

THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

FALK AUDITORIUM

CODE RED:
A BOOK EVENT WITH E.J. DIONNE JR.

Washington, D.C.
Monday, February 24, 2020

Conversation:

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

ALEXANDRA PETRI
Columnist
The Washington Post

* * * * *

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. DIONNE: I want to welcome everybody here today. I'm E.J. Dionne. I'm a senior fellow here at Brookings. The views I am about to express are my own. I don't want people here necessarily to hang on my views.

There are so many people here. First, I want to thank Amber Hurley and Leti Davalos for organizing this event. I want to thank my agent, Gail Ross, for being here. You have probably already seen one of the 10,500,000 Mike Bloomberg ads; you know the tagline is "Mike Gets it Done." No. Gail gets it done (laughter), so thank you for being here.

One unusual person I want to -- also, another great book that you have to read, my friend, Melissa Rogers, who's a visiting scholar here, we worked together for 20 years, her book, "Faith in American Public Life," which has a nice double meaning, is a great book to read.

And, I can't resist honoring my retired Dr. Mark Shepherd who came here today. I honor him because he's an awesome doctor, because he's a great sports fan -- our kids played sports together -- but, he was actually the doctor to about half of the people in my part of Brookings, and there's enormous mourning in this building that you decided to retire. And also, so many other friends here. I want to thank you all for coming.

This is one of the coolest events Brookings has ever had, and that has nothing to do with me. I am so grateful to have Alexandra Petri here to lead this conversation. By the way, I want to say that we may end a little early because I want some time to sign any books you want to buy. You know, as my friend Norma Einstein says, "It makes a great holiday gift," and there's always a holiday somewhere down the road, so we may end a little early.

Many of you, I'm sure, know Alexandra. Let me do the sort of canned bio, and then the real bio. So, the canned bio is Alexandra is an American humorist and a newspaper columnist. In 2010 she became the youngest person to have a column at the Washington Post. She also runs the compost blog on the paper's website.

She is the author of, "A Field Guide to Awkward Silences." Her forthcoming book is, "Nothing is Wrong and Here is Why: Essays." It will be published this June. She was recognized in the 30 under 30 list by Forbes in 2018.

Now, let's go to the other part of the bio. A piece of satire she wrote in 2017 about President Trump was mischaracterized as news and included in one of the White House's daily press briefings.

MS. PETRI: Well the morning --

MR. DIONNE: Oh, there was more?

MS. PETRI: Well, their morning email. They didn't go out and stand in front of the people and say, "Here's real news." They just sent it out in a daily email.

MR. DIONNE: And it will not surprise you that this happened because the piece said, "Donald Trump's budget is perfect, and it will solve everything that's wrong in America," (laughter).

She has also appeared on Jeopardy. She won prizes in the O.Henry Pun-off. She performed in an international whistling competition; you can ask her to do that if you'd like.

Her play, "The Campsite Rule," a sex comedy whose title is derived from an idea taken from Dan Savage, was premiered at the Capital Film Festival. If everyone in this room promises to buy my book, we will only talk about Alexandra's sex comedy here today.

And her new play is about the Bill Buckley/Gore Vidal debates and it is called, "Inherit the Windbag." And on that note, I turn it over to Alexandra. Thanks so much, my goodness.

MS. PETRI: Well, thanks for having me. I don't have a secret second bio for you. I feel sort of unprepared. I just have your official regular bio, which I'm sure is well-known to all those present, but I'll give it anyway.

MR. DIONNE: Oh you can skip me, unless somebody really wants a bio. I grew up in Fall River, Massachusetts, and I'm a friend of Alexandra's, and I have a great new book out.

MS. PETRI: Exactly! "Yes, Code Red: How Progressives and Moderates Can Unite to Save Our Country," out this month.

MR. DIONNE: My wife once said, "You know, you're really good at writing books, but what you're great at is shameless self-promotion." So, there you have it.

MS. PETRI: Yeah, it's funny, I flew back in from Nevada last night. I apologize in advance for being slightly less coherent, even in my low, usual bar for coherence -- coherency? -- already it's happening.

I was excited, though, that I had this as a prospect on the horizon because coming back from the primary is where people are sitting there saying, oh my gosh, the Maginot Line has fallen, and your whole vision is that people not only should get along, but can get along.

MR. DIONNE: Right. Just before this event I sent out a tweet that went with a column that ran in the Post today, and the tweet read, “Democrats cannot defeat Trump without the forces represented by Bernie Sanders, and they cannot defeat Trump with the forces represented by Bernie alone, and that they have to come together.”

And what I am petrified by, and the reason I wrote this book, and what we’re seeing out there in the wake of Nevada, is such enormous division that Donald Trump is having a wonderful time tweeting about it.

I was very struck that his tweet after the Nevada Caucuses congratulated “Crazy Bernie”, and then said don’t let them take it away from you.

The moral of that story is that Trump on the one hand would love to run against those he has called “crazy socialists,” but he would also relish attacking the “democratic establishment” if they denied Sanders the nomination. So, this party, I think, has a lot of work to do going forward and we can sort of talk about that.

The core argument of the book - the first sentence of the book is, “Will progressives and moderates feud while America burns?” And my great fear is that they will.

I argue that people we call progressives and people we call moderates -- and, by the way, I know all terminology in this area is vexed. I have a whole page on the problem with the word moderate and then explain why I use it anyway -- but, that they have more in common than they want to realize. Not only that, they actually need to learn from each other.

Now, that risks making me an unwelcome family counselor in a terrible feud. But the book is not, “oh, progressives have to move to the center and that’s that.”

No, I argue that progressives have been right about a number of things. They were right that moderates spent too much time over the years negotiating with themselves. It was almost like you start a negotiating offering the asking price on a house and expect good things to happen.

Progressives are right that the country has lived under the Reagan economic consensus

for way too long. I think the rise of democratic socialism, which I'm happy to talk about if anybody wants to, can be explained in part by that backlash against the long Reagan economic consensus which basically said every problem in the country we can be solved if we just throw money at rich people. And that's not a very good economic policy, and it hasn't worked for a lot of people.

But I think moderates are right, first, in the dispositions they suggest for our politics. After Trump, we do need a period of what you would call moderation in the way we treat each other as Americans. The moderates are right that we do need to find some way to come together as a country.

I always love to do this with a big crowd because I like to hear the answer, "What's the first word of our Constitution?"

AUDIENCE: We.

MR. DIONNE: I love hearing crowds say "we." We don't say "we" as a country anymore. And above all, moderates are right that in most cases in American history, what Elizabeth Warren likes to call "big structural change" -- we got a new refrigerator and I sent out a note to our very political kids that this new fridge represents "big structural change" in our house (laughter) -- but what Elizabeth Warren calls "big structural change" often happens in steps.

Two examples I use in the book, the original Social Security program was not the one that we ended up with. It was much narrower; it excluded a lot of people. But we put a structure in place that we built on, and eventually, virtually all Americans -- most Americans -- were covered by Social Security.

The great Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Voting Rights Act of '65, followed two much weaker civil rights bills passed in the 1950s that got us going.

So, what I argue, drawing on a man who actually was a democratic socialist, Michael Harrington, the author of "The Other America," that great book that helped spark the Anti-Poverty Program, Mike used to talk about visionary gradualism, and maybe that's not a slogan on which you want to hang your hat.

I can imagine a really cutting, funny, brilliant Alexandra column on how much more boring can you get than visionary gradualism, but I find it exciting because the visionary part says, Progressives are right that we do need substantial change in this country. Moderates are right that those changes

often come step by step by step.

And, if they could come together and agree that yes, both sides want change, both sides want reform, and then agree that it may have to happen over time -- not too long, not putting off forever, not what Martin Luther King called, by taking the tranquilizing drug of gradualism, but by gradualism with a purpose, I think we might be able to win an election or two and actually pass things and add things that would make lives better for Americans, particularly the ones who are left out.

Sorry, that's a long answer, but that was an open invitation to plug the argument, so thank you (laughter).

MS. PETRI: Yeah, I think you pretty much touched on a lot of the key points of sort of where the intersection is between things.

And, taking a step back, I think one of the things that has precipitated this is what's happened to the Republican Party, and you have a whole chapter in your book sort of dedicated to that and one of the statistics that you have -- that I may not be entirely, accurately quoting -- is that while democrats have become somewhat more liberal, republicans have become like 150 percent more conservative by some measures, which explains why you wind up with this alliance. Can you say more about that?

MR. DIONNE: Yeah, thank you, and 150 percent is right actually. Just to give one other piece of data, both parties have moved away from the center some, partly because democrats have lost all those southern segregationists, they used to have back in the '50s. but, if you ask people who say they're republicans, or say they're democrats, how they think of themselves, only about half of democrats call themselves liberal. The other half call themselves moderate or conservative.

Now, two-thirds of republicans in its rising call themselves conservative, and similarly, if you look at how members of Congress vote, republican members of Congress are well to the right of center compared to democrats being left of center, and that became even more extreme after the last election because a lot of the republicans who lost represented more moderate districts, and the democrats elected a slew of more moderate candidates from republican districts.

What I argue is, this presents a peculiar problem for the broad center left and for the Democratic Party because the democrats and liberals in the left have lost a thoughtful interlocutor.

Almost all of the big arguments about how to change the country, how to create reform, are now happening inside the Democratic Party.

Richard Nixon -- I will say a nice word about Richard Nixon (laughter) -- Richard Nixon healthcare plan that he put forward in the early '70s was to the left of Barack Obama's healthcare plan.

Lots of republicans used to acknowledge that, "Yes, it's a problem that so many Americans don't have health insurance and we need to do something about it." Indeed, Obamacare itself was based on ideas from The Heritage Foundation and from Mitt Romney's plan in Massachusetts, yet this was labeled as socialism.

In the book -- and we can talk about Bernie some -- I think one of the useful things about Bernie's intervention in our politics is, I don't think we can move to single payer right away.

I do think having that in the debate has been enormously useful to defining where the left in that debate really is. Suddenly, people are realizing Obamacare is quite moderate.

And so, the chapter on republicans is called "Missing in Action" because I think you see two forms of radicalization in the Republican Party. One is obviously Trump, and Trump is more radical on immigration than even his immediate predecessors. If his predecessors used dog-whistle politics around race issues, Trump uses a bullhorn on these issues.

There are ways in which he's moved in a more radical direction, but there are other ways in which the radicalization of the Republican Party preceded Trump and opened the way for Trump.

I'm very fond of John F. Kennedy's line from his inaugural address, "He who rides to power on the back of the Tiger ends up inside." I think that's what happened with the Republican Party and Donald Trump.

MS. PETRI: Speaking of socialism -- which you did sort of drop in there -- why don't we talk about socialism. I think, especially as a millennial, one of the things that people who are from a slightly older, more venerable generation hear when they hear socialism --

MR. DIONNE: Ancient, young, just to be very clear--

MS. PETRI: They think people are coming with torches to take their cows and things (laughter). And I think millennials tend to think -- as you were saying -- Copenhagen, Denmark. That's what socialism is, more of a broad opportunity for people to be bolstered by their society as opposed to

guillotines right and left. Although I'm sure on the internet there's always a guillotine somewhere.

MR. DIONNE: The internet is a guillotine these days, yes, exactly. No, I think you're exactly right. I think that's one of the -- and I want to shout out my Brookings colleague, Bill Galston, who recently had a very good column on young people and where they're coming from, and he and I actually did a piece for Brookings together on socialism, some of which I used in the book.

Young people have a very different view of socialism for two reasons, and you've really listed them both. One is, young people got hammered more by the fallout from the Great Recession than anybody else.

If you were a college student young person, you went to college at a time when state governments were slashing their support for public education which meant that your tuition went up, your debt went up, and it was a real problem.

If you were non-college bound and you're young, you entered an economy where the unemployment rate shot up, where opportunities did not exist as they existed before, and where the kind of blue collar jobs that you're dad or grand-dad might have had that paid a decent wage weren't there anymore.

So, young people have a much less positive view of capitalism than older people do for good reason. That's one reason why I think Bernie has taken off.

And if you look at Bernie's program, it's a very specific set of what I called today in my column, deliverables. The young people look at it and say, "Yeah, free college, it looks awfully good to me. Single payer looks good to me when I can't buy health insurance in any way," and so on. But the second is, young people didn't live through the Cold War.

I always tell this story, I went to a catholic school, there used to be a catholic comic book called *Treasure Chest* with sort of catholic ideas propagated, it was in the '50s in that anti-communist period and a friend and I were reminiscing about this some years ago.

We will never forget an issue of that magazine that was devoted to what would happen if the Soviets took over the United States, and our flag, the Stars and Stripes -- we had the stripes, but the stars were replaced by a sickle and a hammer. And as kids cowered before the teacher, she was pointing to a black board where it was written, "There is no God." People in the older generation, yeah it

was --

MS. PETRI: Very subtle.

MR. DIONNE: Subtle.

MS. PETRI: Extremely subtle.

MR. DIONNE: It was a completely subtle message. People in the older generation remember the Soviet Union, and the Soviet Union was a repressive regime. You didn't need that comic book to know it.

For young people, socialism means Denmark; it means Sweden, it means Norway. These are not scary places. Indeed, there are polls that show actually that the people in Denmark are the happiest people in the world (laughter). And if socialism means that a lot of people are happy, what's wrong with it?

And so, I think that is the difference. So, you could say American young people are more sophisticated because they have been Europeanized and view socialism through that optic and not the old optic.

Electorally, it's a challenge because there are still a lot of older people in the electorate who associate socialism with absolute state control over the economy.

Just to close, I once wrote a column saying, "Come on Bernie, you're really a social democrat." But he continues to call himself a democratic socialist. Paul Krugman has been on this also saying, "Bernie, why don't you just call yourself a social democrat, everything would be easier."

MS. PETRI: I think you were including in the book some sections of the speeches that he was giving that were basically, you were saying, "this is the New Deal." You're embracing capitalism within the New Deal, and here's an excerpt representing that.

MR. DIONNE: Right, I quote Bernie's two speeches explaining socialism and actually, both speeches are praising the New Deal in a way that just about everybody who voted for all the other candidates over the last few primaries would also agree with, I think.

MS. PETRI: And speaking -- going back from the primaries a little bit, I know one of the things that is exciting about the book is that you're talking about a time when there was actually sort of a success in building this alliance, which is the 2018 elections, and you spoke to a whole range of people

from across the country, and across the ideological spectrum about how they were sort of doing that.

And I thought one of the more fascinating people you talked to was Ayanna Pressley from Massachusetts. Can you share a little bit of that?

MR. DIONNE: Yeah, I had a lot fun in 2018 -- is Amber still here, she arranged all these journeys where I met a lot of -- spoke with a lot of candidates on the ballot that year, including Sherrod Brown -- who's also got a great book out by the way, represented by Gail -- and Stacy Abrams, and a bunch of congressional candidates. An interesting group from New Jersey for example.

But two of my favorites and that I write about at some length were Ayanna Pressley and Abigail Spanberger, out in Richmond. Now, on the face of it, Ayanna Pressley and Abigail Spanberger are quite different from each other.

Ayanna Pressley is a fascinating woman. She was on the City Council in Boston; African American woman 40 years old at the time. She took on a quite progressive member of Congress from her district called Mike Capuano, but her argument was that it was not a moment for even traditional liberalism.

Her slogan, which I like so much I made it the title of my last chapter, "Change Can't Wait," which I thought was a fascinating combination of Barack Obama's, "Change we can believe in," and Martin Luther King's, "The Fierce Urgency of Now," and it's only three words, and her constituency was made up of younger people -- very much like the Bernie constituency or the AOC constituency -- African Americans and other minorities in her district, plus a kind of new class of younger, somewhat techy people in the district, and she swamped Mike Capuano even though most people in the district actually liked him, that's A.

B is Abigail Spanberger, she beat a Tea-Party person in a very republican district. The district, as some of you may remember, was Eric Cantor's district. He lost it to the Tea-Party person.

Spanberger needed Trump votes. She needed a lot of moderate votes. She probably even needed some conservative votes. She also was critical of Trump but in a more mild way that Ayanna would be.

She spoke -- I quote here in the book extensively -- not so much attacking Trump directly as suggesting that we need a different kind of politics.

My favorite promise that she made is, "If I'm elected, I'm won't just represent the people who voted for me, but agree with me, I'll represent everybody in my district," which I recently discovered was Abraham Lincoln's promise in his congressional race.

Now, the democrats would not have their majority if people like Abigail Spanberger hadn't been elected. Ayanna Pressley wouldn't have the influence in Congress that she has as part of the majority if Abigail Spanberger hadn't been elected. However, Abigail Spanberger wouldn't have been elected without the energy on the progressive part of the party that Ayanna Pressley represented.

Rarely does a book event actually ratify a thesis in the book but I did an event recently at Politics and Prose where somebody got up in the audience and said, "My politics are well to the left of Abigail Spanberger's, but I work my heart out for her, and so did a lot of my colleagues." So that's the kind of unity the party needs.

And it's not just the party, there are also independents like Pete Buttigieg's line, "soon to be former republicans." You know, there are a lot of people out there who want an alternative to Trump that they could vote for, and you need to bring together these forces if you're going to have a successful coalition.

MS. PETRI: One of the things that I kept wondering about, you keep saying we need to bring these together, the overage in windows being expanded by those in the left who are describing what, as you point out, is actually a much more left-word policy, in terms of things like Medicare for all or single payer, but it does seem like -- how sort of -- literally, how -- can people reconcile these two perspectives.

MR. DIONNE: you know, I've been wondering, I haven't decided on this yet. Maybe a broker convention would be a blessing because everybody would have to sit around the table and get along. But that's still kind of thinking about that. There are some up sides and down sides to a broker convention.

I think some of it is how each side talks about the other. And here, I risk, again, falling back into that family counselor role, but I think if all moderates are just neoliberal sellouts and are constantly cast that way, and if all lefties are cast as extremists who don't know how the American system works, the kind of very language that each side of this movement -- and I do see it broadly as a

movement -- if they keep talking about each other that way, they're going to make it much harder to do business together.

You know, Nancy Pelosi gets a pretty good ride in my book. I quote her -- I loved a moment during 2018 when she was asked about candidates promising not to vote for her as Speaker, and Pelosi didn't care at all. She said, "Just win it, Baby," (laughter). So, Pelosi even didn't take personally some of this stuff that was out there. I think that's the first step.

I think the second step is to understand how the system works. And here, I was very heartened recently -- and I don't mean the system, the corrupt system; I mean the normal, democratic system -- small D -- where people actually do have to have a give and take if they're going to move forward.

And recently AOC said something very interesting. Some people criticized her for it. I thought it was awesome and I thought -- wrongly, I'm sure -- maybe she read my book (laughter), but she said, "Look, we put out single payer because why give up everything at the first stage of negotiation. If we ended up with a public option with everybody covered, would that be so bad?" I would love more people on that side to talk that way.

And similarly, I would like more people on the moderate side to say, "there is good reason" -- as we were outlining before when you were talking about young people and socialism -- "there is good reason why a lot of people have moved to the left. There is good reason why after the Great Crash of 2008 that capitalism just doesn't look quite as good to people as it might have in the 1990s, and, let's take into account where this point of view comes from."

So, I think that's a start and I think the candidate who can model that in his campaign might get a leg up. Elizabeth Warren briefly tried to do that and discovered the press doesn't cover anybody calling for unity, so she went after Mike Bloomberg rather effectively. But --

MS. PETRI: Isn't going after Mike Bloomberg the highest unity.

MR. DIONNE: Yeah right. Every candidate on the field who had to fight threw all these awful primaries is not happy with Michael Bloomberg stepping in.

MS. PETRI: So, it sounds like what you're saying is most talking differently about one another, and also listening to one another, which is sort of radical, but also, I guess -- I'm now having

difficulty expressing this -- but, given what happened with impeachment where it was made possible by this alliance, but then also it just revealed sort of the strength of the opposition, it sort of really heightened the fact that this is a critical time to be figuring this out. What do you think the stakes are?

MR. DIONNE: Right, and I think the impeachment in the Senate acquittal with only Mitt Romney voting to convict -- and, by the way, I loved the Mitt Romney speech, particularly, as some of you know, I'm very interested in the interaction between religion and politics, and it was really lovely to see somebody invoke God not as ratifying my own view of the world, but rather as a challenge to conscience. I thought that it was just a fascinating speech Romney gave that day -- but what impeachment showed are the forces we are up against.

I argue in the book that I would love to see a different form of conservatism and a different kind of Republican Party which we have had before.

You know, I grew up in a conservative family so I cannot, by my very nature, hate conservatives. There are people I loved who are conservatives. I started turning when I was around 13 years old.

I had a dear uncle I spent 35 years arguing politics with and when he died I gave the eulogy at his funeral where I made a point of quoting Richard Nixon, and I looked at people in the church and I said, "You know, I kind of like that Nixon quote, but I quoted Nixon because I was hoping Uncle Ray would come back to life just to say, 'I knew you'd be quoting Nixon someday'."

So, I would like a better Republican Party and I laid out a little creed for that party, but I don't think that party would come to exist unless this version of it suffers a really overwhelming defeat, is forced to come to terms with where it is leading itself.

Now, in the long-term, I think this kind of republicanism is in trouble because the republican base is so old. I always tell my kids I'm not worried about the country -- and the book is dedicated to the coming generation, which is why I am so grateful you are here (laughter) -- and I always tell my kids, when you guys take over and we die off I'm not worried about the country. The only problem is I want to be around to see it.

But that's in the long run. I think in the short run the dangers are too great and so I think these two sides must hand this version of republicanism a great defeat to have any chance of having a

more rational form of conservatism.

And it does exist. I've been reading a very interesting book -- you shouldn't plug other people's books (laughter), but, Yuval Levin, a very interesting conservative next door at AEI called, *A Time To Build*, which is about how to we need to rebuild institutions in our country.

That's the kind of politics where we could have a real conversation between progressives and conservatives. But that's a very different kind of conservatism than what we're seeing out there right now.

MS. PETRI: You know, I think another thing that AOC said -- you were quoting her earlier -- that rocks the mind is that in many countries she and Joe Biden would not be in the same party.

And so, one of the sort of boons and terrors of the two-party system is that you wind up with an enormous tent under which people are trying to be asked to align themselves. And you talk about values, and the two pieces of that, that were necessary. Not just visionary gradualism, but also recognition and redistribution together.

Can you talk about sort of what that shared vision you think that everyone does have in common under the large tent might be?

MR. DIONNE: God, I love how closely you read this book. Bless you (laughter). Thank you so much.

Just on the two-party, multi-party -- this is Brookings, we could talk about that all day. They each present challenges.

The advantage of a multi-party system is you can vote for the party that really perfectly represents you, thus, as in Germany, and in a lot of others, as in Sweden, you might have a center-left party and left party that would be separate. So, AOC and Joe Biden would be in different parties. That has representational benefits.

The problem is all the coalition building takes place after the election and you can end up with -- the Italians had a great word for this, it was *partitocrazia*. It's a party-ocracy, and there was great alienation because it was just the parties making deals in the back room.

The advantage of a two-party system is the coalitions are made ahead of time, so you roughly know what coalition you're voting for.

There are advantages and disadvantages to each and I think at this moment we're seeing particular disadvantages to our system.

But I argue that, in fact, at this moment -- very particularly 2020 -- the values represented by the broad center and center-left may be, what I think, are what the country needs to get through this past and needs that coalition. But, thank you on the identity politics.

It's a chapter I worked hardest on in some ways because it was the hardest chapter to write because identity politics, as you all know, is very difficult. Especially, an older white guy with hair this color writing about identity politics is a high-risk thing to do.

And, I argue that the very term "identity politics" is vexed because as Stacy Abrams noted, we didn't ask for identity politics, we were made slaves because of the color of our skin. We were segregated because of the color of our skin. And for us, identity politics is a way of fighting back against oppression. And you could say that of women, you can say that of LGBTQ people, you could say that of a lot of groups. So that's the first point.

The second point is that what we do need to recognize is that there are various forms of injustice, all of which need to be dealt with simultaneously. Thus, there is a very particular form of injustice faced by African Americans that is faced by no other kinds of Americans. There are forms of injustice, faced by all people of color, faced by them that are not faced by other Americans.

But there are also class injustices that are faced by Americans of all colors. Including white, working class people in the country, some of whom voted for Donald Trump because they were angry.

Yes, I think you can never deny the strong racial and racist element to that vote, but I think it's a mistake to deny that there was always an anger at class injustice.

In the book I point out, and my friends Tom Mann and Norm Ornstein and I did some work on this, that if you look at the geography of the Trump vote, he did especially best in places that weren't growing economically.

Think of Reading and Erie Pennsylvania, other parts of Wisconsin or Michigan, or my home town of Fall River, Massachusetts -- a very solid democratic place -- Hilary carried it but by a lot less than democrats usually carried it when Trump is on the ballot.

So, I use the ideas of a great scholar called Nancy Fraser to say that we need both the politics of recognition and a politics of redistribution, or distribution if you prefer, where we have to speak simultaneously to the particular injustices faced by groups who were left out through ascription, through a lack of recognition, but also the injustices faced across racial lines connected to class.

And one of the people I think has done this best -- I referenced him earlier -- was Sherrod Brown whom I interviewed in 2018, and in the back of his car he gave this lovely little sermon on the dignity of work.

I really think that equal dignity should be a central idea -- is the central idea of the kind of politics that I'm recommending in the book. I think dignity is a word I would love to hear because I think it's what people are frustrated that they are not being granted.

And I think it's a heck of a critique of the way Donald Trump is carrying out his presidency because dignity is not the first word that comes to mind when you think about it.

MS. PETRI: I think that's a great word. I was also very struck -- I thought Stacy Abrams says it beautifully both in the book and elsewhere that identity politics are not people asking to be treated especially because of who they are, they're asking not to be treated differently or unfairly because of who they are.

MR. DIONNE: Yeah.

MS. PETRI: And that, to me, is such a simple and elegant way of putting it. There's really nothing controversial in that -- or there shouldn't be. And I think dignity is a lovely note to end on as we start moving towards maybe opening the room up to some questions. But what gives you hope as you're writing this, that people won't just fight in the face of conflagration?

MR. DIONNE: A couple of things. First, as you mentioned, 2018 gives me hope. That was an amazing mobilization and sometimes I think that if Trump doesn't destroy our democracy, he may help us save it. Not by design, but my pulling so many new people into political activism. Young people especially, but not just young people.

I cite the work of the great scholar Theda Skocpol, and Theda is a scholar but she's really like a reporter, which I mean, is a compliment because she travels all over the country to places -- she's done a big study of places that voted for Donald Trump.

And Theda can get herself into any door, even people with the most conservative views because she is the most knowledgeable NFL fan in the country. And so, she can talk to anybody about football and that opens the door to a lot of things, particularly in states like Pennsylvania.

But what Theda has noticed is that even in the most republican small towns in the country, groups of people meeting -- usually led by woman -- many of them not particularly ideological but very turned off by the president's politics, have met in diners and in libraries and in church basements -- yes, liberals go to church basements too -- to sort of begin forms in political action.

These are places that saw very little mobilization, except on the right side of politics, before. So that gives me hope.

When you look at the 2018 results, it's a fact that we don't pay enough attention to. If you compare the 2014 midterms with the 2018 midterms, 25 million more Americans voted democratic for Congress in 2018 than in 2014, and that's an enormous change. So, its not like the countries' eyes were shut to what was going on.

And what that tells me -- and then I also noticed that Trump has never, except in some Rasmussen polls, ever had a majority of Americans on his side; that most Americans either recoil from, or at least oppose, to his way of dividing us. I think Americans are tired of this long period of division.

Now, I am a realist. I see all the ways in which we are divided. I think this will take a lot of work, and that's why, again, I go back to dignity because if I oppose -- which I do -- the ways in which Trump divides us along so many lines of gender, of race, of immigration status, I also don't want my side, the broad progressive side, to divide us by talking about parts of our country as flyover country, by implying that people who might disagree with us on one election, in one election, are permanently lost to us.

Democrats won the governorships and senate seats in Pennsylvania, Michigan, and Wisconsin -- just to pick three states at random (laughter) -- in 2018 because 10 to 15 percent of people who voted for Trump came the other way.

So, we can persuade each other, and we have to open our minds I think, with empathy -- which is another word I talk about lot in the book. By feeling -- I mean it was made fun of that Bill Clinton feels your pain -- but feeling someone else's pain is actually a good thing and we ought to be able to do

that across racial lines, more than we do, and we ought to do that across gender lines, and we also ought to do that across class and regional lines, and I hope we'll get to that in this divisive democratic primary before it's over.

You hear some of it. Bernie does it sometimes, Biden, Buttigieg, Warren, I mean they all have pieces of this. I'd like that to be a bit more of a dominant theme, but I suppose they got to beat each other so I might be disappointed for a while.

MS. PETRI: Also, the individual candidates all have problems but, in the aggregate, I really like the person who's running. At some point, we're going to have to Frankenstein this into a person.

MR. DIONNE: The Whigs tried to run four different candidates in 1836 in different parts of the county (laughter), but it didn't work.

MS. PETRI: I think it might be time to start opening -- I see a couple of hands, great. I'm going to start on the right, with you Sir.

MR. ARNO: Do I need a microphone.

MR. DIONNE: Yeah, a mic is coming your way.

MR. ARNO: Okay.

MR. DIONNE: Thank you. And then --

MS. PETRI: Riveting --

MR. ARNO: Hi, I'm Bill Arno with the National Academy of Social Insurance --

MR. DIONNE: Oh, bless you, one of my favorite groups --

MR. ARNO: We had just dusted off a piece you wrote for us about 20 years ago, and we

--

MR. DIONNE: Just keep reminding me of how much older I am.

MR. ARNO: Actually it was 28 years ago, I'm trying to be (laughter) -- we just did a piece on the distinction between social insurance and socialism, but I'm wondering after hearing you, is that more of a distinction without a difference, or should be emphasize the difference?

MR. DIONNE: That's a really great question. I mean, social insurance exists in capitalist societies. So, obviously, social insurance is different from socialism in that sense.

On the other hand, the inspiration for social insurance came from both socialist movements in the country where it got established. And certain forms of conservatism, Christian Democracy is a good example, where in the interest of social cohesion, in the interesting of preventing people from overthrowing capitalism, social insurance was introduced to create a certain amount of harmony and justice in a capitalist society.

Again, the reason why I like the term social democracy is that most socialist parties, democratic socialist parties in the world, have evolved into social democratic parties in places like Sweden, Denmark, Norway, Germany when they were in power. I see a friend who's a German social democrat in the audience here.

And, you know, social democracy accepts that the market is important and useful as an instrument, but that the market shouldn't dominate all aspects of society. That's what I believe: that you could call that person a social democrat and that would be true, you could call him a New Dealer and that would be true, you might even call him a left of center Christian democrat, and that would be true.

So, I would like to de-demonize democratic socialism as a concept, but there's no need to hang your hat on that concept to win an argument.

The New Deal was influenced by democratic socialists, as I write in the book. They were very creative in helping build the New Deal, but the New Deal was not state socialism. And that's the distinction we need to make, I think.

MS. PETRI: All right, you, in the front. If you want to project --

MR. DIONNE: Why don't you stay in the front just for a bit --

MS. PETRI: Yeah --

MR. DIONNE: Because we've got a whole bunch here.

MS. PETRI: Yeah, there's a large cluster.

MR. DIONNE: And then maybe you could just pass the mic along. This gentleman -- a dear friend for many events. Bless you for coming.

MR. CHEKOW: I always like hearing that. Larry Chekow. A statistic that I'd like to have verified and then some reaction to it; but I read somewhere -- and I think it was the Post --

MR. DIONNE: Then it must be true (laughter).

MR. CHEKOW: In the New Hampshire primary, in a very relatively uncontested republican primary in New Hampshire, 132 thousand people came out to vote for Trump. Number 1, is that true? And Number 2, what does that say about republicans being able to get their vote out?

MR. DIONNE: So, I'll be brief on this one. Friends make fun of me as being a glass one-tenth full person (laughter). Like if there's a little liquid there, I want to find it.

What I would point out is that 15 percent of the people who voted in the republican primary made an affirmative effort to go out and vote against Donald Trump in that primary. Bill Well got about 8 percent, there some write-ins, there were a zillion candidates, there are always a zillion candidates on the New Hampshire ballot because it's easy to qualify. If you put together all the people who voted against Trump it was about 15 percent.

I think we know that the Trump constituency will mobilize and the figure I didn't point out when I said 25 million more democratic votes in 2018 than 2014 -- there were 10 million more republican votes. This is a period of real mobilization in our politics.

So, I guess I was struck that that 15 percent going out to do something other than vote for Trump -- if he lost 15 percent of republicans in the election, he's in big trouble. So, that is -- from my point of view -- a hopeful spin on the same number. Sir?

MR. COLEMAN: Richard Coleman, CBP, Retired. I remember not to long ago the republicans could make quite a big deal over a democratic candidate not having an American flag on his lapel, and now they're totally indifferent to a White House where there's joking with the Russians, and the American Press has been banished. They seem to be indifferent.

Can the democrats position themselves as the party of national security? And I would note that the republicans have thrown a good one out, or maybe its just the facts, the idea that Putin is pushing Sanders, which kind of undercuts the argument that, "Hey, the republicans, look what they're doing with the Russians."

MR. DIONNE: Well, a couple of things here. There's evidence that the republicans were pushing -- I mean, the republicans -- see? There I -- Putin and the republicans, are allied -- whoops (laughter). You know, they were doing some of that in 2016 because they hated Hilary Clinton, and there is a debate over what that is about. Bernie Sanders critics who worry that he can't win argue it's about

helping Trump win reelection.

I think what's certain that we might actually agree on across lines is the Russians are very good at using our hatred of each other against us; that they are using our own divisions against us.

There's a story that the Russians created a fake anti-Muslim group in, I think it was Houston, and called a demonstration. Then they created a fake pro-Muslim, that is to say a pro-Muslim rights group, and they called a counter demonstration. This is what they're trying to do to us.

But I agree with your point. I have a whole chapter on nationalism and patriotism in the book, and it does seem to me that -- you know, I prefer for a variety of reasons the word patriotism to nationalism because of the way -- even though we have our own positive form of nationalism in the United States. You could argue Lincoln and Teddy Roosevelt and a lot of other people had a positive American form of nationalism. But I think the term nationalism got discredited for good reasons by the Nazis and my Fascist movements in the '30s.

But patriotism -- the love of country -- is not a reactionary force. In fact, a lot of the solidarity we feel toward each other comes from the fact that we begin with the "we" that I started with before, and that we do feel a particular form of obligation to our fellow Americans just as we feel particular forms of obligation to people in our families.

That doesn't mean we hate other countries, that doesn't mean we have a sort of attitude of massive superiority. We just love our country. And I think, yes, yes, the republicans are very vulnerable on this; yes, the people have to call them out on this.

It is astonishing in the Trump years how republicans have just turned their backs on things -- with the exception of Mitt Romney in that debate, and every once in a while a republican will speak up but it's sort of like whack-a-mole, then they go underground (laughter) again -- there's something very disturbing that's going on, on the other side, and I think democrats should call it out without apology because I think it is against the national interest of the United States.

I have a chapter on foreign policy, which I'll just say two sentences about. Broadly speaking, I am sympathetic to what might be called liberal internationalism, which is to say I think America needs to play an important role in the world, if only because the alternatives are not alternatives we want to see.

Do we really want to see a world in which our power is so diminished that its dominated by say, the current Chinese regime, or by the Putin regime, or God knows some other regimes?

On the other hand, I cite Bernie Sanders and Elizabeth Warren arguing that a lot of average Americans have lost faith in internationalists, the traditional internationalists, because they don't see those forces representing their interests, their economic interests, anymore on the international stage.

And I make the point that the architects of post WWII internationalism, FDR and Harry Truman, had the backs of American workers. They were actually trying to create a world that was fairer, that was more social democratic in Europe, more New Deal-ish, and that we need to bring together the internationalists impulses of people like Biden and Buttigieg, and others, with the concerns for Main Street and the American worker that Bernie and Warren talk about, and that's where I think we need to go.

MS. POPLIN: Hi, I'm Dr. Caroline Poplin, I grew up in Massachusetts, partly in Hudson outside of Worcester, a little mill town.

MR. DIONNE: Just like my place.

MS. POPLIN: Exactly, exactly, full of empty mills. I detested President Reagan, but don't you think the democrats ought to adopt his rule? The 11th commandment, thou shall not speak ill of any other democrat, and talk to Pete Buttigieg who describes Bernie as going to burn the house down?

MR. DIONNE: You know, I'm a fan of Reagan's 11th commandment applied in this race. The problem in the whole business is trust but verify on each side. I wish Bernie had not sort of equated the republican and democratic establishment in a tweet last Friday. I mean, if there is an escalation going on here, that's dangerous.

But there's another Reagan idea that I want to put on the table, so thanks. In the book I talk about the power of negative thinking, and I note that if you look at Reagan, he built a whole ideology out of three Anti(s) basically. Anti-government, anti-tax, anti-communism, and out of those Anti(s) came a whole conservative program.

I think that those Anti(s), when it comes to Trump, allowed progressives and moderates to see where they fundamentally agree, that they are anti-prejudice, anti-racism, anti-authoritarian, and pro-democracy, and so on. And that out of those -- and if you go from Bernie to Biden to Buttigieg to

Warren to Amy Klobuchar, those are all the things about the Trump presidency that all of them are criticizing.

If I could do Bernie's Brooklyn, I would say racism and sexism the way Bernie says it. It's sort of appealing in a Saturday Night Live sort of way (laughter). My wife is from Brooklyn, so I like Brooklyn.

So, I think there is something to be built out of that, so I do sort of talk about Reagan and some lessons that progressives can learn from him. Thank you. Can we call on my doctor?

MS. PETRI: Yes, I want to hear from your doctor. I've been hearing about what a wonderful doctor this gentleman is.

DR. SHEPPARD: No need to introduce me, Dr. Sheppard.

MS. PETRI: We're going to draft him back to work by the way, that's the whole purpose of this. It's a hidden agenda, go ahead.

DR. SHEPPARD: It seems the way forward, if there's going to be an alternative to Bernie as some people dropping out maybe sooner rather than later, and I'm wondering if you think the head of the DNC has any role in any of this?

MR. DIONNE: Here's the problem. I think after what happened in 2016 and after the attack by Bernie-ites, in some cases they had a point, in some cases they didn't. I have a mixed view of that. I mean, I think in 2016 there should have been more debates.

In fact, the ideal number of debates is probably the average of what they had then and what we've had now --

MS. PETRI: Another one tomorrow.

MR. DIONNE: Yeah, I know, so I don't think it's the head of the DNC. I do think it's significant that Jim Clyburn down in South Carolina is going to endorse Joe Biden.

I'm so curious what we might learn from our great newspapers about whether Nancy Pelosi may have encouraged him to do that. So, I don't think the head of the DNC will do it.

I think there are a lot of lines burning up right now as we sit here, probably to Amy Klobuchar because of her showing, except in New Hampshire. It was really amazing. I mean, I give her full credit for the surge she had, but her third place was her best showing.

I think a lot of it is going on, you saw it this morning on some of the talk shows, on Tom Steyer. So, I think you're going to see it organically within the party from the people who are opposed to Bernie.

I think it's going to be important that the whole thing not look like a gang-up on Bernie because, as I say, the democrats cannot win without the energy of the Bernie forces, and I am really worried that it's configured in a way where we will just repeat some of the problems that existed in 2016.

It was bad enough to do that the first time Trump ran, but when we know what we have to look forward to in a second Trump term, it would be a -- tragedy, I think, doesn't even begin to describe it, but thank you.

MS. PETRI: I want to get someone in the back, yes.

SPEAKER: Please help me be optimistic. I was a McGovernite in 1972.

MR. DIONNE: Me too.

SPEAKER: Okay, and I didn't care -- I didn't think McGovern would win, but I wanted to make a statement, and I'm really concerned that history is going to repeat itself in 2020 regarding the Sanders people. So, please make me optimistic.

MR. DIONNE: So, I was an alternate delegate for George McGovern in 1972. I got elected two days after my 20th birthday, and I remember exactly what you're saying. And I remember encountering a young, not-yet-elected politician called Barney Frank (laughter) at a democratic meeting in Massachusetts; he was Ed Muskey.

Barney said, "I am always for the left most electable democrat." (Laughter) that was Barney's rule. And I have had some of the same thoughts, and I don't know about you, but boy do they make me feel old.

The very notion that I might tell some young Bernie-ite that, "well, learn from my experience," I think would make them feel just like I did then, where you older people telling me about losing my hope, losing my idealism; and I think that's problematic.

So, we fight the election. I think we just fight the primaries out on the merits. Having lived through that I have some of the same worries.

I think the difference now is one of the reasons why many people went to work for

George McGovern was the war in Vietnam. That was the crisis, and people who supported McGovern were looking for the Democratic Party to take a strong position on the war, just as people who supported Bobby Kennedy, or Gene McCarthy did in 1968.

In this circumstance, the central issue is not the war, I think it's Donald Trump because I don't think we can move forward before first dispatching with Trumpism. And I argue in the book that this whole notion of, "well either you want restoration or transformation," is a kind of false choice because in order to have transformation, we need to restore certain basic democratic values. But restoration is not enough because we've got to deal with underlying problems Trump represents.

And so, I think people probably should have felt that about Richard Nixon, but I actually think Donald Trump is a greater threat to what we, as small D democrats, believe in. That is a case for why we cannot let the divisions that really tore us apart.

I mean, that democratic convention, as you recall, was rather problematic when McGovern got nominated at two o'clock in the morning. It took a little bit away from the convention bounce that we like to talk about but thank you. Maybe we ran into each other somewhere in 1972 (laughter).

MS. PETRI: On the right middle with the pink tie.

SPEAKER: I'm confused (laughter).

MR. DIONNE: So am I, I think we all are.

SPEAKER: As she talked about the Republican Party and what it has become and you sort of wish there were a different Republican Party, I'm haunted by my memory of a book -- sorry to talk about someone else's book -- I think the guy's name was Michael Lofgren, he wrote it maybe 10,12 years ago, called "The Party is Over."

He had been on the hill, a republican staffer, for 28 years and near the end, as he wrote in the book, he said, "As I was coming up some of the republican mentors said to me, "We have one strategic goal and that is to undermine the confidence of the people in the electoral politics in the country such that they say a pox on both parties and bail. And basically, our group are about the only ones left active."

And as I looked around as the set of the century turned, I said, they're not doing too bad

a job, and then along came Sarah Palin, and then Donald Trump and the detachment from reality that seemed to show up. It's actually quite scary and I wonder how you think they're doing if this is the strategy of that party that once was.

In full disclosure, I was a registered republican for 40 years until about 2003, and I felt the party had gone away. But how are they doing on undermining the basic confidence in the integrity of our elective politics?

MR. DIONNE: I'm glad you mentioned Sarah Palin, and I argue that she should be seen as a fore-runner to Trump. I quote a speech she gave as John McCain's running mate, bless his memory, she said, "We believe that the best of America is in these small towns that we get to visit, and these wonderful little pockets of what I call the real America; being here with all of you hard-working, very patriotic, very pro-America areas of this great nation."

And I write that the places that Palin extolled would be central to Trump's success. So, yes, the Republican Party has been losing more moderate and, yes, liberal voices for 50 years, really, since Goldwater's victory in 1964.

We forget, there used to be people who proudly called themselves liberal republicans, people like Jacob Javits, and Ed Brook, and Senator Mathias from Maryland, and you could go down a long list and then the liberals were gone. They either lost primaries, or they were defeated by democrats who no longer wanted to build the republican majority in Congress as it moved right.

A good example of that right down the street is Connie Morella who were one of the best loved people in her district of anybody in Congress and she was finally voted out of office partly because of a little gerrymandering it should be said -- she always points that out -- but also, her vote kept going down because no matter how much people loved her, they did not want to be adding to Newt Gingrich or Tom DeLay's majority in Congress. So, all these forces have left.

I met with a group of the new democrats elected in 2018 and I said, "You know, in another time a lot of you," -- these were suburban moderate progressives -- I said, "In another time a bunch of you might have been progressive republicans." And about half of them nodded yes, and the other half were deeply offended at the thought that they'd ever be republican.

So, this has been going on for a long time in the Republican Party and then Trump is only

accelerating this. So, yes, it will be some time.

On the other hand, I do have some confidence in the power of self-interest, in that at some point, given where young people are coming from in our country, the young generation is the most progressive generation since the New Deal by many, many measures, this party won't survive.

But to go to your last point, I worry about active measures to reduce the electorate when you look at the voters' suppression measures because you could either win by converting people who are against you, which is the small d democratic way to do it, or you can try to reshape the electorate to exclude the people who are against you. And I really worry when Texas passes a law that says you can use your concealed carry permit as Voter ID, but you can't use your government issued Student I'd. Something is going on here that should trouble us. So, thanks for your question.

MS. PETRI: I think why don't we get you over there in the scarf. I like people with distinctive gear on that I can point out to.

MR. LECLAIRE: Hi, I'm Arty LeClaire, I'm also French-Canadian from New England.

MR. DIONNE: Yes, great, bonjour. I always oppose English only legislature because French was actually my first language. So, I'm very sympathetic to somebody who speaks some other language as their first language.

MR. LECLAIRE: One of the things that no one is really talking about is the economic big picture, and in the 1920s which is very much like now in terms of right wing government, unfettered regulation and so forth --

MR. DIONNE: And restrictive immigration law, by the way; worth remembering, yeah.

MR. LECLAIRE: And we know how that ended. It ended with that political belief being, you know, discredited for a generation. The next time the republicans got eight years under Eisenhower, but you could argue he was basically a right of center democrat; certainly, by today's standards.

And then the only thing that bailed out Reaganism, was the fact that he leveraged the balance sheet under old man Bush. And then we gave eight years to W, and we know how that ended.

And the narrative -- you don't hear the narrative around the, you know, you give the republicans four years and things look good because some of the regulations maybe you go overboard. You know, Suslinger talked a lot about that, the cycles and so forth. But the deregulation goes overboard

as well as the leverage in the economy, the debt.

And I know this is very boring to a lot of people, but --

MR. DIONNE: It's a great thing about having events at Brookings (laughter). This is very good.

MR. LECLAIRE: So my question to you is this, in order for the republicans -- and I would argue Trumpism is republicanism, it is the Republican Party -- so almost if you look at the big picture, wouldn't the God of liberty and the God of democracy almost wish for Trump to be reelected this year so that all these roosters come home to roost -- whatever the expression is -- and then we have an economic downturn, which will probably be more epic given the way the economy has been manipulated by the central banks, that republicanism will be once and for all repudiated again as opposed to just like whoever takes over in a year from now, if it's a democrat, is going to have to undo the damage that was done in terms of the bureaucracy and so forth, and also in terms of the tax cuts, and so, I think you get my drift, so could you talk a little bit about that?

MR. DIONNE: Your question reminds me of a moment in the summer of 2008 where I happen to be sitting with two guys who were very smart about finance -- rich guys -- and one of them laid out the economic collapse that was coming, almost exactly right, including like big bank bailout. The other one was an ardent republican, and again, remember, it's 2008; he said, "I think this would be an excellent time to put the democrats in power," because he wanted them to preside over the downturn.

And you're right, Herbert Hoover did wonders for the Democratic Party. The Great Depression ended that period. I mean, people would hitchhike with a sign that said, "Pick me up or I'll vote for Hoover," (laughter) you know, there was so much hostility to Hoover.

A, I don't think it's ever good for us to wish for mass economic suffering, especially because the poorest people in the country tend to bear the brunt of it. I'm not saying you're saying that, but I think that's something I find hard to do.

But, B, I really do think that -- let's, for the sake of argument except your point, and I'm glad you did point out that in so many respects Trump is a republican, and that he is a phony populist, not a real populist.

You know, a little big on trade sometimes he goes off, and depending on how you want to

view the immigration issue, perhaps. But on anything that has to do with real economic power, he is a very conservative republican.

I just think we're seeing in the wake of the acquittal in the senate, how dangerous another four years of Trump would be. Maybe, you know, I'm never inclined to say let's lose the next election because then the contradictions will be widened; it doesn't usually work well. But even if you believe that, I just think Trump poses too big a threat for us to take that chance. But thanks for your question.

MS. PETRI: I think we have time for one more, and I hope it's a quick one.

MR. DIONNE: I'll try to give a quick answer.

MS. PETRI: I hear you promising you'll be quick.

MR. DIONNE: And I'll be happy when I sign the many books, you're going to buy to talk to you afterwards.

SPEAKER: You alluded to this in one of your answers, but even so, do you think voter suppression is a problem and if so, what can be done about it?

MR. DIONNE: Oh, I do think voter suppression is a problem, and actually some things are being done about it. My friend, Miles Rappaport, whom I'm doing some work with on another project, he was the Secretary of State in Connecticut, has written some great pieces for the American prospect pointing out that we have two contradictory streams of states here because you have a lot of states that, far from engaging in voter suppression, are easing the way to the ballot box.

They're extending voter registration, they're extending early voting, doing all kinds of things. And what you've seen in recent elections is that states that expanded access made it easier for people to vote have actually seen significant turnout spikes.

So, I think we need to be visionary; not simply stop efforts to suppress the vote, to make it harder to vote, but also aggressively try to make it easier for people to exercise their rights, and to carry out their duties.

And, if I could just close with the following: when I was thinking about this book, I was trying to think about something that really encapsulated the argument that I was making. And what came to mind is an old line from Mark Shields, whom many of you know, the political commentator. And Mark once said that in politics, as in religion, we can either hunt for heretics, or we can search for converts.

And I think that this is a moment where our accent, our emphasis, our energy, should not be on hunting heretics, it should be on seeking converts. And so, whether you buy my book or not, I hope you will all for the next period be convert seekers, and thank you all very, very much (applause).

MS. PETRI: Thank you.

MR. DIONNE: You were awesome.

MS. PETRI: Oh, thanks.

* * * * *

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, 2020