CONFERENCE REPORT: SOCIAL MEDIA, CHANGING DEMOGRAPHICS AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE 2016 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

Mark P. Jones, Ph.D.
Fellow in Political Science

John B. Williams
Fellow, Presidential Elections Program

August 2018

Mark P. Jones, Ph.D.
John Williams
"Social Media, Changing Demographics, and Implications of the 2016 Presidential Election"

About the Presidential Elections Program

Founded in 2017, the Baker Institute's Presidential Elections Program is the nation's first program solely dedicated to the study of U.S. presidential campaigns and elections.

The program examines presidential elections in a nonpartisan manner, providing timely analysis during and after each presidential election cycle and allowing stakeholders of all political parties and groups to better understand the changing dynamics of presidential campaigns. Each conference will explore the various political and policy issues of that contest and their effects on the presidential election process in particular and for elections and democracy in the United States in general.

As part of its activities, the program will conduct biennial conferences on topics of high political and policy salience. A conference will be held in the year preceding and after each presidential election to explore the dynamics of that contest and its effects on elections and democracy in the United States.

The Presidential Elections Program builds on the vast experience of the institute's honorary chair, Secretary James A. Baker, III, whose roles in presidential campaigns is unmatched. He helped lead five presidential campaigns and later supervised the legal team that preserved George W. Bush's victory in 2000. It is fitting that the country's premier institution devoted to the study of presidential elections be located at Rice University's James A. Baker III Institute for Public Policy.

In August 1976, President Gerald Ford demonstrated his high regard for Baker by asking him to be his national campaign chairman for the general election effort against Governor Jimmy Carter. The national press dubbed Baker a "Miracle Man," transforming the Ford campaign from one seen in the summer as having no realistic hope of defeating Carter to one where Ford lost the Electoral College by a mere 18,490 votes in Hawaii and Ohio.

Baker and George H.W. Bush then began to organize the latter's Republican Party primary campaign for president in 1980. Former California Governor Ronald Reagan ultimately won the nomination, but not before he unified his party by choosing his most tenacious primary rival as his running mate: Bush.

In the 1980 general election, Baker was a senior advisor to the Reagan–Bush campaign, with specific responsibility for the presidential debates. Baker's acute political instincts, his prior Washington experience, and his attention to detail made a strong impression on the candidate and Nancy Reagan. And so Reagan asked Baker to be his White House chief of staff.

Again with Baker's assistance, Reagan was re-elected in 1984 with a 49-state landslide victory over former Vice President Walter Mondale in a campaign largely run from Baker's chief of staff office.

In 1988, Bush was a two-term vice president and the putative front-runner in the Republican primaries. With Reagan's reluctant blessing, Baker left what by then was his prestigious post as secretary of the treasury and assumed command of Bush's presidential campaign. Bush defeated Michael Dukakis to become the 41st president of the United States, and Baker became its 61st secretary of state designate.

As the 1992 election year began, Bush's high job approval ratings began to erode. In July, he asked Baker to resign his cabinet post and take over the leadership of his re-election campaign. That November, Bush lost after his campaign was adversely affected by the independent candidacy of Ross Perot.

In 2000, Baker returned to the presidential electoral process, this time to manage Texas Governor George W. Bush's legal team in the Florida recount process. Under Baker's leadership, the Bush campaign successfully pursued its complex legal case that led from county offices in South Florida to the U.S. Supreme Court in Washington, D.C. After the Supreme Court ruled in his favor, Bush became the nation's 43rd president.

On March 28, 2018 at the Baker Institute, the Presidential Elections Program held its inaugural conference, "Social Media, Changing Demographics and Implications of the 2016 Presidential Election." The event was part of the 25th anniversary commemorative programs featuring the centers and research of Rice University's Baker Institute. Veteran political consultants David Axelrod and Karl Rove served as the conference's honorary directors. The conference brought together a diverse group of academics, campaign consultants, journalists, and other prominent individuals to look back at 2016, at the present, and forward to the 2020 presidential election. This report summarizes the presentations and discussions of the more than two-dozen individuals who participated in the conference's four thematic panels as well as a lunch conversation featuring Axelrod and Rove.

Panel I: The Role of Social Media in the 2016 Presidential Election

Social media played a pivotal role in both the primary and general election phases of the 2016 presidential election process. Whether it was Donald Trump's use of Twitter or the growing status of Facebook as a leading source of political information for American voters, social media was front and center in the electoral process from the start of the primary season until the end of the day on November 8.

This panel included four insightful speakers who examined the impact of social media on the 2016 presidential election from a variety of perspectives. Katie Harbath, Facebook's global director of policy programs, gave the presentation "Protecting Election Integrity on Facebook." Zac Moffatt, founder and CEO of the strategy and marketing agency Targeted Victory, presented "Political Campaigns are Broken." Juliette Turner-Jones, a Rice University sophomore and youth director of Constituting America, a nonprofit focused on educating Americans about the U.S. Constitution, spoke about "The Power of the Post: The Rising Constructive and Destructive Power of Social Media Among the Millennial Generation." Mark P. Jones, the Baker Institute's fellow in political science, presented his

research, "Twitter and the 2016 Presidential Elections: The Singular Adventures of the Trump Campaign." Joe Barnes, the Baker Institute's Bonner Means Baker Fellow, moderated the panel discussion.

Katie Harbath: Protecting Election Integrity on Facebook

Katie Harbath's timely presentation came amid growing revelations of Russia's use of ads and other efforts on Facebook to influence the 2016 U.S. electoral process. Harbath underscored substantial challenges that Facebook faced in the 2016 U.S. elections, such as foreign interference, fake accounts, dubious advertisements, fake news, harassment, and disenfranchisement. All of these have become global phenomenon and Facebook is working worldwide to address these and related concerns, she said. Facebook is especially focused on addressing such issues in the United States during the run-up to the 2018 midterms. It is also focused on Mexico and Brazil as the countries prepare for their respective July and October presidential and legislative elections and on Sweden's parliamentary election in September.

In her presentation, Harbath provided a detailed overview of the five major planks of Facebook's current and future efforts to address the above-mentioned challenges.

First, Facebook will actively monitor its platform in countries that are holding elections in order to rapidly detect efforts by foreign actors to interfere with a country's electoral process. It will also work with governments across the globe in order to be in the best position possible to understand and combat these potential threats.

Second, during the 2016 election season, Facebook was confronted with the threat of fake accounts being used toward nefarious ends. To combat this problem, Facebook is employing machine learning and artificial intelligence to make it harder to create fake accounts, to detect fake accounts more rapidly and terminate them, and to monitor and identify any coordinated efforts by fake account holders to affect politics or policy in a country.

Third, she said, U.S. federal election regulations have not kept pace with advances in digital advertising. In response to complaints regarding the unknown or opaque provenance of many political ads that appeared on Facebook during the 2016 election cycle, Facebook is working to improve its ad transparency so that viewers of them have a much clearer understanding of who created and paid for each ad. In 2018, a new "paid for by" label will be attached to ads that mention a candidate for federal office in U.S. elections. In future years, the initiative will extend to state and local elections in the United States, and possibly to elections in other countries.

Fourth, the previous U.S. election cycle saw a rise in the presence of what is widely considered to be "fake news" on Facebook's news feed. In response, Facebook is prioritizing legitimate and informative posts and down-ranking posts that are credibly deemed by Facebook and/or third parties to be fake or driven by ad farms.

Fifth, Harbath highlighted Facebook's efforts to improve civic engagement by making it easier for citizens to communicate their concerns to government officials. A prime example of this initiative is Facebook's Town Hall project, which allows people to learn who represents them and to connect with their federal, state, and local representatives via Facebook so their voices can be heard.

Zac Moffatt: Political Campaigns are "Broken"

Zac Moffatt began his presentation with the provocative statement that a major lesson from the 2016 U.S. elections is that most political campaigns in the U.S. are "broken." Moffatt underscored the dramatic change that digital modes of communication have had on the campaign industry. But yet many of the presidential campaigns were run with a strategy better suited to 2000 than 2016. In particular, Moffatt said, the continuing heavy reliance on traditional 30-second broadcast television political ads is proof that many consultants are out-of-step with the times.

Moffatt said the 2016 primary and general election strategies of Donald Trump are evidence that new trends in campaigning are here to stay, and focused on four core lessons of Trump's success. The first lesson was the way that Trump always armed his allies with talking points on the messages he was pushing out at any given time via social media or cable news.

Trump also took advantage of the speed of social media, which allowed him to attack a rival, then move quickly to another subject, often within the course of a day. By the time many of his rivals had followed traditional campaign modes of operation involving meetings, evaluations, approvals, and finally a response, it was too late. Both Trump and the media were focused on a new topic. Moffatt said the second lesson is that speed kills, and the speed of modern campaigns is very rapid, due primarily to the existence and popularity of social media.

Trump also demonstrated the best way to win a fight is not via a perfectly designed and orchestrated knockout blow, but rather by a continuous series of everyday jabs, often via social media. Over time, support for his rivals eroded as he constantly jabbed at them as "low energy Jeb" Bush, "little Marco" Rubio, "lyin' Ted" Cruz, and "crooked Hillary" Clinton.

Finally, Moffatt underscored the success of Trump's broader campaign to discredit the mainstream media—which has been Americans' primary source of political news and information. Moffatt made the important point that Trump has been able to convince almost one-half of Americans and three-quarters of Republicans that many of the negative stories about him in outlets such as *NBC News, CNN, CBS Radio News, The Washington Post,* and *The New York Times* are false. According to Trump, these reports are "fake news." Moffatt's point was that from a practical campaign perspective, it does not really matter if Trump's assertions are accurate or not. Many Americans believe his claims that the mainstream media is out to get him and thus that Americans should not believe everything they hear about Trump in those news sources.

Moffatt highlighted that higher research budgets for digital advertising and social media efforts allow candidates to get much more "bang for their buck" as well as become more agile, and campaign in real time. Correspondingly, they should spend less on the traditional big-dollar items, broadcast television advertising. Moffatt underscored that modern campaigns have become very good at raising money, but have not made equal progress in spending this money efficiently and effectively. The reason for this, he argues, is that these traditional campaigns are not structured for success in the 21st century.

Juliette Turner-Jones: The Power of the Post

Millennials comprise the digital generation, largely reaching adulthood in an era of social media, smart phones, and instantaneous access to information. Juliette Turner-Jones provided a millennial's perspective on the role of social media in politics and society, with a particular focus on the impact it has had on her generation. She determined that social media has both constructive and destructive consequences for millennials, with the ledger balance leaning more toward the latter than the former.

Turner-Jones conducted her analysis of the power of social media using the heuristic of Aristotle's concepts of different modes of persuasion: pathos (focus on emotions and values), logos (focus on logic, facts, and reason), and ethos (focus on ethics, credibility, and trust). She posited that among millennials, the dominant and most effective method of persuasion is based on pathos, followed by logos. She concluded that ethos-based modes of persuasion are quite rare, and inconsequential for millennials.

Among millennials, the dominance of pathos-oriented persuasion can be seen in the plethora of social media campaigns to raise awareness about issues, be it #MeToo, #BlackLivesMatter, or the #IceBucketChallenge. Such campaigns often are very personal, involving videos and personal testimony, and appeal to social media users' emotions.

Logos, or fact-finding forms of persuasion, are also present in the social media of millennials. Turner-Jones said this mode has positive effects by increasing the amount of information possessed by millennials on political matters as well as in enhancing their ability to express their beliefs and exercise their freedom of speech. However, she cautioned about the tendency of social media "fact finding" to often be limited and constrained to like-minded individuals and sources. That can create social media echo chambers where everyone shares the same beliefs, and in turn reinforce tribalism in our political culture.

In all, Turner-Jones' presentation painted a picture of a generation that utilizes social media to share content and raise awareness of pressing social issues, but that has a limited ability to transform information and awareness into concrete action. She concluded "the majority of social media and activism thrives on passion, often ignoring logic and credibility." Taken together, Turner-Jones' overall evaluation of the impact of social media on her millennial generation is negative because it is too detrimental to civil discourse and is ineffective as a vehicle to change public policy, and society more generally.

Mark P. Jones: Twitter and the 2016 Presidential Elections

Mark Jones' presentation was based on an empirical study he carried out with Santiago Alles, Ph.D., of the Universidad del Rosario in Colombia. It examined the use and impact of Twitter by the U.S. presidential candidates in the 2016 Democratic and Republican primaries and in the 2016 general election. All together, 229,000 tweets from 34 different Twitter accounts were examined for the July 1, 2015, through May 31, 2016, period for the primary candidates and for the July 1 through November 15, 2016 period for the general election candidates.

The presentation was divided into four main sections. The first two examined the use of Twitter by the respective Republican and Democratic primary candidates, with particular focus on the extent to which their tweets were re-tweeted and marked as a favorite by other Twitter users. The third examined the same phenomena, but focused on the general election. The final section examined the comparative impact of Donald Trump's tweets and those of his GOP rivals on the public salience of campaign-related issues.

The data indicated that in the Republican primary campaign, Trump was in a league of his own in terms of his tweets being re-tweeted and marked as favorites. No other candidate came remotely close to Trump in terms of the extent to which their tweets were redistributed and "favorited" by Twitter users. In the Democratic primary, there was relatively little difference in the extent to which the tweets of Hillary Clinton and Bernie Sanders were either re-tweeted or favorited.

In the general election campaign, Trump continued his pattern of surpassing his rival in terms of having his tweets re-tweeted and "favorited." However, the gap between Trump and Hillary Clinton was not as large as was the gap between Trump and his principal GOP rivals, Jeb Bush, Ted Cruz, John Kasich, and Marco Rubio.

Jones concluded by presenting evidence that revealed the extent to which Trump was able to drive the news cycle and focus public attention on specific issues via his use of Twitter. In numerous cases, Google Trends Data revealed that after Trump tweeted on a topic, Google searches for that topic would spike, often remaining very high for over a week. This stood in contrast to Trump's principal primary rivals whose tweets tended to focus on topics that were already in the news. In contrast, Trump's tweets *made* the news. In sum, as noted by Zac Moffatt in his presentation, Trump's agile and speedy use of social media allowed him to frequently dominate the news cycle. He influenced the topics the mainstream media and his rivals focused on, and how long they did so.

Panel II: The Role of Demographics and Polling Shortcomings in the 2016 Presidential Election

The 2016 presidential election featured significant shifts among key demographic groups and their respective turnout rates compared to other recent presidential elections. The election also raised serious concerns about how public opinion surveys assess socio-demographic support for different candidates and predict the outcome of presidential elections.

This panel included leading public opinion experts with vast experience conducting both private and academic polls. Combined, they possess more than 150 years of polling experience. The first two presentations focused on the role of demographics in the 2016 presidential election while the latter two presentations explored the topic of polling shortcomings in 2016. Joe Lenski, co-founder and executive vice president of Edison Research, which conducts the exit polls for the National Election Pool, began the panel with his presentation, "2016 Presidential Election: Exit Polls." Marianne Stewart, a professor at The University of Texas at Dallas and former program director at the National Science Foundation, followed with "Hillary's Hypothesis." Harold Clarke, the Ashbel Smith Professor at The University of Texas at Dallas and a former director of social and economic sciences at the National Science Foundation, turned attention to the issue of polling problems in 2016 with his presentation, "Trumping the Polls." Kenneth Goldstein, a professor at the University of San Francisco (USF) and the founding director of the USF in D.C. Program, rounded out the panel his analysis of "Polling and the 2016 Presidential Election." Allen Matusow, the Baker Institute's academic affairs director and a presidential historian at Rice, moderated the panel.

Joe Lenski: 2016 Presidential Elections—Exit Polls

For more than a dozen years, Joe Lenski's Edison Research has conducted every national exit poll for a consortium of news organizations under the umbrella of the National Election Pool (NEP). In 2016 the NEP consisted of *ABC News*, the *Associated Press*, *CBS News*, *CNN*, *Fox News*, and *NBC News*. On election night and during the weeks following the election, these and other news organizations used the exit poll data to understand how and why people voted the way they did in presidential, U.S. Senate, and gubernatorial elections.

The 2016 exit poll was a massive undertaking involving interviews at 933 polling locations along with telephone surveys of absentee and early voters. In all, it represented 110,000 interviews. The results were delivered in real time to provide a representative national exit poll as well as representative state-level polls in 28 states.

In 1976, the ethnic composition of the U.S. electorate was 90 percent white and 10 percent non-white. During each subsequent quadrennial presidential election cycle, the non-white share of the electorate has increased while the white share decreased by between 1 and 4 percentage points. Between 1976 and 2016, the non-white share of the electorate almost tripled to 29 percent while the white share fell to 71 percent.

In the 2016 presidential election, the voting population was 71 percent white, 12 percent African-American, 11 percent Latino, 4 percent Asian-American, and 3 percent others. Donald Trump won the white vote by a 57 to 37 margin. Hillary Clinton won all other ethnic/racial groups, including African-Americans by an 89 to 8 margin, Latinos by a 66 to 28 margin, Asian-Americans by a 65 to 27 margin, and others by a 56 to 36 margin. The NEP exit poll's estimate of the share of the Latino vote won by Clinton and Trump was virtually identical to that found in the Survey Monkey/*Los Angeles Times* post-election survey as well as *The New York Times*/Upshot post-election analysis, indicating that the evidence is very strong that Trump won more than a quarter of the Latino vote.

The NEP exit poll data suggest that two factors were particularly critical to Trump's win: the vote choice of individuals who disliked both Clinton and Trump and the vote choice of late deciders, especially in the crucial battleground states where Trump won by very narrow margins: Florida, Michigan, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin.

The 2016 voters could be divided into four groups: the 41 percent who had a favorable opinion of Clinton but not Trump, the 36 percent who had a favorable opinion of Trump but not Clinton, the 18 percent who had a favorable opinion of neither candidate, and the 2 percent who had a favorable opinion of both candidates. Voters with an unfavorable opinion of both candidates ended up voting significantly more for Trump than for Clinton, by a 47-30 margin, while the Libertarian Party's Gary Johnson took 16 percent of that voting bloc and the Green Party's Jill Stein received 3 percent.

At the same time, 13 percent of voters nationwide waited until the final week to make their choice. In the four states where the election was closest—Florida, Michigan, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin—that group ranged from 11 percent in Florida to 15 percent in Pennsylvania. In each of these key states, a significantly larger proportion of late-deciders opted for Trump over Clinton: 59 to 30 percent in Wisconsin, 55 to 38 percent in Florida, 54 to 37 percent in Pennsylvania, and 50 to 39 percent in Michigan. This represented the difference between a Trump victory and a Clinton victory.

Marianne Stewart: Hillary's Hypothesis

Marianne Stewart drew her inspiration for this presentation from a reason Hillary Clinton gave to explain her defeat. That hypothesis was that some Americans did not vote for Clinton because she was a woman. Stewart tested the hypothesis that public attitudes toward women influenced voting in 2016, and that they affected the outcome of the election and led to Trump's victory, as posited by Clinton.

To evaluate the hypothesis, Stewart utilized data from the 2016 Cooperative Congressional Election Survey (CCES), an online pre-post election survey carried out by *YouGov* containing a sample size of 60,000. This included a CCES module developed by Stewart and fellow panelist Harold Clarke to evaluate the impact of gender role attitudes on voting behavior in 2016.

In her analysis, Stewart revealed that female voters liked Clinton more than Trump while male voters liked Trump more than Clinton. Her analysis also indicated that the more progressive a person's attitudes toward gender roles, the more likely they were to vote for Clinton, while the more traditional a person's attitudes toward gender roles, the less likely they were to vote for Clinton.

Stewart concluded by making two principal points. First, a majority of Americans have progressive attitudes toward the role and status of women in society; holding these progressive attitudes made a voter more likely to cast a ballot for Clinton. Second, by priming women's issues, Clinton raised their salience in the minds of voters, and since a majority of voters hold a progressive position on these issues, this higher salience benefited Clinton at the ballot box.

Stewart concluded that Hillary Clinton did not lose the election because she was a woman—in fact, being a woman helped more than hurt her at the polls. Clinton lost not because of her gender, but because she was too unpopular.

Harold Clarke—Trumping the Polls

Harold Clarke began his presentation by reviewing the predictions made by seven leading forecasting outfits immediately prior to the 2016 presidential election. The median prediction listed the probability of a Clinton victory at 89 percent, but predictions ranged from a high of 99 percent by the Princeton Election Consortium and 98 percent by *The Huffington Post* to 85 percent by *The New York Times* and 71 percent by Nate Silver's FiveThirtyEight.

In a similar vein, three projections of seats in the Electoral College had Clinton winning between 303 electoral votes as projected by Nate Silver's FiveThirtyEight and 323 electoral votes as projected by *The Huffington Post*. The actual result was 306 electoral votes for Trump and 232 for Clinton.

At the national level, the forecasted vote shares based on national opinion polls were not significantly far from the actual values. On average, they missed by a mere 0.9 percent in the case of Clinton and 2.3 percent in the case of Trump. However, statewide polls in the pivotal states of Michigan, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin tell a different story. There, the polls were once again only modestly off in projecting Clinton's vote share by 1.1 percent, but they notably underestimated voter support for Trump, undershooting his actual vote percentage by an average of 5.4 percent.

In response to the failure of the state-level polls to accurately predict the outcome of the 2016 presidential election, the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) commissioned and then issued a report on the matter. Clarke reviewed the report's principal explanations for the poll failures. The best explanations were that there was a late swing to Trump (as highlighted by Joe Lenski) that the polls were unable to pick up. Additionally, the samples used by the surveys were biased in that they oversampled college graduates who tended to be Clinton supporters. Two explanations largely discounted by

the report were the presence of a large number of "shy Trumpsters" who either did not participate in the survey or said they were undecided when in actuality they planned on voting for Trump, and ballot order effects. Lastly, the AAPOR report's authors indicated they had insufficient data to conclude whether turnout changes between 2012 and 2016 or partisan bias in the polls contributed to the 2016 polling snafu.

Clarke concluded by highlighting some of the many challenges facing pollsters when predicting election outcomes. They include evolving dynamics over the course of a campaign, measuring candidate preferences in an era of severe partisan polarization, extremely low survey response rates, and the sampling error that is a component of every survey. Finally, Clarke reminded everyone that surveys can only do so much, and that in extremely close elections they simply cannot determine the winner with a great deal of accuracy.

Kenneth Goldstein: Polling and the 2016 Presidential Election

Kenneth Goldstein began his presentation by reviewing the performance of the major party presidential candidates among three partisan groups as based on self-identification: Democrats, Independents, and Republicans.

In any given election a certain percentage of Democrats, Independents, and Republicans turn out to vote and divide their vote to varying degrees between the Democratic and Republican presidential candidates. For example, the share of voters who identify as Republican has ranged over the past four presidential elections from a high of 37 percent in 2004 to a low of 32 percent in 2008 and 2012. Conversely, the share of voters identifying as Democrat has ranged from a low of 37 percent in 2004 and 2016 to a high of 39 percent in 2009. Those identifying as Independent have ranged from a low of 26 percent in 2004 to a high of 33 percent in 2016. By the same token, the distribution of each group's electoral support between the Democratic and Republican presidential candidates also varies across elections. For example, Independents favored Trump over Clinton 48 to 42 percent in 2016 but favored Barack Obama over John McCain 52 to 44 percent in 2008. Likewise, George W. Bush and Mitt Romney won 93 percent of the Republican vote in 2004 and 2012, compared to 90 percent for McCain and Trump in 2008 and 2016. Obama won 92 percent of the Democratic vote in 2012 while he won 89 percent in 2008, as did John Kerry in 2008 and Clinton in 2016.

Goldstein noted that for polls to accurately forecast election results, they need to both accurately project the share of actual voters who identify as a Democrat, Independent, and Republican as well as how the members of each group are going to distribute their vote across the presidential candidates on their ballot. Achieving this goal requires polls with sample populations that accurately reflect the partisan and socio-demographic distribution of the actual voters casting a ballot. In the case of 2016, Goldstein highlighted how the polls included too many college-educated whites and included too few non-college educated whites. And, while college-educated whites tended to favor Clinton over Trump by small margins, non-college educated whites tended to favor Trump over Clinton by large margins. As a result, polls significantly underestimated Donald Trump's vote share.

Goldstein concluded his presentation by highlighting a notable finding from his research on presidential advertising in 2016. In contrast to the campaigns of the major party candidates in 2000, 2004, 2008, and 2012 as well as the Trump campaign in 2016, Clinton's campaign ads were almost completely devoid of policy discussions. Instead, two-thirds of her ads focused on personal factors regarding either her or Trump. In contrast, in all other campaigns since 2000, the highest proportion of ads of a personal nature by the other major party candidates was a mere one-sixth of the candidate's advertisements.

Luncheon and Keynote Discussion

The following is excerpted from a discussion between David Axelrod and Karl Rove, the honorary directors of the inaugural conference of the Presidential Elections Program. Major Garrett, chief White House correspondent for *CBS News*, moderated the conversation.

Major Garrett:
I want to start with a very broad opening question. Is there something you've always wanted to say that you don't think has yet been said about the 2016 campaign?

Karl Rove:
At the end of May 2016, I ended up spending about three-and-a-half hours with [Donald Trump] at his request, and among the moments of that three-and-a-half hours was a long debate. I said you had to get to 270 electoral votes, and you had to have three or four ways to get there. This led to an argument between candidate Trump, who's then the presumptive nominee, and me over the states that could make up his 270 electoral vote strategy. He was arguing that he could win Oregon, California, and New York. I told him he was nuts on all three of them. I said, "If you spend time trying to win New York, or Oregon, or California, it's a day you can't spend in Pennsylvania or Iowa." So he goes out and gives a speech, and he says, "I've got a strategy to get to 270 electoral votes, and I will spend every day working hard in 15 states. And over the next month I'm going to describe to you what those states are, and today I'm going to tell you about three of them: Oregon, California, and New York!" You may remember a couple weeks later they announced a critical battleground state they were going to compete for was—Connecticut. And why? Because Paul Manafort had grown up in Connecticut. Sometimes when you win a presidential campaign, you look like a genius, and when you lose, you're an idiot, but sometimes you're just a lucky idiot.

David Axelrod:
Everybody who wins a presidential race looks flawless and brilliant. But it takes a lot of work to lose to Donald Trump. And one of the things that was done to facilitate that was to pay attention to extraneous states instead of focusing on those states that were necessary to get to 270. So we'll never know the answer to how it was that the Clinton campaign wound up spending more money in the state of Arizona than the state of Michigan, or how she never managed to visit the state of Wisconsin after the convention, when those states were absolutely central to victory for any Democratic campaign and were lost by just a lash.

These are mysteries that I think help explain what happened in November of 2016. It wasn't an act of brilliance on the part of one candidate. There were great deficiencies on the part of the other campaign.

Garrett:
Barack Obama was an insurgent. Donald Trump clearly was. Talk to us about this idea that now in two separate and distinct presidential elections the party didn't decide the nominee. The nominee came from so far outside the system—they ran within the rules, but also ran athwart many of the conventional ideas about the party producing a nominee. Talk to us about the party deciding, or maybe not anymore.

Axelrod:
Parties are much less dominant in our politics for a variety of reasons—changes in campaign finance law, changes in party rules, and the democratization of parties, social media, and what that facilitates. Listen, when Barack Obama decided to challenge Hillary Clinton in [2008], there was no national organization, we had no money. And the reason that we thought it was possible was because even then, social media and the internet afforded us the opportunity to organize and raise money. In that first quarter after Obama announced, we raised $12 million online. We had actually planned on raising two. That's one element that allows for insurgency. The other is we live in a time of perpetual jaundice about institutions and the status quo. So being the outsider is advantageous, and it was advantageous. The biggest, the most often cited item on a list of items as to why people voted the way they did in the [2016] exit polls was they wanted a candidate who would bring change to Washington. Donald Trump carried that group—I think it was 40 percent of the electorate—with 82 percent of the vote.

Rove:
I have a slightly different view. I think insurgencies are a normal periodic expression of our political system. In 1972, George McGovern. 1940, Wendell Willkie is a Democrat in February and the nominee of the Republican Party in June. William Jennings Bryan, 1896. He is not a candidate the day before he is nominated by the Democratic Party, and he becomes the candidate by seven accidents.

But each one talks about something that I think is more profound than outside insurgencies. It's the weakening of the party structure. It's more the fact that now the parties are controlled by primaries. The whole thing of party organizations with precinct chairmen and delegates to conventions and so on, starting in 1912, began to be replaced by primaries. And with each election, we have more delegates to the national convention who are chosen in primaries in which the parties had very little influence. Increasingly it's driven by the candidate and not by sort of typical people who play a role in a party, election in and election out.

Garrett:

Is it becoming more true that the nominating contest is really six or seven contests at the front end?

Axelrod:

There is a process. We knew, for example, in 2008 that if we lost the Iowa caucuses we were probably done, and that's why he spent I think 87 days in Iowa in 2007, and everything was about winning Iowa, and that unlocked the door to everything. You know, many others fell by the wayside, and then New Hampshire comes next. And then in the democratic process you turn south, to a state like South Carolina where a majority of voters are African-American in the primary, and how are you going to compete with them?

Rove:

I want to go back to a thing that David said, which I think is really important—process matters. One of the smartest things the Obama team did in '08, in my opinion, was they organized in caucus states. And Hillary Clinton, for some reason or another, just said, you know, "I'm Hillary, everybody's going to be for me." I mean, there's Barack Obama cleaning up in Idaho, and she gets nothing. And she had no organization on the ground.

Garrett:

I want to ask both of you about the process of winning a nomination and then how it transfers to a general election. I'm curious about communicating with this audience, how much you learn during the very tough primary process, the pursuit of the nomination, what you learn internally as a campaign, what your candidate learns, and how much of that informs your ability to succeed once you get to the general election.

Axelrod:

We have a long, sometimes crude, absurd process. But one thing it does do is it does test these candidates, and you learn a lot about them. I learned a lot about Barack Obama during that primary, and I honestly didn't know how he'd handle the pressure of the presidential campaign. And we got tested over the longest primary campaign ever. We had the different challenges, the Reverend [Jeremiah] Wright challenge. We lost primaries and caucuses we were supposed to win. When we had setbacks, [Obama] was not one to point fingers. After we lost the Texas primary and the Ohio primary, [Obama] called a meeting, and we didn't know what he was going to do. He came in with a yellow legal pad, and he started off by saying, "You know, I can think of a dozen things I could have done better in the last few weeks, and I bet you guys can, too. I'm not here to point fingers. I want to figure out what we can do better moving forward, what we're going to learn from this." And we had a very productive, two-hour conversation. He got up, and he was walking out, and he turned to the group, and he said, "Now, I want you to know I'm not yelling at you," and then he started walking again, and he stopped, and he said, "Of course, after blowing $20 million in two weeks I could yell at you."

Rove:
There are seminal moments. We lost and lost badly [in New Hampshire in 2000]. This is at a moment where we have people calling for people to be fired. You know, helpful voices from your friends back home saying, "Fire Rove." Not that I've ever forgiven Mike Toomey. And Bush said, "We came into this together. We're going to win together. I've made a lot of mistakes, and I need everybody to be focused on what we're going to do different in South Carolina. Head home for a day or two, but I want everybody thinking about how we're going to turn this into victory." You know, campaigns are really complex human organisms thrown together in a very short period of time with a virtually insurmountable goal. I mean, get 50 percent plus one in the Electoral College and raise and spend a billion dollars in a matter of 18 months. That's a pretty damn difficult thing to do. So you need to have a sense of cohesion, and camaraderie, and leadership, and spirit, and focus, and it really starts with the candidate at the top.

Garrett:
I want to ask whether the 2016 campaign represents an abnormality or the new norm in terms of pursuing the nomination—meaning celebrity status has more traction going in than it theoretically did before Donald Trump.

Rove:
Who the hell knows? My gut tells me each presidential election tends to be a reaction—particularly after big events—to the last one. I was taken by Zac Moffatt's observation this morning that the nature of the candidate and using the social media, [Trump] was uniquely sort of organized. His brain was wired to make use of Twitter in a way that others were not. On the other hand, you also need to look at the nature of the voters who respond to that tool. One of the reasons why there was such a high degree of engagement with his tweets was that the people who were out there waiting and available to him said, "I hate the way that the country is going." The content also matters in terms of, is there a group receptive and ready to hear that message? And there was a group out there in America that said, "By God, somebody's going to stand up. He's a businessman. He's going to be rough. He's not the normal politician. He's going to do something about the economy, and by God he's going to save America before we lose it." Without that group being there, I'm not certain we'd be sitting here saying, "Oh, God, Twitter is the wave of the future."

Axelrod:
On Donald Trump, his great inspiration wasn't so much about technology. His great inspiration is: How do you dominate television? I mean, he did hit those themes, there's no doubt he hit those visceral themes that Karl said. But his great inspiration is that if you light yourself on fire, they have to cover you. You know, as you pointed out when I said this to you earlier, he has an asbestos suit on at all times, a fire retardant suit. And he just lights himself on fire perpetually and understands that the media is going to follow him. Twitter, to him, is just the tool to drive media, to drive coverage.

Rove:
History tells us that [new] tools, when they make their appearance in politics, initially seem to benefit some kind of a candidate, but ultimately benefit potentially other kinds of candidates. When radio came along, the first candidate to use it was Warren G. Harding. And yet the guy who exploited it was Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Television emerges in American politics with "We like Ike." "We like Ike." And eight years later it propels a dynamic young senator from Massachusetts to the White House. The question is, who infuses it with content and personality?

Garrett:
It appears that after the selection, both parties are going through a rather significant existential conversation about what they represent. Are they being pulled apart or reshaped before our very eyes? I'd like your assessment of that for Democrats after Hillary Clinton, and what that means.

Axelrod:
I don't think it's as profound as the one in the Republican Party, but there's a debate between the left and the center left. I think there's a debate in both parties between kind of absolutism and people who believe in compromise, and that I think is a fundamental problem. People are frustrated with gridlock. They're frustrated with compromise. They want the whole thing. There's some of that. But here's what I would say about the Democratic Party, and we've seen a little bit of this in 2017, and this is always true when a party is out of power. The hunger to win overcomes a lot of differences. So there is an enormous desire to win, to rein in Trump, ultimately to beat Trump. And so that's a moderating influence.

Garrett:
How about for the Republican Party and its existential angst at the moment?

Rove:
I think both parties are broken. In some ways they're alike. David's right. Each party has its absolutist wing—the Freedom Caucus in the Republicans, and in the Democrats the "Our Revolution" and the "Sandernisters"—the Elizabeth Warren and Bernie Sanders wing of the party. Did you like that, "Sandernister?" I've got it trademarked, so you're welcome to use it, but give me credit. Each party has its own unique challenge. Look, Donald Trump owns the Republican Party today. But there is no coherent Trumpism. The Republican Party remains a center-right party governed by somebody who thinks [Friedrich] Hayek is a guy who owns a bar on the Upper East Side, you know, and has not read [Ludwig] von Mises, and Bill Buckley, well, he had a cute wife. This is not a guy who's ideologically sound. We're in a tribal, a moment of tribalism in American politics. I see this in my party. I can remember people telling me, "I'm offended by the fact that the president of the United States would have sex with an intern in the Oval Office!" and today it's "God, I love Donald Trump," and "Who cares about the porn star." And similarly, Democrats said, "By God, sex is a private matter, and you should not criticize the president!" Now it's, "By God, we need to impeach that son of a bitch!" So we got a point of tribalism where everybody's this way.

Garrett:

And to the topic of tribalism: The activities undertaken by the Russians to meddle, influence, participate in a negative way is a moment when the country might want to have a conversation about the long-observed notion that tribalism, absolutism, and partisanship are kind of a benign indulgence. It seems to me that the Russians discovered that by dropping things into the social media bloodstream, they could do something that they'd never been able to do before, though they had tried many times before, which is to pit Americans against one another.

Rove:

The Russian thing is deeply troubling to me. First of all, I don't mean to be offensive, but I was offended this morning when there was the note of moral equivalency between what the United States did to promote democracy around the world with Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty and what the Russians are doing in our election. We had Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty broadcasting and educating about the principles of democracy and free elections and freedom and liberty to the people of the Soviet Union. That's a big difference from trolls sitting in St. Petersburg after Charlottesville simultaneously creating Black Lives Matter fake groups and white alt right supremacist groups online in order to stir up controversy in our country. And I wish our president was taking a strong lead in this matter. If he stood up and said, "These people meddled in our elections. I'm not only going to throw their diplomats who are spies out of our country, but I want to remind you they want to pit us against each other and did so in Charlottesville. They spent more money after I got elected than before I got elected, and by God we're going to stop them." The country would come together. And we better do this, because they're coming after this election in 2018, and they're coming after us in 2020, to pit us against each other and to find weaknesses in our voter system that cause us to have problems on election day.

Axelrod:

I thoroughly agree. Part of the role of a president of the United States, regardless of party, is that you're the trustee of our democracy. And I think most presidents approach the job that way, understanding that they're the president of the entire country. That doesn't mean that the entire country is going to embrace them or agree with them. But if you have a president who essentially gets elected and then governs by exploiting our differences, then you make it easier for the Russians to do what they're doing. And I think what troubles me the most today is this question, which is what is it that binds us together as Americans? What are the values that we share? What are the things that supersede those things that we disagree about? There are values that are associated with this country that have been a beacon to the world, and that should be a source of pride to us.

I'm not Pollyanna-ish. I understand politics. I understand every administration has its politics and so on. But there has to be something bigger than that. Yes, I think the Russians have found a fault line and a tool to exploit that fault line. They couldn't beat us with their weapons. And now on the cheap they've found a way to create maximum disruption, and that's a great danger. We ought to be speaking to our common values and our common

concerns as Americans, without kind of washing away those things that are different. If we don't do that, I think that we're at great risk.

Panel III: Lessons Learned from the 2016 Presidential Election

The 2016 presidential campaign established a series of historical precedents that left pollsters and prognosticators reexamining their crafts, the news media questioning their reportage, and the country at times dismayed by the novel campaign style pioneered by Donald Trump.

Hillary Clinton was the first woman nominated by a major political party as its presidential candidate. Trump became the first president elected without prior public service. It was the first time the two major candidacies were scrutinized by law enforcement officials during their campaigns. It was only the fifth time in U.S. history that the winning candidate got fewer votes than his challenger. And it was the first time since the infamous 1948 "Dewey defeats Truman" election that the prognosticators were so far off base.

It was, according to a panel of experts, a presidential election for the ages.

"This is going to be written about and debated for decades and perhaps centuries to come," *New York Times* political reporter Jonathan Martin said during the third panel of the conference.

A Culmination of Trends

In many ways, the 2016 election—and in particular, the emergence of Trump—was a culmination of trends that have been occurring since World War II, said Michael Nelson, a political science professor at Rhodes College who has written extensively about the presidency and presidential campaigns.

"We come out of World War II … and the country's placing an enormous value in choosing presidents who have experience in government, and in particular experience in Washington," said Nelson, referring to a string of five presidents starting with Harry Truman who rose to the White House from high federal office or military positions.

But in the aftermath of the Vietnam War and then Watergate, Nelson said, the tenor of American politics changed as a growing aversion to Washington assisted the candidacies of those with experience in state government—Jimmy Carter, Ronald Reagan, Bill Clinton, and George W. Bush. Trump, Nelson said, represents the next iteration of this trend—that is, a growing voter antipathy toward government. Trump won, partly, because he made a virtue out of his inexperience.

"Even if (Trump) had stopped close to the finish line, we would have learned something that has been underway in American politics for a long time—and of which he will not be the last manifestation," Nelson said.

The Candidates' Different Strategies

In a close race in which Trump won the Electoral College with fewer votes nationwide than Clinton, his most important decision may have been to defy GOP conventional wisdom—shared by some inside his own campaign—and go after the Rust Belt states of Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin, said *Politico* national political reporter Tim Alberta. Those four "Blue Wall" states accounted for the exact number of electoral votes by which fellow Republican Mitt Romney lost in 2012: 64.

That strategy was not part of Republican orthodoxy. Remember, Alberta said, the Republican National Committee's post-election autopsy of Romney's loss to President Barack Obama indicated that their party's 2016 candidate should focus on shoring up purple states such as New Mexico, Colorado, Nevada, Virginia, and areas in the Mid-Atlantic and the Sun Belt, with a heavy emphasis on attracting Hispanic voters.

Trump had other plans and the March 8, 2016, Michigan primaries for both parties should have been a warning that he could redraw the electoral map and win the general election, Alberta said. The plurality of voters in both primaries was non-college educated whites, and most of them opposed free trade. Trump cleaned up among that group on the Republican side, and Bernie Sanders used a similar message to clean up among that group on the Democratic side.

 "If you could have that inside straight through the Rust Belt, you win back the presidency," Alberta said. "And yet Donald Trump and his folks were the only people I ever heard make that argument."

In retrospect, Nelson and Rice University political science professor and pollster Bob Stein said, prognosticators should have read the tea leaves that said the Blue Wall was ripe to fall because many of those states had Republican governors and a large number of Republican state legislators. "He was walking through an open door that only he realized wasn't locked," Nelson said.

For its part, the Clinton campaign wasn't paying enough attention to Rust Belt states. The candidate never traveled to Wisconsin and only made last-minute forays to Michigan and Pennsylvania, two states that don't allow early voting. Instead, she spent a great amount of time in battleground states that allow early voting.

Her messaging in those Rust Belt states was ineffectual because she aimed much too much attention on Republicans who didn't heed her warning that Trump was a risky candidate. Many of those skeptical voters have felt for decades that most politicians are dicey, he said.

"For a lot of folks who were struggling, they didn't really care that he was a bad guy, and they didn't think he was that much more risky than the last 40 years of politicians, because they weren't doing that well," Martin said. "That was a mistake to … target high-income suburbanites at the expense of more downscale traditional Democratic voters."

As Clinton dropped the ball on developing a populist message, she lost enough 2012 Obama supporters in the Rust Belt to allow Trump to win those four states and the election. At the end of the day, 80,000 votes in three states—Michigan, Wisconsin, and Pennsylvania—cost Clinton the election.

"If you talk to the Clinton folks, they certainly regret not putting her in those places earlier on," Martin said.

The Comey Letter

Other factors, of course, led to Trump's victory, the panelists said, including the Oct. 28, 2016, letter that then-FBI Director James Comey sent to Congress announcing that the investigation into Clinton's email server was reopened. In the aftermath of the campaign, Clinton has complained with some justification that Comey's announcement sparked the momentum shift that cost her the election.

Alberta recalled being with the campaign of Mike Pence when the news broke. "The conversations, instantly shifted from … the expectation that Trump would lose—and perhaps lose in historic fashion—to, 'Oh, my goodness, do we actually have a chance now? Is this what we needed? Is this the proverbial October surprise?'" Alberta said.

Andrea Mitchell of *NBC News*, who moderated the discussion, said that the moment Comey's letter became public, the storyline of the campaign changed. Up until that point, people knew that after two terms of the Obama presidency, 2016 was a change election, with Clinton campaigning that Trump was too risky to have his finger on the nuclear button. "Suddenly … she became risky, and it resurrected a lot of feelings about her that a large number of voters had," Mitchell said.

"What happened with the Comey letter was that all those suburbanites who she was trying to convince that Trump was too risky … said, 'Oh, my gosh, well, Hillary's in real trouble here, too,'" Martin said. "'I don't like Trump's tweets and his profanity, and he's kind not my speed, but I think I'm going to go back to the Republican Party.'"

The Comey letter changed the dynamics of the race in another way, Stein said. Before then, a good number of Republicans doubted that their candidate [Trump] could win. So they were not motivated to go to the polls, and many didn't during early voting. "It was that period of the last two weeks when people began to believe correctly not only could Trump possibly win this, but that they ought to come out and vote," Stein said.

Clinton could not shut the floodgates once they had been opened.

Campaign Style: Trump vs. Clinton

Clinton had other challenges aside from the Comey letter and her miscalculation in the Rust Belt states, panelists said. One of those was a special ingredient for candidacy that Trump had: authenticity. Nelson said studies repeatedly show that politicians who come across to voters as authentic are already two steps down a three-step road because that is a quality that people no longer expect to see in candidates. As a result, Trump was the perfect tonic for voters who have grown tired of scripted candidates who seem to be the product of political consultants.

One example of Trump's brashness, Nelson said, was how he handled the aftermath of the release of the *Access Hollywood* tapes during the subsequent debate at Washington University in St. Louis. Many speculated that he might drop out of the debate or perhaps even from the election. Instead, Trump seated in the audience four women who had accused Bill Clinton of sexual misadventures and he accused his opponent of being an enabler.

"That's something that's in nobody's playbook," Nelson said. "But this guy didn't know enough to realize that, and it turned out to be exactly the strategy or the tactic, at least, that worked in getting him close."

Another example of Trump's novel style was his unconventional campaigning and the media's response to it. Historically, Mitchell said, candidates tend to focus their speeches on policy. They often stand before crowds talking about housing, education, or other matters of the day. Instead of taking that approach, Trump's events were prime time, stream-of-consciousness entertainment. And he dominated free media by using tweets and phoning into Sunday morning talk shows.

"It was theater," Martin said. "On live television," Mitchell responded.

In the meantime, Trump routinely attacked the very media he was trying to manipulate. Making the media a punching bag, of course, has been a staple of GOP politics in recent years, Alberta said. Newt Gingrich surged in the polls during his 2012 Republican primary candidacy by attacking CNN moderator John King during one debate. Trump has taken that strategy to another level by inventing a war on "fake" news, a phenomenon that spawned an unintentional consequence with enormous implications for the electoral process as conservative voters are increasingly leery of the mainstream media, he said.

"I understand some of their complaints—I'm not here to vilify them," Alberta said. "But [it] has unwittingly driven many conservative voters into the arms of sources of information that are far less reliable than the mainstream media."

The Gender Issue

One question the panel grappled with was the issue of gender in the race. In the aftermath, Clinton has complained that being a woman cost her the election. Although she won the women's vote, she lost it among white women, largely because of a large deficit among white women without college degrees.

The panelists agreed that some voters simply will not support a woman. But Martin argued it's less clear is how much of her problems were based on her gender rather than the fact that many voters have had a longstanding unease with the Clinton brand in American politics. "We'll never know the answer to that question," Martin said. "Although I think 2020 could be revealing if Democrats nominate a female, and she goes on to beat President Trump. That might indicate it was more about the Clinton factor than anything else."

Alberta said that while in the past, the gender gap has been a telling statistic in internal and exit polls, a new phenomenon is arising: the diploma divide. The primary campaign of Ted Cruz created a very sophisticated approach to determine voting patterns. It looked at 500 indicators, from what type of beer voters drank to the kinds of cars they drove. One factor predicted voting patterns better than any other: whether or not you graduated from college.

Trump spoke the language of the less educated better and more convincingly that Clinton or any of his rivals in the GOP primary. His often jarring language combined with his anti-free trade stance appreciated by Rust Belt voters gave him the narrow cushion he needed to win. "These folks had never voted Republican in their lives, and they've got Trump signs on their lawns," Alberta said.

Panel IV: Looking Ahead to the 2020 Presidential Election

Trump's Chances in 2020

Although President Donald Trump's approval ratings are upside down, his administration faces federal investigation, he is the oldest person ever elected to a first term in the White House, and Democrats threaten his impeachment should they win the House, panelists looking ahead to the 2020 election believe he will probably seek a second term.

And despite the president's many woes, he will have a good chance of winning re-election if his name is on the ballot, they said.

Part of the reason for their belief that Trump can win in 2020 is that he continues to have broad support from his party while also maintaining his ability to cross party lines and reach out to disaffected Democrats. At the same time, Democrats have not done a good job of controlling the narrative aside from their drumbeat criticism of Trump.

"The thing that I think we [Democrats] haven't accomplished—and the single biggest thing the Democrats need to focus on when we are in power—is not doing things like impeaching Donald Trump, but doing things like offering an economic alternative," said

Democratic political consultant and pollster Celinda Lake. "I think that's the single most important task for us."

Amy Walter, national editor of *The Cook Political Report*, said that Trump's strength remains his ability to cast himself as an outsider, even after getting elected to the highest position in the country. A good example of Trump's capacity to brand himself that way, Walter said, was his decision to threaten to veto the $1.3 trillion spending bill even though the White House worked with Republicans and Democrats to craft the legislation.

"His brand always has to be being against whatever Washington and the establishment is, and his brand continues to be that," Walter said. "So he's been able to fly above the Republicans while also being the Republican Party. All that said, the intensity of support for him among Republicans is pretty remarkable."

Political consultant Jeff Roe, who ran Senator Ted Cruz's 2016 primary run against Trump, responded flatly that "Trump is bigger than the [Republican] party, he's more popular than the party." Roe noted that polling he has done in a Western state demonstrated that Republicans are much more prone to support an issue if they know that Trump supported it, even if they have opposed it in the past.

"He'll be the first president to run for reelection as an outsider … incredibly an outsider," Roe said. "He will build a run as a populist, America's first crusader."

Republican and Democratic Contenders

The panelists predicted that few candidates will challenge Trump in the 2020 Republican primary while the Democratic primary may be as crowded as the GOP primary was in 2016, and probably more so.

Inside the Republican Party, there is scant ideological room on either side of Trump for a strong opponent to emerge in the primary. This is because the president has an 88 percent approval rating among Republicans, Walter said. Trump controls the right wing of the party and there is not enough of a cushion on the left of him for someone like Ohio Governor John Kasich or Arizona Senator Jeff Flake to outflank him.

Of course, the GOP primary race would dramatically change should Trump choose not to seek-re-election. But, Roe said, that scenario would probably only unfold if Trump generates enough successes during his first term and can "declare victory and leave the mat."

"I don't think he'd be forced out," Roe said.

Democrats, on the other hand, will likely experience a primary free-for-all, with panelists estimating that there are as many as 41 serious candidates at present, including Bernie Sanders, Elizabeth Warren, Joe Biden, Kirsten Gillibrand, Corey Booker, Chris Murphy, Amy Klobucher, Kamala Harris, and Terry McAuliffe. The list goes on and on, and it could get even larger, Lake said.

"So if you don't like blonde Democrats, we got brunette Democrats," Lake said. "If you don't like women, we got men. If you don't like short, we got tall. We got every kind of Democrat. So you can just have any kind of Democrat you want out there."

Eventually the Democratic field will winnow down to four or five strong candidates, with at least one being a non-traditional candidate, such as a mayor like Eric Garcetti or a billionaire like Tom Steyer. "Anything's possible," moderator Evan Smith said.

The panelists agreed that one thing is certain: The Democratic ticket in 2020 will not have two white males, and it may not ever again. "That, I think, is done," Walter said. "There is no question that … whether they're a VP or president pick, there is going to be a person of color and/or a female."

That said, Lake predicted that it will be hard for a woman to become the Democratic Party's presidential candidate in 2020 after the experience Clinton had in 2016.

"I think it is tougher for a woman," Lake said. "There will be a little residual hesitancy, even though these women are an entirely different generation than Hillary, and I was a big Hillary supporter. Our party's going to be cautious, because we don't have to go female or person of color to go liberal. We can go liberal and go white man."

The Democrats are experiencing a civil war between the left and centrist factions of their party—similar to the one that Republicans experienced in recent years between their right and moderate wings, the panelists said. As Democrats turn their attention to 2020, they will be pressed to support a more ideological candidate despite knowing that a moderate one might be able to reach out to Republicans. The former argument will have greater traction in the aftermath of the 2016 campaign, when Clinton lost as a moderate candidate.

"I've never believed that there are swing voters in presidential primaries or presidential elections anymore," Lake said. "It's 4 percent (of the vote), and I'd rather have a base motivated. Wouldn't you?"

Roe, meanwhile, said that political campaigns must always chose between trying to attract swing voters or increasing the base vote. "That's your choice, and it's simply easier to do base motivation than swing votes," he said.

Race Will Again Be a Factor

Racial politics will continue to play a factor in presidential politics, the panelists agreed. In 2016, Trump received 58 percent of the white vote, 8 percent of the African-American vote, and 28 percent of the Hispanic vote. Those are similar to the numbers Republican candidate Mitt Romney generated in his 2012 loss to President Barack Obama.

Should the electorate in presidential elections remain more than 73 percent white, as it was in 2016, Republicans will have an advantage if they can continue to attract a large

percentage of that racial group, Roe said. Mathematically, he said, he'd rather have a substantial share of the largest voting bloc than almost all of the smaller voting blocs.

That leaves Democrats facing a dilemma, Smith said. They can either work to attract more white voters or increase the turnout of minority voters. Lake said that for Democrats to win nationally, they must attract more white voters, particularly in rural and suburban America.

"That's just empirical," Lake said. "I mean, yes, the revolution is coming. But it's not here tomorrow. The electorate in 2016 was still 73 percent white."

Independent Candidates

The chances of a credible third-party candidacy arising in 2020 are extremely remote, the panelists said. The last third-party candidate to generate great voter interest was in 1992, when Ross Perot captured 19 percent of the votes. Walter said that a billionaire could decide to run in 2020 as an independent, but the electoral map works against such a candidacy because it faces difficult hurdles getting on the ballots in all 50 states. Compounding that problem is the fact that independent candidates can't rely on a party's organizational structure and largesse to assist their campaigns.

The more likely scenario would be for an independent candidate to allow himself or herself to become absorbed into a political party, like Trump did with the Republican Party. Similarly, Walter said, third parties tend to get consumed by the bigger party, much like Google and Facebook acquire start-up companies and bring them in-house.

"The fact that the Republican nominee [Trump] was not a Republican, and the almost Democratic nominee [Bernie Sanders] was not, is not a Democrat, tells you everything you need to know about third parties," Walter said. "So the third party candidates … are like, 'Fine, I'll just take this label for now, because I need it.'"

Roe added that the future of independent candidacies might get brighter as more and more voters view themselves as neither a Republican nor Democrat. In 10 of the 28 states that have party registration, more voters register themselves as "other" than they do with either major party, he said. That phenomenon did not occur in any state in 1992 or in 1996 when Perot got 8 percent of the vote.

"If you had a strong third-party last time, they could have gotten a big share of the vote," Roe said.

The Mid-term Elections

Looking ahead to the 2018 mid-term elections, the panelists indicated that there is a strong likelihood that Democrats will win enough seats to take back the House of Representatives after losing it in 2010. Democrats need a net gain of 23 seats in order to have a House majority.

Walter said that intensity among Democrats has been extremely high since Trump was sworn into the presidency. She likened it to 1994 and 2010, when Republicans took more than 50 seats each year to reclaim the House.

Whether that intensity translates to a Democratic win in the 2020 presidential election is yet to be seen, Walter said, noting that both Bill Clinton and Barack Obama each won second terms after their party had devastating House losses two years earlier.

"By 2019, I don't think the energy about Donald Trump is going to go away," Walter said. "The Democratic base isn't going to be like, 'You know, I guess it's not that bad. It's been okay. He's doing fine.'

"They're going to dislike him with the fury of a thousand suns forever and ever and ever."

Directing that Democratic anger could be problematic, especially because the party stalwarts tend to get distracted, Lake said. Democrats know how to direct their anger at Trump and they have sound bites on most of the progressive issues of the day, from gun control to women's rights. But they lack a coherent direction on the issues that matter to most Americans, such as the economy and health care.

"We're like Greyhounds," Lake said. "We follow the rabbit every time one scurries out into the highway. Trump drops a rabbit every day, or two or three a day. And there are a lot of things to be upset about. So we run after everything."

The panelists said that both parties are going to have to adjust to changing demographics from state to state. States that once voted Democrat—like New Hampshire, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Pennsylvania—are becoming more and more Republican. At the same time, traditional Republican strongholds—like Virginia and Colorado—are becoming Democratic.

"So you put the state of Xanadu on my table, and you tell me, 'Are Democrats going to win Xanadu?'" Lake said. "And I only got two questions to ask you. The first question I want to ask you is, 'what percentage people of color are in Xanadu?' The second question I'm going to ask you is, 'what is the percentage college-educated?'"

Roe added that the rising number of Hispanic voters gives Democrats a potential advantage in the future. But the longer Hispanics live in a state, the more they tend to vote for Republicans. He noted that Texas Governor Greg Abbott received about 44 percent of the Hispanic vote in 2014, including a majority of Latino men and married Latino women.

"We're much more likely to get a Hispanic … in generations two, three, and four than we are to get an African-American," Roe said.

Conference Participants

Honorary Chairs

David Axelrod is a veteran of American politics and journalism, and former chief strategist and senior advisor to President Barack Obama. He currently serves as director of the University of Chicago's nonpartisan Institute of Politics; as senior political commentator for *CNN*; and as host of "The Axe Files," a top-rated podcast jointly produced by *CNN* and the Institute of Politics. Axelrod — a former political writer for the *Chicago Tribune* and, later, media strategist for 150 state, local and national political campaigns — is also the author of the New York Times best-selling memoir, *Believer: My Forty Years in Politics (*Penguin Books, 2016*)*.

Karl Rove served as senior advisor to President George W. Bush from 2000 to 2007 and as deputy chief of staff from 2004 to 2007. At the White House, he oversaw the Offices of Strategic Initiatives, Political Affairs, Public Liaison and Intergovernmental Affairs and was deputy chief of staff for policy, coordinating the White House policymaking process. Before Rove became known as "the architect" of Bush's 2000 and 2004 presidential campaigns, he was president of Karl Rove + Company, an Austin-based public affairs firm that worked with more than 75 Republican gubernatorial and congressional candidates, as well as for nonpartisan causes and nonprofit groups. Rove writes a weekly op-ed for *The Wall Street Journal* and is a *Fox News* contributor. He is the author of two books —*The Triumph of William McKinley: Why the Election of 1896 Still Matters*" (Simon & Schuster, 2016) and the *New York Times* bestseller *Courage and Consequence: My Life as a Conservative in the Fight* (Threshold Editions, 2010)—and is currently working on a third about presidential decision-making.

Panel Members

Timothy Alberta is chief political correspondent for *Politico Magazine*, covering Donald Trump's presidency, Capitol Hill, the ideological warfare between and within the two parties, demographic change in America, and the evolving role of money in elections. Alberta reported on the 2016 presidential campaign for the *National Review* as its chief political correspondent and previously spent more than five years with Atlantic Media. He covered Congress as the House leadership reporter for the *National Journal* and later reported on campaigns as the publication's senior political correspondent. Previously, he served as senior editor of *The Hotline*, reported for *The Wall Street Journal*, and worked as a web producer and assistant editor for *Politico*. Alberta's work has been featured in dozens of other national publications, and he frequently appears as a commentator on political television programs in the United States and around the world. He received his bachelor's degree from Michigan State University.

Santiago Alles, Ph.D., is a postdoctoral researcher for the Department of Political Science at the Universidad del Rosario in Bogotá, Colombia. He specializes in political institutions and electoral politics, with an emphasis on Latin American politics. His research has been published in *The Journal of Politics, Electoral Studies, América Latina Hoy,* and *Revista de*

Ciencia Política. He received his Ph.D. in political science from Rice University and his master's degree in Latin American studies from the University of Salamanca in Spain.

Joe Barnes is the Bonner Means Baker Fellow at the Baker Institute. Since coming to Rice University in 1995, he has written extensively on U.S. foreign policy, with a focus on the geopolitics of energy. He is also interested in tax policy and U.S. politics. In addition to numerous institute studies, Barnes' work has appeared in *The New York Times,* the *Houston Chronicle, Survival, Oil and Gas Journal, Energy Markets,* the *Newsletter of the Royal United Services Institute,* the *SAIS Policy Forum Series* and the *National Interest.* He is a contributor to three volumes: *Energy in the Caspian Region* (Palgrave Press, 2001), *United States Tax Reform in the 21st Century* (Cambridge University Press, 2002) and *Natural Gas and Geopolitics from 1970 to 2040* (Cambridge University Press, 2006). Barnes is the host of the Baker Institute podcast, "Policy Matters," and is faculty advisor to the Baker Institute Student Forum. From 1979 to 1993, he was a career diplomat with the U.S. State Department, serving in Europe, Africa, the Middle East, and South Asia. Barnes is a graduate of Princeton University.

Harold D. Clarke, Ph.D., is the Ashbel Smith Professor at The University of Texas at Dallas (UTD). He has served as editor of *Electoral Studies* and of *Political Research Quarterly*, and as director of social and economic sciences for the National Science Foundation. His research has been supported by the National Science Foundation (U.S.), the Economics and Social Research Council (U.K.), the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, the Canada Council for the Arts, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, and the Hong Kong Science Foundation. Clarke's work has appeared in the *American Journal of Political Science,* the *American Political Science Review,* the *British Journal of Political Science*, the *Journal of Politics, International Studies Quarterly, Political Analysis,* and *Political Science Research and Methods*. His recent books include *Brexit—Why Britain Voted to Leave the European Union* (Cambridge University Press, 2017), *Austerity and Political Choice in Britain* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2016) and *Affluence, Austerity, and Electoral Change in Britain* (Cambridge University Press, 2013). He teaches courses on structural equation modeling, survey research and time series analysis at UTD and at the University of Essex Summer School, as well as workshops in social science research at Concordia University in Montreal. Clarke received his Ph.D. from Duke University.

The Honorable Edward P. Djerejian's Foreign Service career spanned eight U.S. administrations, from John F. Kennedy to William J. Clinton. Prior to his nomination as U.S. ambassador to Israel, he was assistant secretary of state for Near Eastern affairs in both the George H.W. Bush and Bill Clinton administrations. He was previously the U.S. ambassador to the Syrian Arab Republic. He also served as special assistant to President Ronald Reagan and as deputy press secretary for foreign affairs in the White House. Following his retirement from government service, Djerejian became the director of Rice University's Baker Institute for Public Policy. He is the author of *Danger and Opportunity: An American Ambassador's Journey Through the Middle East*. He has been awarded the Presidential Distinguished Service Award; the Department of State's Distinguished Honor Award; the Ellis Island Medal of Honor; the Anti-Defamation League's Moral Statesman Award; the Award for Humanitarian Diplomacy from Netanya Academic College in Israel; the

National Order of the Cedar, bestowed by President Émile Lahoud of Lebanon; the Order of Ouissam Alaouite, bestowed by King Mohammed VI of Morocco; and the Order of Honor, bestowed by President Serzh Sargsyan of Armenia. He is also a recipient of the Association of Rice Alumni's Gold Medal for his service to Rice University. Djerejian is a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and a member of the board of trustees of the Carnegie Corporation of New York.

Major Garrett was named *CBS News*' chief White House correspondent in November 2012 and reports for all *CBS News* broadcasts and platforms. While covering the White House, Garrett reported extensively on presidential actions to address ISIS and Ebola, nuclear negotiations with Iran, and U.S.-European efforts to confront Russia in the standoff over Ukraine. He also reported on the Obama administration's handling of the health care website rollout, numerous policy failures at the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, and the president's ongoing efforts in 2014 to address racial strife and criminal justice reform. In addition, he has traveled on assignment with the president to Asia, Europe, and the Middle East. Before joining *CBS News*, Garrett was a fixture during the network's coverage of the 2012 presidential campaign through a partnership with the *National Journal*, where he was chief White House correspondent. He co-hosted *CBS*' coverage of the 2011 South Carolina Republican primary debate and provided analysis of every 2012 general election presidential debate. Prior to his work with the *National Journal*, Garrett was chief White House correspondent for *Fox News*, covering two presidential elections, Congress, the war in Iraq, and other major stories. Before joining *Fox News*, Garrett was a White House correspondent for *CNN* during the administrations of George W. Bush and Bill Clinton. Previously, he was a senior editor and congressional correspondent for *U.S. News and World Report*, and a congressional reporter and deputy national editor for *The Washington Times.* Earlier in his career, Garrett was a reporter for *The Houston Post,* the *Las Vegas Review-Journal,* and the *Amarillo Globe-News.*

Kenneth M. Goldstein, Ph.D., is a professor of politics at the University of San Francisco (USF) and founding director of the USF in D.C. program. He previously was a professor of political science at the University of Wisconsin–Madison, where he won the Kellet Award for his career research accomplishments and the Chancellor's Award for excellence in teaching. His publications on political advertising, voter turnout, survey methodology, presidential elections, and news coverage have appeared in political science journals and major university presses, as well as in peer-reviewed law and medical journals. Goldstein is currently a consultant for the *ABC News* elections unit and a member of its election night decision team. He has worked on network election night coverage for every U.S. federal election since 1988. He has appeared numerous times on *PBS NewsHour,* ABC's *World News Tonight, NBC Nightly News, CBS Evening News, Fox News, MSNBC, Bloomberg,* and *CNN* and is a frequent contributor on *National Public Radio*. Goldstein earned his Ph.D. from the University of Michigan.

Katie Harbath is Facebook's global director of policy programs in charge of the site's politics and government outreach. Prior to joining Facebook, Harbath was the chief digital strategist at the National Republican Senatorial Committee. She previously led digital

strategy for the DCI Group, Rudy Giuliani's 2008 presidential campaign and the Republican National Committee. Harbath holds a bachelor's degree in journalism and political science from the University of Wisconsin–Madison.

Celinda Lake is president of Lake Research Partners and a prominent pollster and political strategist for progressives. Her polling and strategic advice has helped candidates such as Sen. Jon Tester, Sen. Debbie Stabenow, and former West Virginia Gov. Bob Wise defeat incumbents, and her expertise guided Sen. Mark Begich to victory, making him the first Senate candidate in Alaska to oust an incumbent in 50 years. She has focused on female candidates and women's concerns, having worked for House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi, Sen. Barbara Mikulski, and more than a dozen other women in the House and Senate, as well as Las Vegas Mayor Carolyn Goodman and former Houston Mayor Annise Parker. Lake has been a key player in campaigns launched by progressive groups such as the AFL-CIO, the Service Employees International Union, the Sierra Club, Planned Parenthood, Vote Vets, and EMILY's List. She co-authored a book with Kellyanne Conway on *What Women Really Want: How American Women Are Quietly Erasing Political, Racial, Class and Religious Lines to Change the Way We Live* (Atria Books, 2010) Lake also served as a pollster for Joe Biden's 2008 presidential bid.

Joe Lenski is co-founder and executive vice president of Edison Research, which currently conducts all exit polls in the United States for the four major news organizations comprising the National Election Pool—*ABC, CBS, CNN,* and *NBC*. Since founding Edison Research in 1994, Lenski has overseen hundreds of research projects each year for some of the world's largest media companies, conducting survey research and providing strategic information to radio and television stations, newspapers, cable networks, record labels, internet companies, and other media organizations. The company also conducts research for radio stations in South America, Africa, Asia, Canada and Europe. In 2012, it conducted exit polls for national elections in Venezuela and the Republic of Georgia, and in 2014 it conducted the first exit poll in Iraq for a parliamentary election. Lenski previously worked as a statistical analyst for the New York Times/CBS News Poll and for Voter News Service (formerly Voter Research & Surveys), the network exit polling consortium. In addition to conducting several independent exit polls from 1996 to 2002, Edison Research designed and operated CNN RealVote, the network's vote-gathering and election projections system, during the 2002 midterm elections. Lenski is a graduate of Princeton University and studied at the Annenberg School for Communication at the University of Pennsylvania.

Jonathan Martin is a national political correspondent for *The New York Times* and a political analyst for *CNN*, appearing regularly on the network's "Inside Politics" program. Before joining the Times in 2013, Martin was a senior political writer at *Politico*, which he joined at its inception. He first covered politics for *The Hotline* and *National Review*. His work has been published in *The New Republic, The Washington Post, The Wall Street Journal* and *The New York Times Magazine*. Martin graduated with a bachelor's degree in history from Hampden-Sydney College in Virginia.

Allen Matusow, Ph.D., is the academic affairs director at the Baker Institute. He joined the Rice faculty in 1963 and served as the dean of humanities from 1981 to 1995. He specializes in 20th-century U.S. history and has written or edited five books, including *The Unraveling of America: A History of Liberalism in the 1960s* (Harper & Row, 1984) and *Nixon's Economy: Booms, Busts, Dollars, and Votes* (University Press of Kansas, 1998). Matusow, who continues to teach history, is writing a book on former President Jimmy Carter's search for peace in the Middle East. He received his bachelor's degree from Ursinus College and his master's and doctoral degrees from Harvard University.

Andrea Mitchell is the chief foreign affairs correspondent for *NBC News* and the host of "Andrea Mitchell Reports." Since joining *NBC News* in 1978, Mitchell has covered seven presidential administrations, Capitol Hill, the State Department and intelligence agencies. She reports regularly on *NBC Nightly News*, the *Today* show and *Meet the Press*. Mitchell's in-depth journalism from around the world includes all of the Reagan/Gorbachev arms control summits, a series of exclusive interviews with Cuba's late president Fidel Castro, the diplomatic normalization with Havana, the Iran nuclear negotiations, and conflicts in Haiti, Bosnia and Kosovo, as well as assignments in Iraq, Afghanistan, Iran, North Korea, Pakistan, Israel, and the Palestinian territories. She has also covered every presidential campaign since 1980 for *NBC News*, most recently as the lead correspondent assigned to Hillary Clinton's campaign throughout 2016. In September 2005, Mitchell authored the bestseller *Talking Back* (Penguin Books, 2006), a memoir about her experiences as one of the first women in broadcast news. She received the 2017 Lifetime Achievement Award from the International Women's Media Foundation, the 2015 MATRIX Award from New York Women in Communications as one of the "Women Who Change the World," and the Goldsmith Career Award for Excellence in Journalism from the John F. Kennedy School of Government. Mitchell served as the vice chair of the University of Pennsylvania's board of trustees and currently chairs the board of overseers for its College of Arts and Sciences. She received a bachelor's degree in English literature from the University of Pennsylvania.

Zac Moffatt is the founder and CEO of Targeted Victory, a strategy and marketing agency that has served more than 800 campaigns and organizations, including Facebook, Federal Express, and over a quarter of the Republicans currently serving in the U.S. Senate. Moffatt was named one of the 20 tech insiders defining the 2016 campaign by *Wired* magazine and one of The Adweek 50 in 2012. He is a frequent contributor to *The Wall Street Journal, TechCrunch, The New York Times, The Washington Post, C-SPAN* and other media outlets. In 2011 and 2012, Moffat was the digital director for Mitt Romney's presidential campaign. Moffatt has also served as deputy director for statewide efforts at Freedom's Watch, as director of political education for the Republican National Committee, and as victory director for the Maryland Republican Party. He has held positions on campaigns in New York, Oregon, and Rhode Island, as well as with the 55th Presidential Inaugural Committee and the 2004 Republican National Convention. Moffatt also served as associate chief of staff for former New York Mayor Michael Bloomberg following the mayor's election in 2001.

Michael Nelson, Ph.D., is the Fulmer Professor of Political Science at Rhodes College and a senior fellow at the University of Virginia's Miller Center. He is also the author of *Trump's First Year* (University of Virginia Press, 2018). His book *Resilient America: Electing Nixon, Channeling Dissent, and Dividing Government* (University Press of Kansas, 2014) won the American Political Science Association's Richard Neustadt Award for the year's best book on the presidency. *How the South Joined the Gambling Nation* (Louisiana State University Press, 2007) won the V.O. Key Award for the year's best book on southern politics. A winner of other national awards for articles on baseball and music, Nelson is a frequent contributor to the Claremont Review of Books and recently has written for *The New York Times, Politico,* and *USA Today*. Nelson received his bachelor's degree from the College of William & Mary and his master's degree and doctorate from Johns Hopkins University.

Jeff Roe is a Republican political consultant and strategist. He is the founder and principal of Axiom Strategies, a political consulting firm located in Kansas City, Missouri, with offices in Washington, D.C., San Francisco, Dublin, Austin, Annapolis, and Houston. In his role with Axiom, Roe has contributed to the elections of over 60 congressmen, senators and governors, drawing upon Axiom's award-winning direct mail program. Roe formerly served as chief of staff for U.S. Rep. Sam Graves and has consulted for a number of local, state and federal political campaigns. He was the senior strategist and campaign manager for Sen. Ted Cruz's 2016 presidential bid, using sophisticated polling and campaign data to inform strategic decisions. Roe also worked for the presidential campaigns of Mitt Romney and Newt Gingrich in 2012 and Mike Huckabee in 2008, in addition to serving on numerous other congressional and gubernatorial campaigns. He is a graduate of Northwest Missouri State University.

Evan Smith is the CEO and co-founder of *The Texas Tribune*, a pioneering nonprofit, nonpartisan digital news organization whose deep coverage of Texas politics and public policy can be found on its website, in newspapers and on TV and radio stations across the state, as well as in the print and online editions of *The Washington Post*. Since its launch in 2009, the Tribune has won numerous honors, including a Peabody Award and 13 national Edward R. Murrow Awards from the Radio Television Digital News Association. Smith is also the host of "Overheard with Evan Smith," a weekly half-hour interview program that airs on PBS stations across the country. Previously, he spent nearly 18 years at *Texas Monthly*, including eight years as the magazine's editor and a year as its president and editor-in-chief. He is a member of the board of directors of *PBS* and has served on or chaired the boards of various other organizations, including KLRU-TV, the Blanton Museum of Art, and the American Society of Magazine Editors.

Robert M. Stein, Ph.D., is the Lena Gohlman Fox Professor of Political Science at Rice University, where he is also faculty director of the Center for Civic Engagement, fellow in urban politics at the Baker Institute and former dean of the School of Social Sciences. He is an expert on urban politics, public policy and voting behavior. His current research, funded by the Pew Charitable Trusts and the National Science Foundation, focuses on voting behavior, election administration and emergency preparedness. Stein is the author of *Urban Alternatives: Private and Public Markets in the Provision of Local Services* (Pittsburg

Press, 1990), for which he received a special award from the Urban Politics and Policy section of the American Political Science Association in 1991. He also co-authored *Perpetuating the Pork Barrel: Policy Subsystems and American Democracy* (Cambridge University Press, 1995). During his years at Rice, he has received numerous awards, including the George R. Brown Award for Superior Teaching in 1998 and 1987. Stein received his bachelor's degree from Ohio Wesleyan University and earned his master's and doctoral degrees from the University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee.

Marianne C. Stewart, Ph.D., is a professor in the School of Economic, Political and Policy Sciences at The University of Texas at Dallas (UTD). Her research and teaching areas involve public attitudes about and people's participation in governance and politics, regime change and development, and survey research methodology. Her research has been supported by the National Science Foundation (U.S.) and the Economic and Social Research Council (U.K.) and has been published by professional journals, Cambridge University Press and Oxford University Press, among others. Her current projects include examining voting choices in recent U.S. presidential elections, in U.K. general elections, and in the U.K. Brexit referendum and its aftermath. She has been a program director at the National Science Foundation, as well as a program director and dean at UTD. Stewart received her doctorate in political science from Duke University.

Juliette Turner-Jones is a sophomore at Rice University studying English with minors in business and in politics, law & social thought. She is the author of three books: *Our Constitution Rocks* (Zonderkidz, 2012), *Our Presidents Rock* (Zonderkidz, 2014), and *That's Not Hay in My Hair* (Zonderkidz, 2016). Since 2010, she has served as national youth director of Constituting America, a nonprofit organization dedicated to educating Americans about the importance of the U.S. Constitution. To date, Turner has spoken at over 50 schools and events in 10 different states about the Constitution and the importance of civic engagement.

Amy Walter is the national editor of *The Cook Political Report*, where she analyzes the issues, trends and events that shape the political environment, and authors a weekly column. She is also a regular panelist on *NBC*'s "Meet the Press," *Fox News*' "Special Report with Bret Baier" and *CBS*' "Face the Nation," and she provides political analysis every Monday evening for the "PBS NewsHour." Previously, she served as the political director of *ABC News*, as a senior editor for *The Cook Political Report* covering the U.S. House of Representatives, and as editor-in-chief of the *The Hotline*. Walter was also part of the Emmy-winning *CNN* election coverage team in 2006 and the recipient of *The Washington Post*'s Crystal Ball Award in 2000.

Conference Organizers

Mark P. Jones, Ph.D., is the fellow in political science at the Baker Institute, the Joseph D. Jamail Chair in Latin American Studies and a professor in the Department of Political Science at Rice University. Jones also serves as the faculty director of Rice's Master of Global Affairs program. His research focuses on the effect of electoral laws and other political institutions on governance, representation and voting. He has received substantial financial support for this research, including grants from the National Science Foundation.

He is a frequent contributor to Texas media outlets, and his research on the Texas Legislature has been widely cited in the media as well as by numerous political campaigns. Jones regularly advises U.S. government institutions on economic and political affairs in Argentina and has conducted research on public policy issues in Latin America and Texas for numerous international, national and local organizations, including the Inter-American Development Bank, the United Nations Development Programme, the U.S. Department of Defense, the Texas Department of Agriculture and the city of Houston. He is currently working on two principal research agendas, one that examines the impact of political institutions on politics and public policy in Latin America, and the other that analyzes the evolution of partisan politics in Texas over the past 50 years. Jones received his doctorate from the University of Michigan and his bachelor's degree from Tulane University.

John B. Williams oversees the Baker Institute Presidential Elections Program. A national award-winning journalist and speechwriter, Williams has been a policy assistant to the Honorable James A. Baker, III, since July 2004. In that role, he has supported Secretary Baker's efforts to find solutions for a wide array of international and domestic challenges, including the Iraq Study Group, the Commission on Federal Election Reform, the National War Powers Commission, and the BP U.S. Refineries Independent Safety Review Panel. He also prepares speeches, op-eds and other written materials for Secretary Baker and is an employee of Baker Botts L.L.P. Williams had a long career reporting on governmental and political issues, serving as a political columnist and reporter in his prior job with the *Houston Chronicle*, where he focused on state and local news. He received a 1987 Penney-Missouri Journalism Award for a series of articles about a Mississippi investment banking firm that took advantage of small investors and a 2012 Cicero Speechwriting Award for "The Life and Legacy of Ronald Wilson Reagan." Williams received his bachelor's degrees in zoology and journalism from The University of Texas at Austin.

Additional Speakers

John Anzalone is a partner at ALG Research and has over 25 years of polling experience. He was a battleground states pollster (Florida, North Carolina, Virginia and Nevada) for both of Barack Obama's presidential campaigns, and a key strategist for Hillary Clinton's 2016 campaign. He has assisted in winning electoral campaigns for U.S. senators, governors, and dozens of members of Congress; most recently, he conducted polls for North Carolina Gov. Roy Cooper and the campaign against the state's anti-LGBT laws. Anzalone currently conducts polls for Louisiana Gov. John Bel Edwards and is working for 2018 Democratic gubernatorial candidates in Florida, Michigan, Nevada, and Iowa. Anzalone was the lead pollster for the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee's efforts to elect Doug Jones in Alabama. Prior to his polling career, Anzalone was a campaign operative who worked for James Carville during New Jersey Sen. Frank Lautenberg's 1988 campaign. He began his political career as an aide to David Wilhelm at Citizens for Tax Justice and the AFL-CIO, and then went on to manage campaigns in five states. Anzalone is a graduate of Kalamazoo College in Michigan.

Corey Lewandowski is a political strategist, author, and commentator. He served as Donald Trump's chief political advisor and first campaign manager, overseeing all aspects of a

historic presidential campaign. Lewandowski previously served as the national director of voter registration and the East Coast regional director for Americans for Prosperity, organizing the group's first events and first presidential summits in New Hampshire. He also worked as the legislative political director for the Republican National Committee's northeast region, as well as in senior positions with several members of Congress, including former U.S. Rep. Peter Torkildsen and former U.S. Rep. Robert Ney. Lewandowski is most recently the co-author of *The New York Times* bestselling book *Let Trump Be Trump: The Inside Story of His Rise to the Presidency* (Center Street, 2017). He holds a master's degree in political science from American University and a bachelor's degree in political science from the University of Massachusetts at Lowell.

Susan Glasser is *Politico*'s chief international affairs columnist and host of its weekly podcast, "The Global Politico." She is also a contributing editor to *The New Yorker*, where she writes a twice-monthly column on life in Washington, D.C., during the Trump administration. She previously served as founding editor of *Politico Magazine* and went on to become editor of *Politico* during the 2016 election cycle. Glasser joined *Politico* from *Foreign Policy*, where she oversaw its relaunch in print and as a daily online magazine. During her tenure as editor-in-chief, *Foreign Policy* was recognized as a finalist for 10 National Magazine Awards and won three of the magazine world's highest honors. Before that, she worked at *The Washington Post*, where she was a foreign correspondent, editor of the Post's "Sunday Outlook" and national news sections, and political reporter. She spent four years traveling the former Soviet Union as the Post's Moscow co-bureau chief, covered the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and co-authored *Kremlin Rising: Vladimir Putin and the End of Revolution* (Scribner, 2005). Glasser started at the Post in 1998 as deputy national editor, overseeing the Monica Lewinsky investigation and subsequent impeachment of President Bill Clinton. Prior to the Post, Glasser was the editor of *Roll Call*, a newspaper covering the U.S. Congress. Glasser and her husband, *New York Times* chief White House correspondent Peter Baker, are currently working on a biography of former Secretary of State James A. Baker, III.