

NATIONAL AGENDA SPEAKER SERIES

NOVEMBER 2016: ELECTION AFTERMATH

Transcript of Event

HOSTED BY: Center for Political Communication,
University of Delaware

PARTICIPANTS

Dr. Lindsay H. Hoffman, Moderator	Director, National Agenda; Associate Director, Center for Political Communication, University of Delaware
David Plouffe	Vice President, Policy and Strategy, Uber (January 2017 joined the Chan Zuckerberg Initiative as President of Policy and Advocacy)
Jennifer Palmieri	Former Director of Communications for Hillary Clinton's 2016 Presidential campaign
Kim Alfano	President and CEO Alfano Communications and partner in Red America, Blue America Research
Chris Russell	President, Chris Russell Consulting LLC

Date: November 16, 2016

Place: Mitchell Hall, University of Delaware, Newark, DE

DR. HOFFMAN Good evening. It's great to see such a big crowd here tonight in our final event of the National Agenda Speaker Series. And welcome to the University of Delaware community and beyond. We are live streaming on the University of Delaware live stream site tonight. So welcome to those of you who are watching from beyond. We are just over one week past a historic U.S. presidential election and there is a lot to talk about. I'm Dr. Lindsay Hoffman. I'm the Director of National Agenda and the Associate Director of the Center for Political Communication. Thank you for being here for our final event this year. We're ending our sixth annual National Agenda Speaker Series and we're already planning for our seventh in 2017. Thanks also to the College of Arts and Sciences; the Office of the Provost; and the William P. Frank Foundation for your support. This year we've dug deep into the inner workings of campaigns, the policies, and the candidates. And tonight we're in for a one of a kind bipartisan analysis of the election. We've already heard from two journalists, a comedy writer, an author, and a former governor. And this isn't a joke, they didn't walk into a bar, but you can view all of those conversations at udel.edu/nationalagenda. You can also view the Delaware Congressional and Gubernatorial debates that we held right here in Mitchell Hall at udel.edu/nationalagenda. Tonight's event is free and open to the public like all of all events to create a space for honest and robust dialogue. This is a phrase that UD President Assanis asserted yesterday in a message to the UD community as an important value for us to establish on this campus. So I encourage audience participation, both the audience here in Mitchell Hall and on social media, and I encourage you to tweet at the account @udelagenda or using the hash tag on twitter, #udelagenda. Your tweet could make it into our conversation tonight. Yet as always, civil and respectful dialogue is expected. Look, emotions are high. I've seen it in my classrooms. There have been tears. There have been outbursts, physical and

otherwise, on this campus and around the country. So here tonight let's agree to be both candid but courteous of other's perspectives. So tonight we have a panel of experts that must be the envy of any college campus in this country. Four experienced political strategists who've been on the ground in some of the most contentious campaigns in this country's history. We look to them tonight for some clarity on this year's election. These introductions are as brief as I can make them because these speakers have incredible resumes. I'll start with David Plouffe who's joining us via Skype. He's a proud University of Delaware Blue Hen. He is widely referred to as the architect of President Barack Obama's two presidential campaign victories. President Obama himself credited Plouffe, his campaign manager, in his acceptance speech in 2008 calling him the unsung hero of this campaign who built the best political campaign in the history of the United States of America. I as a professor here at UD can also credit myself as having been David's professor at one point when he completed his independent study with me in 2009. Plouffe served inside the White House as Senior Advisor to the President from 2011 to 2013. He's managed campaigns at all levels of politics. He served as an award-winning producer of television advertisements, served as a consultant to leading Fortune 500 companies, and has been a ubiquitous presence on national news shows. In 2014 Plouffe joined Uber as Vice President of Policy and Strategy, and we're pleased to have him here tonight via Skype. Please give him a big round of applause. Jennifer Palmieri is a veteran political communications strategist who served as the Communications Director for the Hillary for America campaign. Prior to joining the Clinton campaign, Palmieri served as an assistant to President Obama and as the Communications Director of the Obama Administration. She played a critical role in crafting Obama's message after the 2014 midterm elections. She previously worked as a Senior Vice President of the Center for American Progress, and as

President of that Center's Action Fund. She was also National Press Secretary of the Democratic National Committee and advisor to John Edward's presidential campaigns, and Deputy Press Secretary in the Clinton Administration. Please welcome Jennifer Palmieri to the stage tonight. You can take [Indiscernible] next to David. Thank you. We're also pleased to invite here tonight Kim Alfano. She's the President and CEO of Alfano Communications and is partner in Red America Blue America Research. She's consulted many Republican leaders including Governors Mitch Daniels, Terry Branstad, Bob Riley, Frank Keating, and Jim Gilmore. She's consulted with Senators Dick Lugar and Lamar Alexander and the Presidential races of Senators Fred Thompson and John Ashcroft. She's received numerous awards for her work including being named a "Rising Star" by Campaigns and Elections Magazine, a "Person to Watch" by Washingtonian Magazine, and a "DC Power Broker" by Business Forward Magazine. In addition to running her successful firm, she founded The EdForce Project, a national super PAC created to affect change in the world of education reform. Kim, welcome to UD. Finally, drawing on his experience as a roll-up-the-sleeves political operative on the local county, state legislative and congressional level in New Jersey, Chris Russell is an award winning direct mail consultant for candidates in multiple states. He opened his own firm in 2009 aiming to win tough races for Republican candidates. Since then, he's branched into non-partisan corporate work helping to steer clients to victory in public referendum campaigns. He's a graduate of Temple University and provides a customized strategic, tactical, and media communication advice for his clients to best fit their individual needs. He's won numerous awards, as I think we can say all of our panelists have, from campaigns in elections magazines as well as the American Association of Political Consultants. Please join me in welcoming Chris to the stage. So, thank you again. I'm very excited to have this panel here. What I'm going to do is

ask each member of the panel to give a few minute debrief. What's your perspective on what happened in this campaign and what's your big takeaway? And let's start with none other than our UD alum, David Plouffe.

MR. PLOUFFE Well, thanks Professor, and it's great to be with all of you. Hello Jen. I wish I was sitting next to you. I was hoping that I could go last so I could listen to what everybody else said because I think a lot of us including myself were really wrong about this election. Which happens. And, I know everyone is still either recovering from it if you didn't like the outcome; people are still celebrating of those that did. But I think all of us, because it was almost unanimous, Republican and Democrat, media, new people in politics, people who've been around for a long time were surprised by the outcome. So, I would say that we still have a long way to go to understand what happened because you really need to look at individual voter data which will be available not in some states for five to six months. We gathered, I think, for the most part in Colorado now. So that's really; because the exit polls are going to be in some cases accurate, in many cases not. But when you really begin to look at who voted precinct by precinct you begin to get a better sense of things. But, I think what's pretty clear is that Democratic turnout was strong in some areas like Florida where Secretary Clinton actually received a lot more votes than Barack Obama did in either one of his races and we won Florida. It was pretty strong in Philadelphia right up I-95; less strong in some places in the Midwest. Republican turnout across the board wasn't incredibly strong either. Again, pockets where it was stronger. So, right now Donald Trump won the presidency but he's I think at 46.9 percent of the vote which is a lower percentage than Mitt Romney got four years ago when he just barely got over 200 electoral votes. So, I think there is some turnout here. There's no question that slightly better turnout might have flipped a couple of states. But, this is about how the electorate moved I

think in many respects. And, there are counties in the Midwest; in Iowa and Ohio and Wisconsin, that moved pretty significantly, 10, 15, 20 points in the Republican direction. And I think we have to really dig into why that is. There's no doubt that the Trump message, and you know I'm the first one to say that I underestimated a) the power of his message, b) the breadth of its appeal, and c) his ceiling, meaning I thought his sort of vote ceiling was around 45 percent in a lot of states maybe 46. Now, he only got 46.9 nationally but as it turns out in some of those Midwestern states and in Florida his ceiling was a little bit higher than that. He was able to get to 47, 48. My sense of why that is, and again, we'll learn more about this in the months to come is, Gary Johnson, his vote collapsed compared to where it was polling but still Johnson and Stein but Johnson in particular got some vote and my suspicion is some of the Trump voters who were sitting with Johnson, who were Republican leaning voters, went back to Trump, and some of the voters who might have voted for Hillary Clinton stayed with Johnson and that, given how close some of these states were, and look how close Michigan was, Pennsylvania was, Wisconsin was very important I think to that. And there's no doubt that I think we should none of us make predictions maybe ever again, but certainly anytime this close to the election. But my strong suspicion is if the election were held the day after the third debate we'd be talking about President-Elect Clinton. There's no doubt she was in a very strong position in the race. Now, some of that was I think moments, and Jen can speak much more articulately to this, but were very good to Hillary Clinton. I think the conventions; the three debates were moments Trump seemed to come back a little bit. And in those last 20 days obviously you had WikiLeaks almost every day vomiting things out into the public's face. Then you had both Comey and [indiscernible] and I think that that wasn't a great atmosphere. And my sense was, based on and looking at the data and at the polling, it wasn't having a big

affect. But I think in the aftermath we could probably all agree that it probably wasn't the greatest dynamic for really strong democratic turnout and it might have flipped some voters into the Trump column. And again, what's fascinating is a lot of those folks who voted for Trump didn't have favorable opinions of him, didn't think he was as prepared as Hillary Clinton to be President, didn't trust him enough on the economy. So, I think that's the other mistake a lot of people made is you say well there are some undecided voters out there or some soft voters and even if they were unfavorably disposed to both Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump, on every attribute that generally matters in politics she had an advantage. And there's been some great journalism I think done after the election where reporters are actually going into communities and talking to voters and what they're getting back is basically I chose Trump, he was kind of taking a Howitzer to everything, both parties, Congress, business, Wall Street. We'll see whether that was authentic or not in the months and years to come. But, they didn't really trust him. They didn't even really like him. So, it's wherever we see someone win when you're winning the votes of people who are unfavorably disposed to you and don't think from an attribute standpoint you're as strong as your opponent. So, I think obviously I'm very disappointed in the outcome. I think Hillary Clinton would have been a tremendous President. I think there's a lot we can learn about what happened and I think the first one is I'm a big believer in data, I'm a big believer in predictive models and analytics, and when your models are right you make great decisions. And in this case, it wasn't just the Clinton campaign models; it was the Clinton campaign models, media models. My understanding is the Republican National Committee had Donald Trump losing the day of the election in their models. I think the Trump campaign had themselves with a seven or eight percent chance a couple of weeks out from the election. So, all of the models were wrong. And, there might have been some survey bias that happened here

where some of the people who weren't answering questions about the election over indexed to Trump. So when you allocate everyone who did answer the questions you were probably being a little bit more confident about that. So, anyway with that I will be quiet and listen to the real experts who were involved in the campaign. But again, Lindsay, Professor Hoffman, thanks for having me and I look forward to a great discussion.

DR. HOFFMAN Thank you, David. I think I'll pass it to -- thank you. I think I'll pass it to Kim at this point who has worked as a Republican strategist on presidential campaigns. You had some really great insights earlier today with our National Agenda students. What's your big take away from this campaign?

MS. ALFANO Well, a lot of what David said I would agree with pretty much 100 percent, but, I would, I think that I heard in the news said today, a really good line that sort of sums it up, which is what commercial makers like me try to always find, that one line that takes less than ten seconds, they said that people, the voters understood Donald Trump. They took him seriously but not literally. And the press and the pundits and the elite took him literally but not seriously. So, if I said that right --

MR. PLOUFFE Uh-huh.

MS. ALFANO -- that I thought was a really insightful commentary because people were just, their heads were exploding. Republicans, Democrats, everybody, their heads were exploding every time Donald Trump would say something that blew their minds one more time and he did it day after day, after day and why is this not affecting him? Why are people not running from this guy? Why does he continue to win? And, I think because people understood that he was an entertainer, that his style was to come out and say the most incendiary thing he could think of and then three or four days later after he had said five more things that first thing that he said he had dialed back to the

acceptable sort of base; that boiled down part that people could nod their heads at. He said we're going to build a wall and we're going to kick out all illegal immigrants. Well, six or seven days or two weeks later, if you recall, we're just going to kick out the illegal immigrants who committed crimes. We're going to ban all Muslims; oh, well, not necessarily, we're going to just vet them a little bit more vigorously than is being done now. And his style is an entertainer's style, captures your attention with something really radical, and then captures your heart with the actual sort of acceptable part later. If he had started from that sort of normal, acceptable, even in you would consider it far right like tea party-esque, those lines, he would have just been another politician. So, he learned how to entertain people in a twitter environment, in a 140-character environment, and keep them bumping along every single day with some other exciting blast. And I think that every other politician, especially Hillary Clinton, didn't get that. She was tailor-made to be the doppelganger to that and I think that she could have run against probably anybody else and maybe gotten away with it but again against him she was the perfect symbol of the typical politician, thirty years of service, wonkish, wanted to say a lot more than 140 characters on issues, not exciting, not emotional but really just sort of, keep it between the lines and America was not keeping it between the lines. They wanted to blow everything up. And he saw it and did it and shocked all of us.

DR. HOFFMAN I think that's what a lot of people are concluding, this was a change election --

MS. ALFANO Yeah.

DR. HOFFMAN -- and she wasn't necessarily the change candidate. I'll hand it over to -- we're so lucky, by the way to have two Democratic strategists and two Republican strategists. We can get a really well balanced view of this election. I'd like to hand it over to Jennifer Palmieri who ran, was the Communications Director for

Hillary Clinton's campaign. Thank you so much for being here tonight. What's your big takeaway?

MS. PALMIERI Thanks Professor Hoffman. Well, first of all I imagine there are a lot of people here who voted for Hillary and so on behalf of the Clinton campaign we want to -- I mean, we're devastated obviously -- but we feel like we weren't able to deliver it for her, we weren't able to deliver it for you and apology seems sort of small to say but we do apologize to all of our supporters for that. I look at; Lindsay asked me to speak about and reflect on the last week, what our two big takeaways' are. On the practitioner side we're talking about, what I saw on the practitioner side and then what I see going forward because that's the big question I get. Well, what now? What are we going to do now that we're facing a Trump presidency? I think that on the practitioner side, like what literally happened, and these are not excuses but reasons for why we lost, is that we didn't win Michigan, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin. Those are three states that we thought we were going to win. We didn't win those states. And then we - - some by very small margins like Michigan by 12,000 votes -- and then we failed to recreate the Obama coalition. We never thought that we would be able to turn out as much African American support as the President had but we had adjusted for that with women, and, what happened was our African American -- and this is mostly about millennials or the turnout among millennial whites, millennial African Americans, and Latino millennials was low. And women, we thought that more women would vote for Hillary Clinton and in the end, and if you look at demographics of white women and again this is early data as David cautioned us, but it appeared that we only did one point better than President Obama did in 2012. I think he got 43 percent of the white women vote and she got 44 percent. So that's not what we expected to have happen. Could we have spent more time in Michigan and Wisconsin? Sure. Would it have made a

difference? I don't know because we spent a ton of time in Pennsylvania, a lot of money in Pennsylvania and that didn't produce for us. So it's not clear that more money and time in Michigan and Wisconsin would have made a difference. We lost Michigan by 12,000 votes, so maybe some more effort in there could have made the difference. Not enough in the Electoral College. And that's what we needed to do going into this. We knew we needed to repeat the Obama Coalition. We were running for a third term for the Democratic Party, a really hard thing to do. Global forces, you see leaders in the same lane as Trump, big outsiders succeeding in other countries. We knew we were going to face that here. And then we were running the first woman president which comes with its very own special set of challenges that I now have a much more acute sense of what those are than I did even before starting the race. Lots of people should write books about that particular part, a review of them. And, we were poised to overcome all of those factors and as David said a very interesting thing which was if we had voted after the third debate she could have won. And what was such a struggle for us and for me as a communications director was trying to find a way to break through because Trump was so compelling a candidate and said such outrageous things and the only time Hillary got covered was when she was reacting to him. So, I don't agree that people weren't looking for solutions. I think people wanted solutions in this campaign, I think they wanted to hear about details, I think they actually wanted to hear about policy and what Hillary Clinton, the kind of results she could deliver for people. I think that's why she, among the reasons why she ultimately got about at least two million votes more than he did. But it was very, very hard to be heard. And what happened on the debate stage and why I think that was at our zenith, and it wasn't just true by the way for the general election, it was very true in the primary, was people saw Hillary Clinton unfiltered. It was the only time. We had ten debates about 90 minutes

each so that's 900 minutes. That was the only time in the entire 18 months that you ever saw Hillary Clinton unfiltered and you saw her do two things. In the general you saw her stand up with a lot of courage to Donald Trump and let him throw all the nasty personal stuff at her, let him say everything that he did about other people but America saw her defend herself, saw her defend other people. I think they really reacted to that. You saw the contrast very starkly. Someone who is the most qualified person ever to run for president, ever, up against someone who, I believe was, what I think he did was disqualify him from being considered to be fit for president. And, that is the only time we were really able to break through, and once those debates were over we could never recreate that. Right? Trump was able to go back into his box where he said interesting things and the press covered us and then we got picked apart on WikiLeaks and on Comey. And we were never together with him again. So, if there's one tactical mistake that we made that I think could have actually have made a difference is we should have called for a fourth debate. We should have done a fourth debate a week out. It would have been very unconventional. It would have been what you're not supposed to do, you're supposed to sweat it out and get through the debates, but I actually think that could have created a dynamic where we finally would have been heard again. So there's that. And then I just want to say also how proud I am of Hillary. She was the best-prepared person to ever run for president. She was someone who was going to be able to not just have good solutions but be able to deliver on them. She withstood so much in this race, and you know elections are about choices and I think that she was the right counter to Donald Trump in someone who was not qualified to be president and not fit to be commander in chief, doesn't understand policy or problems. She is somebody; she was a very different choice and in the end more people voted for her but not in the right places.

DR. HOFFMAN Thank you very much. So, something we've talked a lot about today is earned media versus paid media, and Chris is an expert in direct mail and paid media. I'd be curious for your overall takeaway but also the future of political advertising, direct mail, and other types of advertising.

MR. RUSSELL Well, first, I mean, just thank you for having me. A tough group to bat cleanup after. So there's really no one on base. Everything's really been said. But, every time I meet fellow political operatives, people who do what we do, there's usually an easy comradery that I find with people and all of us up here have been in races we've won, we've lost, we've cared about. I give Jennifer a ton of credit for coming up here and doing this after a loss like that. That's really difficult but I respect --

MS. PALMIERI Oh. [Laughter].

MR. RUSSELL -- a ton for doing that --

MS. PALMIERI David --

MR. RUSSELL -- for both of you guys, I mean --

MS. PALMIERI No one's been more supportive of us or me personally than David, so I'm like really happy to --

MR. RUSSELL No I mean, I think it's tremendous, I do. And I think it's helpful. I do a lot of congressional work. I do a lot of work for Republican caucuses, state legislatures across the country, do some independent expenditure work. So I was; a lot of the data that David talked about I was seeing polling data from clients that I was working with that was quite a roller coaster ride for Republicans. There were times when it felt like this had to be a triage election. Like we were just going to try and hang on to what we had and make sure that our vulnerable members, whether it be a legislature or congressional members, would hang on. And then a month out things looked bleak. Two weeks later when the media, which I think is something to examine

in this, was still reporting almost that the race was over. It felt like it was over. There was certainly this sense that she was inevitable. I was telling some friends of mine who were Hillary supporters, don't be so sure, don't crack the champagne just yet. I'm seeing numbers in places that I'm working, things are tightening, things are getting a lot more interesting. There are a lot of shifts in the electorate particularly in the Midwest that you just saw people kind of making gains. I had a friend who worked on Ron Johnson's campaign in Wisconsin. He was telling me: I'm telling you man I'm seeing something; I'm seeing something out here; I don't know if we can win; I don't know if we'll win, I don't know if Trump will win but there's certainly movement. And I think really in that last ten days of the campaign there was a tremendous amount of movement. Anyone who was undecided at that point, and a friend of mine said this and I think David said, about the unfavorable to both. That vote, that subsection of the vote, people who didn't like either candidate, were really integral, I think, at the end of the day to who won. And, I think if you weren't anti-Trump by the last ten days you were going to break for him if you voted. And I think that's what happened in a lot of places. I think he won the late breaking undecided. Because if you weren't going to pass on him after the Access Hollywood, or the New York Times reporter, or whatever kind of thing that happened to him or that he made happen to himself during the campaign, if you were still there at the end then you weren't voting on those things. You didn't care about his comments necessarily, or possibly what his, whether you thought he was qualified. It was a feeling. It was visceral. And I think that visceral feeling is what put him over the edge. As a Republican now, I look at it as we have an opportunity; we have a president, and two houses in Congress. Whether they get along well, I hope they do because I think the midterm will be here quickly. And, Republicans have no one to point the finger at in the next midterm elections so we have to govern. I hope that the scars

of the primary, the scars even of the general don't turn into settling scores and actually turn into setting a policy agenda and following it. Because if we don't do that, and Kim and I were talking a little bit, we're going to have trouble in 2018 and 2020. So, the future of advertising, I think it'll always continue to evolve. We were talking before about, every campaign is at some level historic, and every one kind of feels ultimate when it happens and then it's not. The next campaign comes around. When I started my firm in 2009 it was a pretty dark time for Republicans. By the end of 2010 I had a Congressional candidate under my belt who just won and upset race and we were rolling along and things changed. 2012 was dark again and then 2014. So, I think to all the people out here who maybe despondent about the election keep heart and the people who are happy about the election dig in because there's work to do. And I think that's what's going to be the next two and four years are about.

MS. PALMIERI Dr. Hoffman, can I -- there's something that Chris just --

DR. HOFFMAN Yeah, please --

MS. PALMIERI -- happened to mention it's not really reacting to what he said but --

DR. HOFFMAN Thank you.

MS. PALMIERI -- yes, thank you, thank you -- which was something that people talked a lot about which is that these are two historically unpopular candidates. Friends, that did not happen by accident. That happened by design, by Donald Trump and the Republican candidates that were part of the primary process. Hillary Clinton ran for president for 18 months. Every single day from the day she got in she was attacked first by 17 candidates, then 16, then 15, then from there on out in a way that no other candidate has ever faced in American politics, ever. This is something very different about this cycle. And not only did she experience that and particularly since the paid media just didn't matter the way it used to in this race and earned did and that all

happened on the earned side. And, got through that to face the Trump campaign -- which yes, I think he was a vessel for a lot of frustration that's been a long time coming and there's a lot of good reasons why people feel frustrated and they should and they're not wrong about that and he was a vessel for that frustration. But he also, I mean, what people really reacted to was lock her up. Right? That's what got his crowds going. What people, his crowds would get the most excited when it was something that was anti that was about her. It's a hard thing to watch frankly. And then he hired Steve Bannon who, helped create the Breitbart website that spent a lot of time tearing Hillary Clinton down. And other, other people in that campaign were hired who had spent decades, literally decades, singularly focused on the Clintons but really Hillary. So, yeah, her negatives went up. Yes they did because that's the way that she was attacked. She owns a lot of this. She's not a perfect person. She's made mistakes. She's a little too private. She doesn't like the spotlight. She was a little too defensive. That's all true. But, so her faves are really high and his, excuse me, his, her unfaves are really high and his unfaves are really high too because he spent a lot of time attacking her and people don't like that. So, in the end his negative rating was higher than hers. The debates actually helped her. This is something we were really encouraged after the debates. Her favorability rating went up. I think people wanted to support the person they saw [indiscernible] and also liked to hear what she had to say about the economy, and again that's the only time that she was unfiltered. I do feel like I need to defend her on this point; that this happened in large part by design.

DR. HOFFMAN Okay. Thank you. I'll open it up to the panel. As always, I ask my students in the class associated with this National Agenda program to do a lot of research on our speakers and ask interesting questions of them. And I think that, this has come up a lot, is that Donald Trump ran a twitter campaign in many ways and was

very successful by reaching out to people via twitter. What happens with the President-elect and then President Donald Trump on the @potus twitter account? Does he continue the type of dialogue and rhetoric that he has had now or does he change? Does he become more presidential?

MS. ALFANO I think both. I would say, Donald Trump is the first, despite his age, is the first modern communication candidate we've had since the birth of Facebook, Twitter, and ironically Republicans are usually the ones that are behind on that. We don't get technology very quickly. You know, we were trying to chase down President Obama's digital mobilization unit, their grassroots, and we tried to recreate it for our races. We didn't create it. But I think Donald Trump gets to own the way that we talk to each other now. He brought it to politics and it was going to happen and I guess it was long overdue I guess to happen in politics. He understood the 140-character limit and spoke in 140-character bites one after another after another. He kept feeding the feeds. The way people ingest information now is by getting a feed either by Facebook or Twitter or, maybe even Instagram. You just get a constant feed of just what you want because you choose who it is. And, he understood how to communicate with people through those feeds. And I think he's not going to give that up and he shouldn't as President because he's tapped into a world of people that don't watch cable news all day, that don't read the newspapers cover to cover. He's tapped into a world and has a direct conduit to them that he could really use as a muscle to get done what he wants to get done. So, I don't think he's going to change. He might not be as bombastic but I think he's going to go straight to the people. He'll go over Washington.

MR. RUSSELL No, I agree. I mean, I think the one thing he did with Twitter and that started in the primary, he was able to basically begin and end news cycles by himself. He used Twitter to, if something bad happened the day before he was tweeting

about something different that night. So by the morning the news was different. People were talking about something else. Conversely, if there was something bad he was able to pour fuel on the fire to keep people talking about it. So I thought he used it masterfully. I agree with Kim; I think he's going to have to find some kind of middle ground. He's not going to be able to operate the same way I don't think although he's defied my expectations before so who knows. But I think he'll have to find some middle ground where he certainly continues to have this direct conversation with people. He is not going to just depend on the White House Press Room and a Press Secretary speaking for him while he hides in the background. He will speak directly to the American people. The question is if he has the restraint and kind of the discipline to stay on his message and to not get caught off guard and be swept into things like he was swept into in the general election. I'll tell you, the Clinton campaign did a very good job of baiting him and he took the bait a lot. And I think he's got to avoid that when he's going to govern.

DR. HOFFMAN David, you really orchestrated the first social media campaign for a presidential candidate. How do you see Donald Trump using social media as a president?

MR. PLOUFFE Well, first of all, it's wonderful to be virtually on a panel with Kim and Chris. I want to echo something that Chris said though. You guys are so fortunate to have Jen Palmieri there. I mean, to be with you guys eight days after what she just went through is a remarkable feat. She was such an integral of both this campaign and the White House. And just promise me, if she's up for it, you guys make sure she gets some nachos and beer from the Deer Park Tavern before she leaves.

DR. HOFFMAN I told you --

MS. PALMIERI We've already discussed the Deer Park --

DR. HOFFMAN -- I told you the Deer Park.

MS. PALMIERI Yeah.

MR. PLOUFFE And thank you for the wine, Jen. Well, I think, listen, President Obama's gotten a lot of criticism for doing interviews with YouTube personalities and late night and if you're trying to communicate with people you've got to go where they live. And so I think Trump's going to continue to do that. And I think, the conventions that we all are now raising -- well, he doesn't have a protected pool and is he going to do daily White House briefings with his press secretary. I don't know. I wouldn't be surprised if he doesn't do any of that. And I think he's going to continue the tweeting. I will say that. And he should. It's a great way to communicate directly with people. I do think, and again, we should all be careful about any sort of prediction but I do think people look at you differently as president than as a candidate and remember, this is someone who's going to come in that even if everybody who voted for him says they're favorable towards him on inauguration day he's going to be at 46, 47 percent of the vote. He doesn't; he could quickly drop into the 30's if he's not careful. So, I do think that he should use the devices. He's never going to turn into an automaton. So even if he tries to be careful I'm sure he'll color outside the lines from time to time. But I think it's important. And I think, listen, that's going to continue to change. I mean, millennials are on Facebook not because they want to be; they consider email to be Jurassic Park. They consider Facebook to be an important way to stay in touch with maybe family members, but they communicate largely through other means. That's going to continue to change. I think virtual and augmented realities are going to change politics in probably a big way. I don't know if that's by 2020 but certainly 2024. So again, I think you have to look at, I think, at politics, what's the best thing happening out there in the private sector, in the non-profit sector;? Who's doing interesting things? And it can't be

experimentation for experimentation's sake. But for us in '08, which again does seem like Jurassic Park, we understood that we needed to build a social network. Facebook became that for us in '12 and in '08 it was the only social network we built, and that people were obviously consuming messages and sharing them online. And the television advertising was getting less important. In presidential campaigns it still has a place. So, I think in the White House a President should use every means and that means direct communication and on this President Obama had started to do that and write some of his own material on twitter. So think we'll see more of that. And, that's going to be a tension with the Washington press corps and I think at the end of the day you want good relations with the press corps. Jen can speak much more authoritatively about that than I can. But at the end of the day he's going to want to directly communicate. I think the challenge will be if he criticizes -- he's been criticizing I think the New York Times a lot the last couple of days -- but if he goes back to criticizing fellow Republicans, if he loses 50 people on a key vote and he attacks them I think that's where things can get fairly problematic.

DR. HOFFMAN Did you want to follow up on that, Jen?

MS. PALMIERI Just that I think that after the President won in 2008 a lot of people said, oh, this digital stuff that's the big answer. And the tools matter, but what really matters is what you say. So if Donald Trump had been really boring on Twitter nobody would have cared. So, it's not just the medium that matters although you've got find people where they are but it's what you say. And if you're really boring on Twitter, he's not going to be effective.

DR. HOFFMAN Well, so going from super new technologies to kind of an antiquated technology on the campaign trail which is the use of surrogates, Ashley had this question for David Plouffe in particular. The President and the First Lady

campaigned with unusual enthusiasm for Hillary Clinton over the last few weeks but it didn't seem to do any good. Why do you think those important and relatively popular Democrats didn't work as surrogates and what else could have worked?

MS. PALMIERI Is that to David? He's --

DR. HOFFMAN No, to both of you I think.

MS. PALMIERI Okay.

DR. HOFFMAN David, will you start?

MR. PLOUFFE Well, right, I mean I, I would say --

MS. PALMIERI You should say how badly we would have done without them.

You're assuming that they didn't help. I think they helped a lot.

MR. PLOUFFE What you'll find is when you win a campaign everything you did was genius and worked. When you lose a campaign everything you did was disastrous. And so, I thought the Clinton campaign did a very good job of deploying surrogates. We had a lot of them. Bernie Sanders was out there. We had a lot of popular officials -- governors and senators -- and the Obama's obviously had the biggest wattage. And, I'm sure that they helped with turnout and I'm sure they helped convince some voters. And again, the President's favorable rating, I mean, now it's in the 60's but it was in the high 50's before the election. But, surrogates can only do so much I think we've learned. I think one of the things, listen, first of all the Clinton campaign is going to win the popular vote as Jen said by about two million. You know, if you move 80,000 or 90,000 votes around we'd be talking about President-elect Clinton. And it was very tough. I mean, Jen talked about in this sort of negative gauntlet she had to run but remember people's instinct is to change parties after eight years. All right? And that was the other thing we probably were all overlooking a little bit, as the President's approval ratings went up, and so, that was tough but I think that we had, as I think Chris

talked about this, so Democrats had a great 2008. We had a pretty good 2006 too. 2010 really terrible but we said well, it's still a tough economy, we won a lot of seats we didn't deserve, '12 we bounced back a little bit, 14 tough. So I think we all convinced ourselves that this was only about off years. And it turns out that like Ronald Reagan, Barack Obama had some unique political appeal. Now listen, Hillary Clinton outperformed Barack Obama in certain counties around the States so she had unique appeal as well. But, that Obama Coalition really is an Obama Coalition and I think Hillary Clinton did as good a job as she could getting it out, and he did do exceedingly well with voters in the upper Midwest. Now, part of that was in 2012 his opponent Mitt Romney, we were able to more easily win the argument about who the middleclass could trust. I think Trump was much tougher in that regard. So, I think that from a surrogate standpoint these things don't transfer. And all those people out there who were knocking on doors for Hillary Clinton, who were making phone calls, who were engaged in social media they were doing it for Hillary Clinton and I do think that, they had a great volunteer effort. So, I don't think you can say the surrogates didn't work but no surrogate is going to get it across the line. And this is about those two people, and even more important than the two people I have learned is the dynamics and atmospherics of the time. I mean, we have three political professionals on the panel there with you, I think we've all learned, I certainly have, that sometimes you can run the perfect race and things are aligned against you, and sometimes you get lucky and you don't run the perfect race and the stars align. So, again, I think that Clinton did a good job with deploying surrogates. It's actually something we had a huge advantage on and we were able to deploy them in many more states than Trump was able to. But again, this is a weird election. I think I'll say is we all want to look for the one thing and I think if Trump had lost you'd want to look for the one thing. There is no one thing. There's a

whole bunch of things and some of them are a little more important than another. But, I think we're always a lot smarter when we look through the rearview mirror. But I'm the first person to tell you, I did not think it was mathematically possible in a presidential year for Donald Trump to win the state of Pennsylvania. I just didn't think it was possible. I mean, that probably more than anything else is the thing that I'm still scratching my head about is the numbers that he was able to put up in the part of the state between Philadelphia and Pittsburgh and even how well he did in counties like Bucks County. I mean, he just did better than I thought he would.

DR. HOFFMAN So, from our Republican strategists, from a New Jersey perspective and a Pennsylvania perspective, what went right for Trump in states like Pennsylvania and Wisconsin and Michigan?

MS. ALFANO Well, I'd have to say I grew up in Hockessin, Delaware and I moved to Washington in college and I just came back two or three years ago to live in Pennsylvania just over the border. And, the perspective from living here was dramatically different than the conversations I was having with people in Washington and operative friends. And, I think Trump kind of endemically understood that. He knew what he; he got that visceral ground feeling. And I remember talking to a reporter and saying, I live in the little pocket, I'm a white Republican woman living in the suburbs just across the street from very blue Delaware, down the I-95 from very blue Philadelphia and there are Trump signs everywhere where I live. And it's not redneck, and it's not uneducated. These are doctors and lawyers, and somewhat affluent, neighbors of mine that have big houses and these are intellectual people who have college degrees and there were Trump signs. And the reporter shot back, oh, that's the Trump campaign; they spend all their money on swag and they're out, putting up signs while they lose the election. And I said these are not on street corners. These are in

people's yards and there's not one, there's like five. And they're huge. And they're like hand painted. This is like --

DR. HOFFMAN Yeah, hand painted.

MS. ALFANO -- this is not the sort of image that people had in their heads of baseball hat wearing truck driving gun rack in the back. This is people working at the corporations in Delaware. So, I think that one of the things that people didn't get is what my grandfather used to say, politics needs to be as close to knocking on a door as possible. So if you're going to make TV ads you need to make TV ads and make them feel like you just knocked on their door and had a personal conversation with them. Trump had personal conversations with people. He shed all of the usual Washington sort of perspective. He shed the politician perspective. He did not agree to the premise of the race. He did not agree to the traditional premise of how to run a race and instead had a conversation with people directly and I think it was missed because we all live in the cities, we're in New York or LA or in D.C., and we missed what's going on in the suburbs.

MR. RUSSELL I, I agree with a lot of what Kim said. I think you get west of Philadelphia suburbs, I mean Bucks County, start with Bucks County and then go west and you can kind of snake a path all the way to the West Coast with people who are Trump supporters who we don't, even as a Republican on the East Coast I miss it. I mean, I missed it. I didn't see it. I didn't feel it. When I talked to some of my friends -- I went to college in Philadelphia, I have friends from Pennsylvania, many from Bucks County, I can tell you a lot of my friends from Bucks County are voting for Trump, and a lot of them voted for Obama. They were people who were frustrated. They felt that the, economically they were being stifled. They just couldn't connect with Hillary Clinton. They felt some kind of connection to Trump. They were able to compartmentalize his

comments and things that he did as unimportant or less important to them. It didn't mean they wanted him to be a role model for their kids necessarily but they were able to compartmentalize that stuff and make it about something else. Something that was more important to them. I brought up to a friend and we were talking about it, we, and I don't have any data to back this up but it just feels like symbolic to me, the Keystone Pipeline, I mean, you're talking about an issue where President Obama and the Democratic Party largely sided with environmentalists on that issue. Who did they not side with? It wasn't Republicans who they kind of rebuffed on that. It seems like that because it's Republicans in Congress fighting for it. But the people who were going to build that were not Republicans necessarily, or at least not traditional ones. They weren't suit and tie Republicans. As someone said to me the other day so I can't take credit but it's a great line, there are people who take showers after work not before. And that's who Trump, I think, really appealed to in that kind of swath of the country and was able to tap into that economic insecurity, that frustration and I think changed some places like Wilkes Barre, Pennsylvania we were talking about that voted for Obama yet flipped for Trump and that kind of went all the way up through to Wisconsin. And I think that was kind of where he was able to tap into something that people on the East Coast or even the West Coast, D.C.; we didn't see it as much. I didn't think he was done. I didn't think the election was over. Like I said, I was talking to people along the way but if you asked me on Election Day was I going to bet my house he was going to win? Hell no, I wasn't going to bet my house he was going to win because I didn't think I was going to have a house by the end of the day. So, but I didn't think it was over because he was able to tap into something that a lot of us just missed.

DR. HOFFMAN You mentioned him as a role model and that kind of stuck with me because there was a famous Hillary campaign ad called Role Model and I was

mentioning to you earlier that in many ways from, -- well first of all I should mention, the students in the room will understand that I've been saying this all semester long but I've created a new tagline for any time I talk about campaigns and rules and what happens which is #accept2016. It's been a very different campaign. But as a scholar who studies political advertisements, that ad and the mirrors ad were some of the most effective ads I've ever seen. Why do you think those didn't sway particularly white women who were a big target group for the Hillary Clinton campaign?

MS. PALMIERI I would be guessing but I think I think they did again just not in the right states and I think that in the last few weeks, as I said before, after the third debate and we had nearly three weeks of sort of dead time that that filled up by more things about our campaign that people didn't want to hear, and it was very hard for us to break through. And then the thing that we feared the most in facing Trump was that he would become normalized or that he would change the person that he was. He never changed the person that he was but if she's not directly confronting him, if you don't have the drama of the debate stage, it was hard to continue to drive that. So, we found as effective as those ads were, and the problem is we have all these ads and we would test them and they would come back and say the Trump ones, they're the best. Well of course the Trump ones were the best because they're super compelling and super disturbing. But I thought we needed to do more positive ads about Hillary and about what -- and it's funny, I think she was great on the debate stage talking about the economy but I think the things that people were looking for for her is because she's the most famous least well-known person is something they can grab onto that's relatable because her experience is so unique. There's not anyone that's had a comparable experience. There's no one in the work that looks like Hillary Clinton. So I was talking with a student before about Hillary has an autism plan. If you both thought that that

spoke to them because if that's an issue for your family, that's something you really care about. We had a disability policy that really broke through a lot because if that's something in your family, that's something you really care about. Mental health, addiction; so many of the celebrities, the artists who supported us over Senator Sanders in the primary did so because Hillary had an addiction plan. So, I felt like we probably could have done more, not even just in the economic space but which that argument could have been a traditional Democrat Republican argument and this was not a traditional Democrat Republican race but try to find things in our paid media that gave people a better sense of her or saw the side that we know is there about how she really cares about people and is really always thinking about some way to solve a problem in their life. And I feel like as effective as the Trump stuff was we probably needed to have done more showing that of who she was.

DR. HOFFMAN So before I hand it over to the audience, and I have two volunteers who have microphones so they'll be going around and asking students and community members to ask questions. I'd like to ask the biggest question on everyone's mind, Tuesday night, Wednesday morning last week was how did the polls get it so wrong? How did everyone get it so wrong? And I know David's a numbers guy. I'm know Kim's done some polling. What do you both think about what went wrong?

MR. PLOUFFE Well, I don't think we know yet. So this is a very uneducated response. But I think a couple of things. One is I think Trump ended up having more momentum at the end than any of us realized. Chris said maybe it was if they hadn't chose Hillary by the end, and there's no doubt that atmospherics won great for her the last week, things broke to him more than a model might have shown. Even though undecided voters you model them out and say, okay 50 ought to be Trump, 50 ought to be Clinton. I think it broke more than that. My sense is what could have happened here

is there is some biases in terms of survey response. Listen, most people in America don't sit through a survey, whether that's a short online survey, a landline survey, a cell phone survey. So, I think, and it wasn't just the Clinton campaign. The Republican models, the Clinton models, the media models. So let's say there are a hundred people. Let's say its a hundred people who live in [indiscernible] areas in Ohio and 80 of them you're able to get some response from. My sense is the 20 who didn't respond you ended up allocating them out in a model and my guess is they were more favorable to Trump than the overall set. So I think that basically the models got corrupted because there was some survey bias. I really believe that to be the case.

DR. HOFFMAN If I can interrupt you --

MR. PLOUFFE Yes.

DR. HOFFMAN -- I just want to ask for a second. We've got about; I'd say about 350 people here. How many of you, show of hands, have ever hung up on a survey researcher, a pollster? Oh, my goodness. All right. Thank you, David. Yes, that's the majority of the room.

MR. PLOUFFE So, I think there's going to be a lot of, and again once the raw vote comes in when we have individual voter records, I think we're going to learn a lot more and that's going to have to wait a few months. But I think part of it was that. And, but again, it wasn't just that the polls were off. Again, if I looked, I would play with the map sometimes at like one in the morning, Florida, Pennsylvania. I wasn't playing much with Wisconsin and Michigan. And I just from a mathematical standpoint had a hard time getting Trump. So he busted the models. I mean, he performed better than certainly McCain or Romney or in many cases George W. Bush, right? And all it takes is a little bit weaker turnout than Democrats would have liked in a few places and Trump better performing and all of our assumptions go out the window. And that's what happened.

And again, the models almost all of them, did not suggest that Trump had a ceiling at this level. And that I think was the thing that really happened this year is that he broke through into the high 40's and low 50's in some places that nobody saw coming. And my guess is that the Trump campaign didn't see coming. They hoped it would happen. They didn't expect it to happen.

MS. ALFANO I would, I would agree with David. The survey firm that I sorted with this year is a bipartisan firm and one of the things that we struggle with, as every firm does, is what they call their secret sauce which is exactly what David's talking about, figuring out you weight things in your survey because to accommodate the lack of response or people who don't get through the whole survey so you know weighting it a little bit more Republican here or a little bit more senior citizens in the poll than maybe actually answered. I don't think our secret sauces were very good. I don't think we cooked very good sauce which my mother would just be very angry about. If you're Italian you've got to cook good sauce. However, the other thing that kind of we went back and forth with, and we did a lot of academics surveying. As political professionals from both parties we went to universities and worked with them so of course their focus was a lot on millennials and it sort of brought up some issues that the traditional way of polling, there is no way you can get through a benchmark survey any more ever anywhere. Nobody is going to sit through a survey that lasts more than two minutes, ever. So, when you try to do a traditional benchmark survey in a political race to get a real deep understanding of where you are you just can't. It doesn't work that way anymore. So, you have to figure out clever and different ways to not only find people on cell phones or online or with IVR or with live calling, those are the sort of the old school methods of doing things and one thing that we struggle with as a young firm who's really trying to be bipartisan and look at it as a new industry instead of like the masters or the

big guys who have done it for years and years, try to be disruptors in the industry is how do you collect data anymore? Do you do it in the form that we've known forever which is a survey or do you have to use different analytical tools? Do you need to find out consumer data? Do you need to; do we need to look to McDonald's and find out how they're figuring out their market share. So, I think that two things happen. One, the secret sauce was off because we based it on our knowledge of 30 years in campaigns and this wasn't a traditional campaign, and two, I think the style is dying and it's really in need of just a new way to look at gathering data.

MS. PALMIERI I think they have to, I'm not a pollster but I imagine you're going to have to come up with something that is more observing people's behavior and then asking them questions. I always thought Hillary was going to win but I definitely saw it. I definitely saw it. Every day I saw something that made me go, ugh, you know? A bout with Trump supporters or anxieties in our own party. Like there was a roiling up of tensions that had been below the surface in our country for a long time and it's been a long time coming and you see it from we've gone through 15 years of very dramatic disruption, very dramatic change: terrorism, the great recession, two wars, a digital economy, globalization, a 30-year wage stagnation. And so, I think that I would see this happening. I would imagine either she's going to win or America's not the country that I thought it was in 2016. And I'm mostly disappointed in what that outcome is but I think that the roiling to the surface of the tensions, it's probably some sort of growing pains that we need to go through. And I think young African American activists per Black Lives Matter, they expect more from this country because they, I don't think they rejected country, I think they believe in the fundamental values that it was founded on, but that's not how their family got here. I would talk to some African American colleagues in the campaign about having Hillary do an event at the Statue of Liberty and

they'd say to me, uh-uh, my family didn't come through the Statue of Liberty. And you're like, what? Okay. I see we go to Pennsylvania and we see unemployed steel workers who worked really hard their whole life who don't see any opportunity and they're not wrong and they expect more of America because they believe in America, they expected to get more from it. I see that in Hispanic families who have been living in the shadows for 30 years for fear that their mother, or a sibling, or someone's going to get deported and that's coming to the surface. I saw it from women on a rope line who would cry when Hillary would talk to them because, as I said before, crying is another expression of anger. It's not a sign of weakness. When women can cry at work and have the same kind of reaction as men get when they yell at work. I feel like that's some kind of equality. It's not acceptable, it's not good behavior, but it's the same expression.

MS. ALFANO I think John Boehner would agree.

MS. PALMIERI Yeah, huh?

MS. ALFANO I think John Boehner would agree.

MS. PALMIERI John Boehner, [indiscernible] I appreciate that. Senator Cain can well up from time to time too. I also appreciate that. But, I saw women would cry on the rope line saying to Hillary that they were repressed, assault, or something that they hadn't wanted to talk about that had come to the surface now. Like all, it's happening everywhere. It's happening everywhere in the country and I had hoped that Hillary would win and that the election would be a coming-together of the country affirming, saying we are, our values were tested and we've affirmed these core values that we hold as Americans and that the election could be a unifying force, a unifying act. That didn't happen and we're going to have to go through this crucible. But I am still fundamentally optimistic because I think it is about people dealing with these problems

that we've always had but haven't quite dealt with and expecting more from the country because they believe in these values. So I think it's going to be, it could be a rough four years but I think people are feeling more urgency now about this is just a country that is the way it is because we agree to live by a certain set of rules and if we're not affirming those, those principles and not dealing with the tensions and not listening to each other, then there's a huge problem people being in silos, you've got a lot at risk, like I think the situation we're in now.

DR. HOFFMAN I'll give Kim a one-minute response to that.

MS. ALFANO It wasn't really a response. It's an agreement. I just wanted to, you made me think of the fact that we also, I also think that, that our blinders are on. Politics has become corporatized. We're, we're a business now. When I started when my mother was the state party director here in Delaware there was a guy named Neil Tyson who knew the numbers of this state inside and out. He was the local guy. He knew where the vote was going to be and where to get it and how to talk to it. And now we're this sort of industry and we come at it from Washington or New York or wherever we're living and we're not living in the world that we used to where we knew what was going on with our neighbors and had a gut feeling. So, I agree with you. When you're out and you see it, and again, having moved home I got to see it, it was the best thing I ever did, but I think polling needs to de-corporatize a little bit and become more personal and not so sterile of numbers because the numbers are missing, they're being analyzed by people with perspectives that are caught within the Beltway or within a major city.

DR. HOFFMAN So from an academic perspective we need more qualitative research --

MS. ALFANO Exactly.

DR. HOFFMAN -- rather than simply quantitative.

MS. ALFANO I was told there'd be no math.

MS. PALMIERI Yeah, I'm with Kim.

DR. HOFFMAN I'm going to open it up to Chris who is on this side of the room. If you could find a community member, we have community members and students in this audience. On this side of the room if there's a community member with a question Chris can come over. Just raise your hand.

MS. ALFANO I rendered them silent.

DR. HOFFMAN Lose your chance. Three --

MS. PALMIERI There's a community member over here.

DR. HOFFMAN All right, let's jump to Andrew then. Thank you, Chris. Andrew, if you could let this young lady ask the question of our panel. Thank you.

Q: It seemed to me at the end of this campaign when Hillary was appearing with all the celebrities and everybody seemed to be for Hillary and all the papers were pillorying Donald Trump, and I'm a Hillary supporter, and there was Donald Trump going it alone. In fact, that was the headline, "Going It Alone." It almost seemed like he was the underdog and America loves an underdog. And the more he got criticized the more people stuck with him. And I don't know whether you took that phenomenon into account when you were polling or asking people. But, I was dismayed to feel like Donald Trump seemed to be the underdog as he was out there campaigning by himself flying all over the place.

DR. HOFFMAN So, did Donald Trump win on an underdog --

MS. PALMIERI So --

DR. HOFFMAN -- mentality?

MS. PALMIERI -- I think that you have to play; I think you have to play your game. You have to play whatever your, the hand you have, the strengths that you have. And,

we were blessed to have a lot of people that supported her and we found anecdotally, analytically, we found that this is why President Obama was such an effective advocate for us even though we had the outcome that we had. The most effective advocates for Hillary Clinton were convert communicators, okay? So, Barack Obama is the all time convert communicator because he is somebody who ran against her. He actually ran against her. He's someone who had a lot of doubts about her, got to know her, worked with her, and came to really respect and love her. So, when Barack Obama and Michelle Obama said they were for Hillary that was the millennials number one reason to be for her. It was their validation. So weirdly, even though she was so well known, she needed the validation from some core constituencies. So, us having the energy of Jay Z and Beyonce and James Taylor one night and Katy Perry another, and ending in Philadelphia with the --

MS. ALFANO [Indiscernible] stars.

MS. PALMIERI -- the amazing 35,000 event that with the President and the First Lady and Bruce Springsteen --

MS. ALFANO That was me.

MS. PALMIERI You know, that was an important thing to show America. And so, I get that he chose a different route but it doesn't necessarily mean it was the wrong thing for us to do what we did. And, because we had a different charge than he did. He was a vessel. He was, is a vessel for people's frustration and I think that our big fear was that people get that into him because we saw that in the Republican primary. Once people got that into Donald Trump there was no getting them back. There was nothing they could hear or learn about the guy that would make a difference. So that was like what we struggled to fight to protect against, which we were not as successful at as we thought. But, at the time we thought him going it alone, that didn't seem to be -- he was

very defensive about it, very defensive about it. If you say, he'd like had all these tweets about like Jay Z's bad language. Okay. And, then he; then people even came after Springsteen which why would you ever do that?

MS. ALFANO Don't go after Springsteen.

MS. PALMIERI Don't go after Springsteen. So he was defensive about it. But, I would also just end with this saying, as I would tell our staff all the time, because there are no clean hits, right? So whatever we did we would get attacked for what we didn't do. So just because we got attacked for doing something doesn't mean it was the wrong thing. So I would say just because they made fun of us on Saturday Live doesn't mean it wasn't the right thing to do because it often, particularly it's true in politics but it's really true this year, there was, whatever we did we got criticized for not doing the other option so you had to look at your candidate's strengths where she needed shoring up and then make decisions that way.

DR. HOFFMAN We've already got a lot of questions from Twitter but I'm going to open it up over to Chris here and see if there's a student on this side of the room. In the front, Chris, we have a couple of students. Right here in the middle. Thank you.

Q: Hi. Thank you for taking my question. And tonight we, I know we all talked a lot about Hillary Clinton's campaign and what they did well and not so well. And my question is actually about Donald Trump's campaign. What do you think was so effective about the way his campaign was run? Was it the fact that he was so bombastic and he really just got to people, or was it the way his advisors and people like Kellyanne Conway ran his campaign?

DR. HOFFMAN That's a great question.

MR. RUSSELL I think people like Kellyanne Conway helped to stabilize the campaign and stabilize him to a degree and brought a level of professionalism and

stability that I don't think he would have won without. However, I think ultimately the strength of his campaign though, and Jennifer used the word vessel, he was a vessel for people in the middle of the country who felt left behind, who felt left out. I think what he did really well, and I agree with your point as well, I think those people in the middle of the country, whether it's James Taylor or Beyonce or Jay Z or Jon Bon Jovi, those people don't care. That doesn't animate them like --

DR. HOFFMAN Yeah.

MR. RUSSELL -- it animates people on a college campus or on the East Coast or on the West Coast. Those people aren't sitting there watching the Academy Awards to the end and talking about the routines at work the next day. They don't care. And I think there is a sense that that's what the Clinton Campaign, like you said you play to your strengths, you play the cards you're dealt, I think that was about motivating a base, turning people out. That was not convincing anyone who was undecided at that point to vote for her at all. So, I think what he did well is whether it was by his own doing or just the cards that were dealt, I think the underdog theme, the go it alone, the I'm you and they're them, the Clinton Campaign represents the insiders, the powerful people, the people who --

MS. ALFANO And they ran that way.

MR. RUSSELL -- were making it well and I'm for you. Now the fact that a guy who's a billionaire, whatever you want to say how much money he makes, that he was able to say that I'm the middleclass guy. I know your concerns better than she does. Very fascinating, I mean, that to me it needs to be kind of, that only needs to be unpeeled a few times but he was able to do it. And he did it through his voice, through the tone, and through what he was saying to people. He spoke to people in a way that frankly a bunch of millionaire music stars or actors or actresses can't do and I think that

was really the strength of his campaign that he took it to voters at a level that was far more visceral and far more important to them at the time.

DR. HOFFMAN I'm wondering, David, I'm thinking back to 2008 in particular, with the celebrity support for Obama, it was very I don't know if grassroots is the right term but it wasn't the Will I. Am. video and I've got a crush on Obama video, that I just showed my students the other day who were kind of fascinated by this quaint campaigning, it was more immersive from the supporters. And I wonder if it makes a difference where those surrogates come in and where those celebrity endorsements come in. Does it need to be more grassroots?

MR. PLOUFFE Well, I think, listen, it's always better when things are organic, but my strong suspicion is and we could count on two hands the number of people who voted against Hillary Clinton because Jay Z or Bruce Springsteen was out there. So that was all about they had turnout challenges and they were trying to address them. I do think Trump being out there kind of alone, which fit his whole MO. So, but I will say, what did the Trump campaign do well? First of all, you know Donald Trump wasn't interested in where could he win, a campaign that was like the Lincoln-Douglas debates. You know, he wanted Mad Max fury road, the World Wrestling Federation. And so everyday I think that was strategic. You know, they were just going to make this crazy and secondly, his strength. So I think a lot of voters were bothered about certain things he said, attacking John McCain, as an example of the Republicans, but he never apologized, all right? And I think for a lot of voters that strength, right, appealed to them. And again, I think that was strategic. They would always rather get criticized than back down and I think that probably started with Trump so maybe it wasn't even a strategy but I think it worked for him. The third thing is, again, I certainly think at least a week out you couldn't find a single person in the Trump campaign or the Republican

Party who thought he was going to win Wisconsin, Michigan or even maybe Pennsylvania. But they thought they could and there's something to that. So it's the art of the possible. You know, we had that in 2008, when we targeted Virginia and North Carolina Democrats thought we were crazy much less Republicans. So the Trump Campaign saw something there. Now maybe it was because of desperation, that was their only path. But they saw something and they stuck with it and they had a theory of the case and sometimes you're rewarded for sort of audacious electoral strategies. And in that case they worked. So, they did a lot of things right. But let's not forget, he got 46.9 percent of the vote and to Jen's point, but there was enough of it in the right places. But you look back on it and there was a consistency to him, there was a consistency to the kind of voters they told us all they were going to acquire and we all said they couldn't do it. But they were consistent about that and I think that they should deserve a lot of credit for that. I think the canvas they wanted to run the race on was not a traditional political canvas. The [indiscernible] is everything's magnified in the social media world. Now how much of it gets through to actual voters I don't know, but everywhere it was the most important thing in the history of the world every 15 minutes. And of course, when everything is important nothing really is. And that's one of the reasons I thought, I thought the things that were important were your convention and three big debate moments. And Hillary Clinton, I think, as most neutral observers would say, survived there. But, I think probably the biggest thing of all is there was enough voters looking for change and somebody said, what, I'm going to take a Howitzer to everyone, everyone; R, D, business, labor, it doesn't matter. And in this particular moment, in this particular year, in this particular election that's exactly what the doctor ordered. So that's the other thing Trump did well. He was unafraid to criticize anyone. And we all thought he was going to pay a price for it and I think he did with some voters

certainly but there was a lot of people that found that appealing.

DR. HOFFMAN If I can bring it back to the audience here. Andrew, could you find another student perspective? We have a couple of hands up right there.

Q: Do you think the way in which trade was addressed in this election affected its outcome? Trade?

DR. HOFFMAN Yeah. The way in which trade was addressed?

MS. PALMIERI I think that trade was, I think it was part of the litany of things that have disrupted life in America particularly in certain pockets, so I think trade, globalization was, is a big, it's a big factor. So, I think it's less so, maybe less specifically trade but as globalization and the economy changing and there not being good options for people who got left behind from that. I would say in the primary we felt that's contrary to what the public -- so the perception is what the press's perception is -- we felt that we ultimately had a more effective argument on trade than Senator Sanders did. In Michigan, let me tell you what, in the primary, we screwed Michigan up. We just screwed it up. We should never have lost that state and we didn't have the right ground game. But we litigated out trade pretty well in Ohio, and we won Ohio by a lot in the primary. So we didn't feel that -- but you know in the general it was a different, it was a different deal. I feel like it was just one part of the forces that had hurt a lot of people that ended up voting for Trump.

DR. HOFFMAN I'm glad that this is a question that came in from Twitter and this is something that I brought up earlier which is kind of the elephant in the room but here we have the first female candidate running for President of the United States and I think sometimes we forget to ask questions about the unique nature of that. So Jenny asks, what were some of the challenges for Hillary as a female candidate and how do female candidates combat those issues in the future as the these young women decide to run

for office themselves?

MS. PALMIERI I think it's getting easier. I think it's still hard I think. I have a different perspective about this at the end of this race than when I started. Even when I thought she was going to win I had a much different perspective about the role of sexism in the press coverage and then at the end of the race. And really what concerns me most, maybe it's because of what I do for a living, is in the press coverage. But, I find it's probably something that we're less aware of than racism because you can be a white person who knows very few if any black people but and so that might make you more aware of; ironically it may make you more aware of a racial attitude. But everybody has women in their families so you may have a certain attitude about women that you don't even appreciate because it's just your experience with your mother or your sister or, and I we may not see how those views can affect politics or, or press but I think that it's actually deeper, it's harder to see. And, I think with Hillary, she had an easier time running this time than in 2008. In 2008 she was facing having to convince people she could be Commander-in-Chief. I didn't do 2008 but the 2008 Campaign told me they were never able to reconcile the need to show she understood people's problems and use that as a strength versus having to prove that she was strong enough and tough enough to be a Commander-in-Chief and they never reconciled that. And, this that wasn't even a question so that's great. That's great news. It wasn't even a question that the woman in the race in the primary, the woman in the race in the general was clearly the person that was most prepared to be the Commander-in-Chief. But -- so that's good -- but I do think that there's a view that, I didn't have this view, but there's a view that it was easy; that you should assume a woman candidate is running so women are going to vote for her. That's not how we make decisions. And, sometimes it's even harder to convince women to vote for another woman than a man. I don't think

that there's the inherent upside to being a woman candidate that people might of thought and in the end we did find that women didn't turn out for her as much as we thought it would. So I think that it's getting easier. I think the more women candidates there are that are out there those are women -- part of Hillary's problem is she has no peer. There are lots of women senators and we can look at Elizabeth Warren and celebrate her and we can look at Senator Baldwin and celebrate her and we can see them. You can compare them because they're equals but see them as different people. Hillary Clinton, she has always been, I think since the moment she stepped on the stage to do her commencement at Wellesley, a generationally challenging figure. She's a baby boomer. She saw the stage at Wellesley and she confronted the Senator that had introduced her and that was an act of rebellion. Then she's the first First Lady to have had her own career. She says she wouldn't bake cookies. And that challenged a lot of norms that we see of women and then she was the first major presidential candidate which again challenges norms in women. And I think that that's part of the reason why this stuff, as I refer to it, this baggage, hangs around her because she's always violated what people think women should do in real time as a young woman, as First Lady later and so she's always challenged that and then there's not anyone to compare her to. So a lot of this baggage changed her in ways that I think isn't fair. So, I really thought she was going to do it, I thought she was going to be the one to do it and I thought okay it's worth it because she went through all of this but she'll do it. I think she's really paved the way. I think it should be easier next time and next time it won't be the first person; it will be someone who hopefully is looked at more "well-roundedly" and not just as the first woman president, first woman candidate because I think that's where women, there's a lot of strength in numbers so women shouldn't be scared of it, we just need more of it. But she's blazed a pretty good trail.

DR. HOFFMAN All right, let's take one more question over here on Chris's side from a community member and then we'll have to wrap it up.

Q: I have a question. It's actually more of a lessons learned kind of comment about the lady that thought he was a kind of an underdog the last two weeks. To me the whole election was the last three weeks. He was appearing day after day, hour after hour in different places talking to the common people and she was appearing just kind of sporadically and like when you saw this thing in Philadelphia it was like a coronation. Now wait a minute now, we've got to play nine innings here. We're not just playing eight. We've got to play the ninth inning. You've got to be in people's heads at the 11th hour the last night of the election that's what they're going to bed with.

MS. PALMIERI So, I think that there's a myth that she didn't have a schedule that she did in the last three weeks. She did. People just didn't cover it that way.

DR. HOFFMAN What are your thoughts?

MR. RUSSELL I think you, similar to the question before, I think there was a feeling in the media, and a feeling I think talking to some of the students earlier today, a feeling among some of her supporters that it was over.

MS. PALMIERI There was that feeling [indiscernible].

MR. RUSSELL That it was done. And I'm sure you guys had a, that must have been maddening.

MS. PALMIERI Yeah, that was something that we were really scared about. Yeah.

MR. RUSSELL And I think that her, the concert and the big rallies, and the media kind of seeping in to kind of the narrative that Trump was; they're already doing the post mortem on why Trump lost before the game was over. I think all of that fed into two things that hurt the Clinton Campaign; one, let the foot off the pedal for her supporters, not that they were depressed, they felt like that maybe it wasn't as important, they didn't

need to show up and I think it galvanized Trump supporters or people who were on the fence, that they felt like what we're going to show all these people. We're going to show all the bigwigs, the insiders, and he played into that masterfully. He masterfully used that. They're saying we're done and they're saying America's done. We're going to make America great again. It was almost like his slogan fit the last week of the campaign perfectly and he played it really perfectly I thought in the final week.

DR. HOFFMAN Well thank you so much. I want to thank David Plouffe for being here. If we could give him a big round of applause. I'd also like to thank our panel: Chris Russell, Kim Alfano, and Jennifer Palmieri. Thank you so much. And I want to thank everyone for participating in this year's National Agenda. This is a great opportunity to engage in civil public dialogue about issues that are important to us. I hope to see you back here again next Fall semester. Thank you so much for a great year.

#