

THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION  
BROOKINGS CAFETERIA PODCAST  
THE EVOLUTION OF THE U.S. VICE PRESIDENT

Washington, D.C.

Friday, August 14, 2020

**PARTICIPANTS:**

**Host:**

FRED DEWS  
Managing Editor, Podcasts and Digital Projects  
The Brookings Institution

**Guests:**

ELAINE KAMARCK  
Founding Director, Center for Effective Public  
Management  
The Brookings Institution

SARAH BINDER  
Senior Fellow, Governance Studies  
The Brookings Institution

\* \* \* \* \*

## PROCEEDINGS

DEWS: Welcome to the Brookings Cafeteria, the podcast about ideas and the experts who have them. I'm Fred Dews. That was my colleague Bill Finan reading part of a letter then Vice President John Adams wrote in December 1793 to his wife Abigail Adams whom he addressed as My Dearest Friend.

In his note, Adams lamented his inability to do anything about a growing conflict between Britain and France, which seemed to threaten the Washington administration's policy of neutrality. And, as I can do neither good nor evil, the Vice President continued, I must be born away by others and meet the common fate.

On this episode of the Brookings Cafeteria, a discussion about the vice presidency of the United States, a position ill-defined in the Constitution and derided from much of the nation's history until only the last few decades. My guest is Elaine Kamarck, Brookings Senior Fellow, Founding Director of the Center for Public Management, and author of the new e-book from Brookings Press titled *Picking the Vice President*.

In the interview, Kamarck discusses the historical role of the vice president, how the VP choice factored into presidential politics until the late 20th century, and why that started to change to the point that the vice president is now a much more important office than it ever used to be.

As well, Kamarck addresses former Vice President Joe Biden's selection of Senator Kamala Harris to be his running mate, potentially making her the first woman and person of color to become Vice President of the United States. For a longer discussion of Biden's choice of Harris, listen to our recent episode of The Current podcast in which my colleague Adrianna Pita talks with Brookings Senior Fellow Camille Busette about the significance of the pick.

Also on today's episode, Senior Fellow Sarah Binder reflects on what's happening in

Congress or what's not happening in Congress. Binder walks us through recent congressional activity around coronavirus relief bills and the political winds shaping the Democratic and Republican approaches.

You can follow the Brookings Podcast Network on Twitter at @policypodcasts to get information about and links to all our shows, including Dollar and Sense, the Brookings trade podcast; The Current; and our Events podcast. First up, here's Sarah Binder on what's happening or what's not happening in Congress.

BINDER: I'm Sarah Binder, a Senior Fellow in Governance Studies at the Brookings Institution. We often say that Congress is gridlocked and is getting nothing done. That can be an exaggeration, because lawmakers can often address the small stuff even when the party's deadlocked on big problems. But, right now, in mid-August, it's stalemate all the way around. So, what's happening on Capitol Hill, or rather, what's not happening in Congress and why not?

The looming issue on the table, where the party's actually negotiating, is one more large-scale emergency relief package before the November elections, what's being called CARES 2.0, following the mammoth CARES package enacted almost unanimously in late March to address the economic and health crises caused by the spread of the coronavirus.

House Democrats passed a \$3 trillion HEROES Act in early May, with funds to expand many of the more successful programs enacted in the original CARES Act -- unemployment benefits, cash payments to individuals, small business loans, grants to state and local governments, money for testing, and so forth.

In contrast, Senate Republicans took a wait-and-see attitude in May and June, in part because the Republican conference was divided on whether more aid was needed, and probably also because the states that were hit the worst by COVID-19 were largely blue Democratic states,

until that was no longer the case in July and August when the virus raced through Republican red states.

But, Senate Republican Leader Mitch McConnell from Kentucky couldn't get his Republican colleagues on the same page, and (inaudible) in the Republican conference undermined his ability more recently to put a rival \$1 trillion bill on the floor for a test vote.

With Democrats pushing for a \$3 trillion HEROES package and Republicans in the White House not willing to come up to \$2 trillion, talks broke down. Instead, the President signed some executive orders that experts say can't possibly provide relief for hurting Americans nor revive the economy or fight the virus. So, what's going on here?

Big deals only become "must pass" if both parties think they'll pay a steep electoral cost for refusing to negotiate the deal. For the Democrats, I see three reasons why a deal is must pass. First, Democrats have strong electoral incentives to act, largely because the crisis hits working and middle-income Americans the hardest, and those are typically Democratic constituencies.

Second, emergency relief is ideologically compatible with Democrats governing philosophy. The government can solve problems, especially in a crisis that requires fiscal action. Third, Democrats remain remarkably cohesive, empowering Speaker Pelosi to steer the House Majority to a \$3 trillion HEROES Act.

What about the Republicans? Republicans should have an electoral incentive to act and go big. Their control of the White House and Senate in the November elections hangs in the balance on the economic recovery, which requires the U.S. to tackle the virus. That's largely why I think they will eventually come back to the table to negotiate a deal.

But, Republicans are hamstrung in a couple of ways. First, President Trump seems to think he can wish away the problem with executive orders and then blame Democrats when the

economy continues to falter.

Second, the administration is divided between conservative White House Chief of Staff Mark Meadows and Treasury Secretary Steve Mnuchin who's proven his ability to make deals with the Democrats. Both Meadows and Mnuchin are in the room trying to negotiate with Democrats. And, President Trump is either uninterested or unable to choose between their two positions.

Third, Senate Republicans are divided. About half are ideologically opposed to spending more federal money on emergency relief. Those Republicans tend to favor higher-income constituencies in red states, and most of those senators aren't up for re-election. But, other Senate Republicans support another infusion of emergency relief, and especially those Republicans running for re-election in swing states who are at risk of losing their seats to well-funded Democrats.

Fourth, Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell has ceded negotiations to the White House, probably because Senate Republicans are so divided. He's likely involved behind the scenes, but his absence as adds another element of dysfunction to his impasse.

So, what's next? Well, usually, the advantage goes to the unified team with the more popular position. In this case, that's really the Democrats. They have an incentive not to fold to Republican demands, even in the face of a recalcitrant, and many say bumbling, Republican White House.

So, stalemate, lawmakers are now back home till mid-September. They could be called back if leaders reach a deal. Republicans may yet realize that winning in November or not getting wiped out requires more congressional action, or maybe not.

Of course, in September, Congress has to deal with government funding for the coming

fiscal year that starts September 1st. If they don't pass the spending bill, even a temporary band-aid to fund the federal government until after the election, if they don't do that, the government shuts down on October 1st.

It's possible that CARES 2.0 and stopgap government funding will be tied together to become a single, must-pass bill in late September. But, even so, economic damage and the virus will continue to surge across the United States, keeping schools closed, sports teams off the fields, Americans closed off from the rest of the world and from each other, while we anxiously await for an effective vaccine.

DEWS: And, now, here's my interview with Elaine Kamarck.

Well, Elaine, welcome back to the Brookings Cafeteria.

KAMARCK: Thanks for having me, Fred.

DEWS: So, as I mentioned in the introduction, we're here to talk about your new e-book just published by the Brookings Institution Press, *Picking the Vice President*. Obviously, it's a super-timely book, super-timely topic. Let's talk in kind of the big picture and the historical picture about the things that you're writing about, because it's super-fascinating. Can you describe how the founding fathers conceived of the office of the vice presidency?

KAMARCK: Well, the founding fathers who were so wise in so many things were pretty naive when it came to the topic of the vice president, and that's because they were pretty naive about political parties. And, so, they wrote in the initial Constitution that the vice president would be the runner-up to the president, thinking, of course, that they could maintain the peace and unity they had under George Washington forever.

Well, the minute George Washington was no longer president, they had a political party system. And, so, you had a situation where President John Adams had Vice President Thomas

Jefferson as his vice president and the two didn't agree on anything.

Thomas Jefferson spent his vice presidency building his own political party in order to run against John Adams. So, it just didn't work, and they quickly changed that, so that the president and the vice president were on the same ticket and they were in the same political party.

But, the second important thing to realize about this is, from 1831 all the way up till 1968, we nominated our presidential candidates in both parties in conventions, and those conventions were composed of basically what we would call today superdelegates -- party leaders, county chairmen, state chairmen from around the country. And, they came to the convention city and they actually deliberated.

They didn't have primaries. If there were primaries, they were meaningless. The convention delegates got to the convention city and they engaged in days, sometimes weeks, of negotiations. Because that was the way the system worked, guess what? The biggest prize in the negotiation was to offer somebody the vice presidency.

And, often they would offer someone the vice presidency in order to get their delegates and be on the ticket. And, very often this meant that the president and the vice president didn't agree on much. They were from different factions of the party, from different parts of the country, and so, from much of our history we had some pretty dysfunctional presidents and vice presidents.

DEWS: I'll just shout out for listeners that you've written a book about the presidential primary system called *Presidential Primaries*. I think it's in its third printing. We've done a podcast on it.

KAMARCK: Yep.

DEWS: We did our email course on it. So, that's a fascinating history and contemporary

look at the presidential primary process itself that this, the vice presidential pick, is very much a part of.

So, you talk about the dysfunction that existed a lot of the times between the president or the presidential nominee and the vice presidential nominee. Can you talk about some of the examples -- the famous examples of sometimes where that just didn't work?

KAMARCK: Oh, yeah. Well, for instance, one of the famous examples was Theodore Roosevelt and his vice president, a guy from Indiana, and the ticket was famously called The Hot Tamale and the Indiana Icicle, because the two were so different.

Teddy Roosevelt's vice president spent most of his time chairing the Senate, which is his constitutional duty, and undermining everything that Teddy Roosevelt was trying to do. The second Roosevelt to have this was Franklin Roosevelt whose first vice president was John Nance Garner who also disagreed with much of the New Deal and tried to undermine Roosevelt in the Senate.

So, we've had two examples of vice presidents that, if you go back and include Thomas Jefferson, there's three famous examples of vice presidents who not only didn't help the president, but they tried their best to screw up what the president was doing.

The second more common model was that the president simply ignored the vice president or sent the vice president off for trivial duties. That's why for those of you listeners who watched VEEP, the TV series, you may remember how there was a trope that ran through all the episodes where the vice president would come into her office, say to her assistant sitting there at the phones -- Did the President call? And, the answer was always -- Nope.

And, it became a sort of funny joke, because that was frankly the way most presidents and vice presidents were for much of history. The president didn't call because, if you think



about it, the vice president was chosen to balance the ticket, right. That meant they were from a different region and/or a different ideology. So, the president often didn't want anything to do with the vice president and certainly didn't want to give the vice president something important to do.

DEWS: Well, the ideology difference is really stark, I think, in the Lincoln-Johnson ticket in 1864. You have President Lincoln dumping Hannibal Hamlin for Andrew Johnson. How'd that work out?

KAMARCK: Well, the interesting question about that is, if Lincoln had lived, would he have been able to do with his vice president what he did with his cabinet, create a team of rivals. He clearly put Johnson on the ticket in order to try to get the cooperation of the southern states in putting the Union back together and reconstruction.

The problem, of course, was he was shot. And, then, somebody who was diametrically opposed to Lincoln, and to most of the Republican Party at that time who had won the war, became the president and tried to basically undo the Union victory and roll back all the rights for the former slaves, et cetera, prevent the former slaves from getting rights. And, that's clearly not something Lincoln would have done, but, whether or not Lincoln could have managed that very different person, we don't know, never got a chance.

DEWS: Let's fast forward nearly a hundred years to an example where it seems to me that you have a classic balancing model but also a vice president who was relegated to the sidelines, and that's Kennedy-Johnson. Can you talk about that?

KAMARCK: Yeah, I mean, the sad thing about this is that a lot of these vice presidents were quite powerful and important people in their own right, and then they became vice president and found themselves powerless and sidelined. So, Kennedy needed the votes in the

1960 convention in Los Angeles.

Lyndon Johnson was a very powerful majority leader in the United States Senate, also running for president, coming up short. But, Kennedy figured he could put Texas in the Democratic column, and also it was a ploy to the southern Democrats because Kennedy was a northerner from Massachusetts. So, that was the classic balancing.

Well, Kennedy didn't pay much attention to Johnson. Kennedy's brother, Bobby, who was the attorney general, actively disliked Johnson, and the two of them were at each other's throats, not just in the administration but afterwards. Bobby Kennedy, in fact, ran for president against Lyndon Johnson's vice president.

So, it was a fraught relationship. It really wasn't a good relationship. And, it couldn't have been very satisfying to Lyndon Johnson who went from the position of real power to being basically sidelined and denigrated.

DEWS: You mentioned a few minutes ago that the convention system, where they actually pick the president and the vice president, kind of lasted through 1968. So, what happened after 1968? How did that change the way that vice presidents were added to tickets?

KAMARCK: What happened after 1968 was a reform movement in the Democratic Party, and what it led to was the creation of lots of primaries but more importantly they were binding primaries. So, whereas in the old days if there was a primary, it was usually a beauty contest. Usually, it didn't mean much.

After 1968, the primaries determined how the delegates were going to vote. That meant you started to get conventions where people came into the convention city and you knew the vote. I mean, you knew, really, with a fairly high degree of accuracy, what the vote was going to be on the first ballot. And, usually, candidates had managed to amass the requisite number of

votes long before the convention opened.

I think Joe Biden this year declared that he'd gone over the top sometime in May in terms of having the vote, which meant that when the delegates arrived in the city, there really wasn't much negotiating to be done. And, if there wasn't much negotiating to be done, then the president could pick the vice president and pick using a sort of different set of criteria.

So, if you think about this, for some years they did balance, right. Jimmy Carter, a southerner from Georgia, picks Walter Mondale, a traditional liberal, from Minnesota. Okay. That's a classic balanced ticket.

When Bill Clinton ran -- and this is where the turning point is -- everybody expected him to pick Mario Cuomo, because they had that balancing mindset. They thought, okay, Bill Clinton was a southerner from Arkansas and with a conservative for the Democratic Party as sort of center-left orientation, whereas, Mario Cuomo, northerner and a classic liberal, New Deal liberal. So, everybody thought for sure that it was going to be Mario Cuomo.

And, Bill Clinton did something that really broke the mold, and it's pretty much changed for good, which is he chose Al Gore who was, like him, a southern baby boomer from the center-left of the Democratic Party. And, he says in his biography -- I didn't want to confuse the message; I wanted to reinforce the message.

Now, I'm not sure that Bill Clinton at the time knew how this would work out, but, Al Gore became very much a trusted partner. Bill Clinton could give him a lot of things to do, because they were similar. They were similar in background, they were similar in ideology, they were similar in region, they'd grown up in the same milieu, so to speak, and he trusted Al Gore, and that turned out to be a big deal, because the job of the presidency is so enormous, if you have a vice president that you can really trust and say, hey, go figure this out and tell me what to do,

you're really way ahead of the game.

DEWS: And, so, Al Gore as vice president had a significant policy portfolio, and as I understand it you were on his staff as well.

KAMARCK: Yeah, I was hired to run the Reinventing Government initiative, but, there was nobody working for President Clinton who ran Reinventing Government. It was just me reporting to Al Gore who reported to the president, obviously.

And, that was the case with several other areas of important policy. The relationship with Russia was another one. Environmental Policy -- Al Gore really did run the show. So, there were areas of high-tech -- Telecommunications Act, Al Gore and his staff, a man named Greg Simon, very talented. They ran the policy for the administration.

And, you know, if you think about how enormous that job is, being able to take chunks of policy and give them to somebody that you know and you trust is a huge advantage, which is why I think the model has switched from the balancing model to the partnership model.

DEWS: Well, in your book you talk in some detail about all of these vice president-president relationships, especially since Bill Clinton-Al Gore. Can you talk briefly about some of those relationships after Clinton-Gore?

KAMARCK: Well, the Bush-Cheney relationship was, if anything, even closer. Like Bush, Cheney was from Texas, he was a westerner. He had to switch his registration to his vacation place in Wyoming because the Constitution says you can't have the president-vice president from the same state.

But, let's face it. Dick Cheney was an oil man from Texas with a heavy political background. He had worked in Congress and the Executive Branch. So, he'd been cabinet secretary. So, Dick Cheney was a real powerhouse help to Bush. In fact, he was such a

powerhouse that in the first term a lot of people thought it was Dick Cheney who was president, not Bush. So, he was very powerful.

I think the next model you see is Obama-Biden. And, again, Biden right out of the gate gets the huge job of managing the -- overseeing all that stimulus money that went out as part of the Great Recession. And, so, that was a huge job. He was in the center of the action. There was no way he was sidelined. So, again, that's the same model.

And, just like Gore and just like Cheney, Biden brought nothing electorally to the ticket. He was from Delaware. It's Democratic and it has three electoral votes. So, it really wasn't a balancing model. It was really much more of a partnership model.

And, then, of course, that brings us to Trump and Pence. And, Pence -- Indiana, again, is a pretty solid Republican state. I have in the book -- so, I may get this wrong, but I think it's only gone Democratic once in like the last 30, 40 years.

So, it's a pretty solid Republican state. Trump didn't need to put Pence on the ticket for balancing, although there was an element of it because Pence had sound relationships with the evangelical portion of the party. So, that was a bit of a balancing act.

But, basically, Pence had huge credentials in government. He'd been in the Congress. He'd been a governor. Trump had no government experience. I think Pence was a very valuable addition to the ticket, and he's running the Coronavirus Task Force. He's done a lot of foreign policy work for Trump. So, I think Trump-Pence is very much in the model of our recent president and vice president pairings.

DEWS: In all of these recent examples, though, is there space for the vice president to disagree with the president he's serving? I mean, you write about Dick Cheney in his second term maybe wasn't as powerful as he had been in his first term. Are there areas of disagreement

ever between the president and the vice president in the partnership model, or is the vice president just kind of expected to carry out the president's wishes, even if they're in large, important portfolios?

KAMARCK: It's really the latter, and any disagreements are very, very carefully expressed and almost always in private. So, we don't really know about these until we've uncovered layers and layers of history. And, that sometimes puts vice presidents in awkward positions.

I mean, Gore had to stand there during Clinton's impeachment and all the scandal around Monica Lewinsky and show the flag. Pence has had to do that time after time after time. But, that's how they keep their power. They keep their power by keeping their advice and their disagreements very, very private. And, sometimes they win and sometimes they don't.

DEWS: Now, in terms of the law, the Constitution, of the structure of the two offices, the president obviously is very well-defined in the Constitution, has a lot of power. As far as I know, there's nothing that really defines the vice presidency beyond that he's the presiding officer or the president of the Senate. So, he breaks ties if there are ties.

I mean, is there anything that would keep a modern president from, again, relegating a modern vice president or keeping that person out of the loop?

KAMARCK: Oh, yeah. I mean, suppose, for instance, that the presidential candidate, first of all, needed the votes of a faction of the party that supported somebody, and the way to get those delegate votes was the vice presidency.

I mean, even though we have a primary system which tends to end the nomination worries before the convention, it's entirely possible that someday three people could come into the convention with more or less an equal number of votes, right. And, then, a deal would have

to be cut for who's going to be vice president and who's going to be president. It still could happen again. It just happens much less often than it used to.

And, you could see a president sort of, for political reasons, getting stuck with a vice president that they don't particularly like or that they don't trust. And, the trust is even, frankly, more important. And, in that point, you'd have that person relegated to such chores as the one that Johnson gave Hubert Humphrey -- chairman of the tourism and scenic places committee. Okay.

Now, here's Humphrey, great senator, a great legislator, a solid New Deal liberal, and, boy, was he pushed to the side by Lyndon Johnson. And, that was kind of more common.

DEWS: Thinking in terms now of the election itself, what do you think that the American electorate wants or expects in the choice of a vice presidential running mate? And, this kind of attunes, also, to that age-old question: Does the vice presidential pick help or hurt the presidential candidate get elected?

KAMARCK: Well, I think the bulk of the political science on this says that it really doesn't help. There's no evidence that vice presidential candidates help candidates win a certain state or a certain faction. Their vice presidency tends to be a couple-day story and then it goes on. Unless, the vice presidential candidate turns up to have something wrong with them. And, then, the reflection is on the judgment of the presidential candidate. So, it hurts the presidential candidate because people then question their judgment.

So, the two big ones, in recent history, the biggest one perhaps was 1972 when George McGovern, the Democratic nominee, chose Thomas Eagleton to be on the ticket and then it turned out that Eagleton had had a history of mental problems, and they'd been severe enough to have electric shock treatments, and that hadn't been disclosed. When it was disclosed, people

wondered.

Remember, we were still in a Cold War Era then. People wondered, well, could we trust this guy with the nuclear weapons, with the buttons, et cetera? So, McGovern had to dump Eagleton, put somebody else on the ticket. And, McGovern had plenty of problems before that. He certainly didn't need that one.

And, then, the most recent one is the selection of Sarah Palin by John McCain, a Republican, the Republican nominee in 2008. And, initially it was a great choice, because Sarah Palin was quite talented, a political speaker and she was great on the stump. She was very folksy. She had all sorts of great lines, like putting lipstick on a pig, and stuff like that.

But, as the campaign wore on and she had to do interviews, what people saw immediately was that she was nowhere near ready to be president. She just didn't know enough. And, that was pretty disastrous, and it reflected poorly on McCain. He said in an interview before he died that he regretted that decision.

And, McCain himself at the time -- and this is relevant for today's situation -- McCain was 72 years old with a history of cancer. So, when the candidate is older, obviously people look at the vice president in a more serious way. And, I'll give you the counterexample to this.

When the first George Bush chose Dan Quayle to be his running mate in 1988, Quayle was basically regarded as a lightweight as well, and yet Bush was 62, 63 years old, he was in perfect health. Nobody really thought Dan Quayle was going to become president. And, so, it didn't have the impact, I think, that the Sarah Palin choice had.

DEWS: Well, Elaine, as of today, August 11th, we've learned that Joe Biden has made his selection, it's Kamala Harris. Can you comment on that and how that kind of fits into this discussion we've been having about the models of the vice presidency?



KAMARCK: Well, it's very much in the partnership mold. There is no need for Joe Biden to pick someone from California. California will go Democratic in the fall. I can pretty much say that right now. So, it's not a balancing choice in the old-fashioned way.

Now, there is a little bit of a balancing aspect to it in that we are now looking, particularly in the Democratic Party, at a party that has become very much a party of women and minorities. And, in that respect he is playing to an important constituency in the party.

But, she also is someone who is very much in the partnership model. She is more like Joe Biden than unlike Joe Biden. She is somebody who is sort of center-left, as is Biden. She doesn't have any positions that would be called extreme, although the Republicans are doing their darndest to try to turn Joe Biden into a Marxist, which is maybe one of the more ridiculous things I've ever seen in politics.

But, she really is somebody that's in the partnership model, because Biden can trust her. He can trust her instincts to be like his instincts. She is not ideologically different from him. And, I think that that's the essence of the partnership model.

One other thing to say about this is this could have been predicted. Remember that Joe Biden himself was chosen in the partnership model. You didn't need Joe Biden on the ticket to deliver Delaware to Barack Obama. That was going to happen anyway. And, so, Biden himself was a very loyal helpmate to Obama, understood how powerful that could be, and clearly wanted to have a vice president who was like him, okay.

And, what's going to happen is there's going to be all this fuss because she's a woman and she's African American, et cetera. But, frankly, the bottom line is, she's the person he feels most comfortable with, and regardless of the fact that she's a woman, that she's African American.

And, so, I think that that's what we have to bear in mind. All of our recent vice presidents have been in this mold. They have been people that the president himself felt comfortable with and trusted.

DEWS: There was also this criticism that we started hearing about her, though, as she emerged as a leading contender, that during the primaries, in one of the debates, she had some pretty pointed words for Joe Biden's track record. But, then, that struck me and a lot of people, also, as incredibly sexist that they would charge her with that kind of political rhetoric when we didn't hear that about, say, George H.W. Bush when he was running against Ronald Reagan and then got picked to be his vice president.

KAMARCK: Then got picked. Listen, I mean, what that episode showed me, and may have showed Joe Biden as well, is that she could do something that's very important for the vice presidential candidate to do. She could prosecute. She could make the case. She made the strongest case she could against Joe Biden.

Now, in the end it didn't work, right, because African American voters knew Joe Biden a lot longer, frankly, than she had, and it was not persuasive. But, the fact is that she was very pointed and very strong in doing that, and I suspect that Joe Biden looked at that and said, boy, if she turned that against Donald Trump, that could be a real help. I suspect she's going to be a very tough prosecutor of Trump.

DEWS: Just looking ahead, do you expect the partnership model as we know it now will endure or could there be some new model of how the vice president of the United States relates to the president and to the power of the White House?

KAMARCK: I think it will endure. I think it has proved -- these presidents who've had vice presidents who are partners, one of the interesting things about them is that the three of them

have all been two-term presidents. In other words, they've done a pretty good job and their partners have helped them. And, we don't know about Trump, whether he'll be two terms or not. So, that's why I say the first three. I think the model will endure, because I think that the people running for president themselves usually have an understanding of just how big the job has gotten and how overwhelming it is.

I remember I went into the White House just several weeks after the president and the vice president had gone into the White House, and the feeling I had was drinking from a fire hose. And, I was a PhD in Political Science with a concentration of American Government.

Al Gore had spent decades in the House and the Senate. Bill Clinton had been a governor of Arkansas for more than a decade. In other words, even with an awful lot of governmental experience, you're still a bit overwhelmed. And, having somebody who can help you with that, I think, is really valuable.

There's another element here which we've seen mostly with Hilary Clinton, which is that as we get into an era where first ladies have not been at home with the children but they've actually had careers and sometimes an interest in public policy, like Hilary did, you've got yet another very trusted person that you can ask to (inaudible) these to. And, that's what Clinton did with Hilary Clinton. I think they need the help in the job, which is why I think the model will persist until it doesn't work politically.

DEWS: Well, Elaine, I think we'll leave it at that. I thank you for your time and your expertise, as always.

KAMARCK: Well, thank you, Fred.

DEWS: The book is *Picking the Vice President: How Picking the Vice President Has Changed and Why it Matters*. It's available for free on Brookings.edu.

The Brookings Cafeteria Podcast is made possible with the help of an amazing team of colleagues. My thanks go out to Audio Engineer Gaston Reboredo; Bill Finan, Director of the Brookings Institution Press, who does the book interviews; Marie Wilkin, Adrianna Pita, and Chris McKenna for their collaboration, and Camilo Ramirez and Emily Horne for their guidance and support.

The Brookings Cafeteria is brought to you by the Brookings Podcast Network which also produces Dollar and Sense, The Current, and our Events podcasts. Email your questions and comments to me at BCP@Brookings.edu. If you have a question for a scholar, include an audio file and I'll play it and the answer on the air. Follow us on Twitter at @policypodcasts. You can listen to the Brookings Cafeteria in all the usual places. Visit us online at Brookings.edu. Until next time, I'm Fred Dews.

\* \* \* \* \*

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