robbie, a question for you, there was a question about women political leadership, gender-based double standards, I was curious if you had information on religious breakdown of that feeling, or if you didn't what do you think that might show.

SPEAKER: I'm Casey Hor. And I'm curious about the question on immigrants, or Americans' feelings towards immigrants. Is this something that has gotten more negative over time, or is it something that really has stayed about even as it is today?

MR. GALSTON: Good question. Okay. There's a gentleman right here, and then one in the front row.

MR. SMITH: I'm David Smith, of the Guardian. Is there evidence in the survey that if Trump had been much more self-disciplined and would not have the video tape, and not had him picking these fights with the Khan family, and so on, that he actually -- he could have won, if he had been more on message? Or, were the demographics always loaded against him?

SPEAKER: Thank you. Larry Chekko. I think it's going to say where, somewhat with Henry, I'm listening. And who are people listening to? For example, I'm mainly between CNN and Fox, and it's like I'm living in two alternate universes. I mean, you don't even think you are listening to the election season. And how do people -- I guess what I would like to know, Robbie, is could there be a question asked in another asked another survey, as where people get their information from because that's what's

"education them" quote/unquote.

MR. OLSEN: I'll take the gentleman from the Guardian question. There was always going to be a challenge for a host of reasons, but twice in the campaign, Trump stayed within some degree of normal campaigning behavior for about a three-week period, and both times he rose in the polls and came very close to parity with her. The most recent time was when he dumped Manafort and hired Ben, and then Conway, and there was about a three-week period where he stopped tweeting at 3:00 in the morning, and he was talking about how to reach the African-Americans, and his poll ratings, his favorable/unfavorable over a span of three weeks went from minus-30 to minus-19, and it stopped at the first debate, and now it's been going backwards.

So, I think what's pretty clear is that there was a majority to be had for a non-Hillary Clinton Republican who represented change, that Donald Trump niche marketed to people who wanted radical change, and he was never ever able to pivot to the people who wanted safe change.

MR. GALSTON: Other responses. Go ahead, Robbie.

MR. JONES: I'll answer the question about so we have a very long trend on this question about whether immigrants, you know, threatened traditional customs values or whether they strengthen American society. They look pretty flat actually, we haven't seen a lot of -- there's been some kind of ups and downs, but you know, go back to 2011, they look kind of right on top of where they are today, and then they move a little bit in 2015, but I would say the pattern, there's no distinct pattern, they kind of bounce around a little bit.

The other thing to say, is that there's been absolutely no movement on the immigrant question, on policy. We've been asking -- We started this question in an early Brookings PRRI Survey back in 2013, about a path to citizenship, 6 in 10

Americans support a path to citizenship, including a half of Republicans. And that is not changed. We've asked this question I think over 100 times since 2013 and today of more than 100,000 Americans and it has just not moved, it is tabletop flat.

So that's a kind of interesting, only about 3 in 10 were even Republicans want to see deportation as the policy of the U.S. I have to come back to you on the political leader's question. My guess is that we'd see White Evangelicals in particular, since there were sojourners, being a little more reticent about women leaders, but I'd have to look and see. I mean, general speaking, you know, traditional gender roles have been kind of a marker of the Evangelical kind of morality and values.

MR. BACON: To get at your sort of media question a little bit. I read a survey and I can't recall where I read it, but anyways, suggested essentially there's a fraction of Americans who are very politically engaged. They use Twitter, they watch cable news, they read the New York -- they read these sort of lead publications, and they do tend to live in a left-right universe, so they read the Daily Post and they watch MSNBC and they don't -- or they consume Fox.

But the majority of Americans interestingly still consume local newspaper, NBC News, some broad kind of, you know, Yahoo News which, you know, I don't read, but there's like MSN.Com, sort of a broader websites. So it's not as if people are living -- the parallel universe experience is actually more of an elite one than for most people who act like you said, are not consumed by political news. Thank goodness for them. And I guess I would say in terms of like how does that -- how does it affect issues?

What I would say is that I think there is room to maneuver and compromise on the issues that are not part of that partisan matrix. Like, people are not going to come together on ObamaCare at this point. I think that's pretty in the partisan matrix, for example. But the poll actually showed people support for restoring voting

rights for felons. Republicans, Democrats, Independents, majorities of all those groups support that. And my suspicion for that is, that's not the issue that's yet become -- Donald Trump has announced he's against that, and Obama -- I think Obama is for that and people know that, but it's not clear if that's become an issue to become part of the national political debate in a way that other issues do.

Once an issue gets in the national political debate, Fox picks its side, MSNBC pick -- other you know -- Daily Post picks its side, and you get to that partisanship quickly on issues where that hasn't -- like people I don't think didn't know what is my view on body cameras for police officers. That view is not necessarily predetermined by the parties, so it gave a little bit of room to maneuver in.

MR. DIONNE: I agree totally with Perry. I just wanted to point out a few reports ago we did an interesting analysis of viewership and to me the most interesting thing was the difference between Fox News Republicans, and non-Fox News Republicans, on a lot of issues. Now we don't know which way the causal arrow goes. Like you choose to watch Fox, therefore you have these views, or you watch Fox and you move towards these views. But there is clearly that split.

Having said that, I think it's really important to underscore what Perry said, which is a whole lot of Americans are not addicted to any of these networks.

MR. GALSTON: Thank God. Well, let me just conclude this marvelously spirited panel, and inclusive question-and-answer session, with one comment. And that is, that in many respects what we are talking about in this survey is not and exclusively American phenomenon. You see similar demographic splits throughout the advanced market economies. And I remember how startled I was when I listened to the analysis of the Brexit vote into the wee hours of the morning, and if you changed the nouns and the accents, you would have thought that they were talking about the U.S. election.

And in country after country in Europe you see these same divisions emerging. We are, whether we know it or not, in the grips of much larger historical forces. We have to get our minds around those forces, and then figure out distinctively American responses to them.

Thank you very much, to the panel, and the audience. (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