



**AMERICAN EVOLUTION™**  
**FORUM ON THE FUTURE OF  
REPRESENTATIVE  
DEMOCRACY**  
**WILLIAM & MARY**

**American Evolution Forum on the Future of Representative Democracy**  
*William & Mary*  
*July 30 – August 1, 2019*

**Welcome and Introductions by Commemoration Co-Chairs**  
**The Honorable M. Kirkland Cox, Speaker of the House of Delegates of Virginia**  
**The Honorable Thomas K. Norment, Jr., Majority Leader of the Senate of Virginia**

The Honorable M. Kirkland Cox:

So let me welcome you once again. Good evening and welcome to the opening reception of the American Evolution Forum on the Future of Representative Democracy. Some of you were on hand for the joint commemorative session earlier today at Jamestown, and we're glad to have you back for this evening's program.

For those of you who were not at Jamestown, let me say a few brief words about this important anniversary that we commemorate today. 400 years ago, less than two dozen burgesses selected from the major settlements or boroughs of the colony gathered at the church in the fort at Jamestown. They were joined by Governor Yeardley. And the colony's leaders, they held the first representative legislative assembly in America.

It was not an especially grand affair like this. In fact, as much could be said about what that assembly lacked is what it included. By all standards, it was very rudimentary and selective. It lasted just a few days. It took up just a few items. And it was so hot, one of the burgesses passed away. I've heard like five speeches, this poor guy, he passed away and so he was very, he made history by passing away. That's not a good thing. But from heatstroke. We have avoided it in today's session, thanks to the American Evolution of air conditioning-- You're supposed to laugh on that one. American Evolution. It wasn't very good.

And yet for all the differences from the modern and inclusive legislative assemblies we know today, that gathering had one attribute none other can claim. It was the beginning. Freedom in the form of representative democracy began here in Virginia. On this date four centuries ago, what happened here, what began here, has changed not only Virginia and not only America, but the world.

Today of course marks the 400<sup>th</sup> anniversary of our Virginia General Assembly, the oldest continuous legislative body in the Western Hemisphere. But like so much of our past, Virginia's history is also America's history. All of our democratic institutions in America, the Congress, the other 49 state legislatures, all the local and municipal representative bodies across our country, trace their roots to what happened just a few miles from here 400 years ago. Indeed, all over the world, there are new democracies and new representative assemblies based on the American model that likewise trace their lineage and the crucial beginning to Jamestown. So this is an important milestone, a momentous occasion, and we are thankful you are here to be part of it with us.

With the start of the American Evolution Forum this evening, we pivot from remembrance of the past to focus on the future. And that is fitting. Because the future of this precious 400-year old gift we call representative democracy now rests in our hands. To paraphrase one of my favorite historical figures Winston Churchill, a democratic form of government is not perfect. It just happens to be better than every alternative. And it is our job to be its faithful stewards and leave the institutions of our representative democracy better, stronger, and more inclusive and more responsive than we found them.

To consider how we can accomplish that noble goal is the purpose and mission of the forum that we kick off this evening. Joining me is co-chair of this year's American Evolution, the commemoration, is my friend, the state senator who hails from the hallowed ground, Senator Tommy Norment. And it's my pleasure to call on him now, for some comments, acknowledgments, and introductions. Senator Norment, welcome.

The Honorable Thomas K. Norment, Jr.:

Kirk, thank you very much for your eloquence. As you were speaking, I was looking around the room. Gosh, what an absolutely fantastic gathering and cross section of not just our communities but America that we have here tonight, and it is indeed my pleasure to have the privilege of participating in this commemoration.

There are some in this room that think actually I was there on July the 30th in 1619, but that was not true. I was not elected until 1699, when we moved the capital to Williamsburg, so on that... but what a wonderful group. And thank you very much.

It has really been a privilege for me to serve with Speaker Cox as the co-chair of this commemoration. And he deserves an incredible amount of appreciation, because he in fact really has carried the burden of the responsibility. I know it's shocking, Kirk, but I have been a pretty face. But thank you for what you have done.

As I reflect on this anniversary and the profound words that we heard today, it really does take me back about 12 years ago. And for those of you that were not at Jamestown today, what an extraordinary group of speakers we had. We started off with the Clerk of the House of Commons, Sir David L. Natzler. He spoke at the reconstructed church on Jamestown Island and was, I think, very fair in his historical comments. From then, we also heard from the well-known

historian Jon Meacham, and he was also very pointed in some of his comments as he was reflecting on some of the historical aspects of Jamestown.

Finally, as you are well aware, we heard from the President of the United States of America. And for those of you that were not there, I really wanted to give him a thunderous applause, because he did stay on script with the teleprompter the entire way. And I will say that he was given an opportunity to deviate from the script, and Speaker Cox and I were behind him and could see the teleprompter, and he stayed right on it word for word. So I was very, very proud of him.

But the reason I say I reflect back to 12 years ago, in 2007, I was much more active in that commemoration. And on that commemoration, while it had a different focus on the founding of America as opposed to the evolving of the legislative assembly and representative democracy. We had two visits from the President of the United States, one on May the 13th of 2007, down in Jamestown and the other on Thanksgiving up at Berkeley Plantation.

Also many of you who witnessed that wonderful event recall the presence of her majesty. Queen Elizabeth was here which attracted an enormous amount of attention, and she had some pithy comments that she rendered both in the capital and also down at Jamestown.

One of the reflections that I've had is, and I asked this rhetorically, where else in America can events like what have taken place in 2007 and then 2019 take place? If you think about the Historic Triangle, I consider it some of the most sacred historical land in America.

On 1607 on May the 13th, when 104 intrepid young men and boys landed, can you imagine the uncertainties that they felt and were faced as they stepped to shore, especially after the less than hospitable greeting they had at Virginia Beach? But think of what they've done. And then up to 1699 when the capital moved to Williamsburg, which was then known as Middle Plantation. It was there where the thoughts of freedom and independence fermented along the streets of the Duke of Gloucester St, or in Bruton Parish Church, and ultimately where the world was turned upside down, when Cornwallis ultimately capitulated down to the Battle of Yorktown where independence was one.

I ask you where else in America can make a claim to those historical episodes that really have laid the foundation for what we know today? It is here in the Historic Triangle that individuals have suffered, they have persevered, they have built and created, and over 400 years they have continued to market bold ideas and advanced bold forms of government. They picked up a form of government that had been developed over hundreds of years in the mother country and planted it in the Virginia soil and continued to nurture it until what we have today.

And it's no coincidence that this commemoration has been characterized as American Evolution. For those of you that were down at Jamestown today, you heard a number of speakers talk about the good, the bad and the ugly in American history.

But if you use 1619 or even 1607 as the historical benchmark of some of the history events that we've been through, it is remarkable how much we have evolved over 400 years. And that is not

to say that we should stop evolving. One of the nice things about the definition of evolving is that it has no termination date. So we continue to evolve on our representative form of government. We continue to evolve on the equality of rights regardless of race or gender. And while there may be spirited debates about it, we continue to evolve about it, and I think that is incredibly special.

To make these events seem seamless, there is an incredible group of professionals and volunteers that have been working, not just for the last week, but some of them for five years, and trying to plan every aspect of this commemoration. And I know as I look around the room, I see a number of you who have been very involved as volunteers. I think we should share a thunderous applause of appreciation for Kathy Spangler, Nancy Rodrigues, and their entire team, but [also] all of the volunteers who have just put countless hours of energy into making this such a wonderful event, so if you would, please join me in expressing the appreciation.

And in some remarks I made earlier today, I made reference to the fact that perhaps I had a little unusual perspective, because I am what would be affectionately referred to as a townie. I grew up here in Williamsburg. And so there is nothing unusual about me seeing someone in a local store with the tricorne hat on or a waistcoat. Or someone dressed in Native American attire or glorious and flamboyant African American heritage dress. It is just my home and my way of life. But I would say to you that all in all, it is really an incredible venue. And one of the remarkable things is, if you look around at some of the other institutions that we have, we have the second oldest public college in America. Just a little bit down the street from here in the College of William & Mary, which received its charter in 1693. And every year, there is a commemoration of the issuance of that charter. In just a few minutes we'll hear from the president of the college.

But also surrounding the college is another very special historical institution known as the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. And we're very blessed to be guided and led by an extraordinary gentleman who has been the president of Colonial Williamsburg. And as I look out there, I would be remiss if I didn't recognize who we'll hear from later, my fellow trustee on the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Carly Fiorina. Carly, it's great to have you with us as well.

Speaker Cox mentioned about the first legislative assembly that took place on July the 30th of 1619 down at Jamestown Church, and yes, they did have to cut the sessions short. I wish I could figure out how to do that in Richmond, but I haven't quite come to that approach just yet. And no, I don't want the infection of malaria to have to be the reason for us declaring it very short. But it is interesting. Some may not be aware that while they were in session for only six days that they passed a number of pieces of legislation. And one of them, much to the chagrin of many fiscally conservative Republicans, was probably the first tax that was imposed in the New World. And that was a tax on the hogshead of tobacco.

But that money was supposed to be used for the founding of a higher education public institution of learning that eventually became the College of William & Mary. In July of 2018, the 28th president of the College of William Mary was selected. And the following February, I believe that she actually had her investiture. And even though some say "Gosh, she was a Shakespearean scholar," I say, "All is well that ends well," on it. And so, President Katherine Rowe is going to

speak to us in just a moment, and she will be followed by the President Mitchell Reiss, who is also the head of another marvelous educational institution that we call the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation.

And interestingly enough, Mitchell, I have thought a number of times this weekend as we have reflected back to 1619, I've thought about the motto or the phrase that we have at Colonial Williamsburg. And that is, "In order the future may learn from the past," and we need to continue to evolve in that direction. So, Madam President, if you will be so gracious to come up and share some of your Shakespearean literature with us, we'll be delighted.

### **Greetings**

**Dr. Katherine A. Rowe, President of William & Mary**

**The Honorable Mitchell B. Reiss, President and CEO of the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation**

**The Honorable Robert J. Wittman, United States Representative from Virginia**

**The Honorable Elaine G. Luria, United States Representative from Virginia**

Dr. Katherine A. Rowe:

Thank you so much. Yes. Good evening. Thank you, Speaker Cox and Majority Leader Norment. It's such a pleasure to be here and an honor to be here tonight, distinguished guests, on behalf of William & Mary. It's my pleasure to welcome you to Williamsburg to our campus and to this incredible series of events. We're delighted to join American Evolution in hosting the signature event celebrating the birth and future of American democracy. And because I am a renaissance scholar, I'm just going to give you a tiny bit more history that links William & Mary to the histories that you just heard and will continue to hear.

William & Mary's roots in representative government run deep. As many know the monarchs who established this university by Royal Charter were King William III and Queen Mary II. They ruled together, the first and only co-rulers of England. And more importantly, they ruled by contract. They did not rule by divine right. They did not rule by blood, as had been the tradition for so many centuries in Europe. They ruled by an agreement with the Parliament that laid out the rights of the rulers, the rights of the Parliament and the rights of those who governed. They took the throne by the English Declaration of Right.

This innovative document limited the power of the monarchy and guaranteed the liberty of the subjects. It gave to parliament primary authority to govern and uphold the law. And in 1689, it became the basis for the English Bill of Rights, which in turn in 1776, as you well know, became the template for Virginia's own Declaration of Rights, which claimed the rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness and safety. Some 15 years later, these words would be echoed in the United States Constitution and Bill of Rights. So today amid rapid transformations in technology and communications, we are testing these long held democratic values of equity and liberty around the world. Solutions will come out of meetings like this, and they will require the shared expertise from every industry and discipline, collaboration across all generations.

As the Americas' second oldest institution of higher education, William & Mary recognizes that we simultaneously commemorate the 400th anniversary of representative democracy and the arrival of the first enslaved persons on these shores. And the ongoing work to ensure that we the people of the United States are continually forming a more perfect union is work we commit to here. William & Mary is grateful to be a place of convening for these essential conversations about that union and about the future of representative democracy around the world.

All around the university, our brilliant faculty and our sparkingly smart students are pursuing far reaching research to address the world's most complex challenges. We're especially proud of our Chancellor and William & Mary alumnus, the Honorable Robert M. Gates. Tomorrow morning, Chancellor Gates will give remarks on framing our American evolution in democracy, diversity and opportunity. It's imperative that we engage in sustaining 21st century democracy and define in convenings like this what that will be, and that we do so in the entrepreneurial tradition of William & Mary. William & Mary looks forward to flourishing partnerships as we think about that future and prepare the next generation of leaders to advance the principles of democracy here and around the globe. Thank you and welcome.

The Honorable Thomas K. Norment, Jr.:

As I mentioned, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation is another extraordinary educational institution. And we're very blessed to have some leadership. The challenge of Colonial Williamsburg is very similar to that of a college, while we have an educational mission, there is always an interest in good business practices and philanthropic contributions to it. As I also look around the room, I see the mixture that we have here of business and academia. I see Barry DuVal, the president of the chamber, another great educating advocate. Next to him, James Stike, former chairman of the Colonial Williamsburg board. My dear friend, Tom Farrell, who is here, who certainly is running one of Virginia's major corporations on it.

Mitchell Reiss came from academia but before he was academia, he certainly was a senior American diplomat, and he certainly is very skilled in negotiating and bringing individuals together. Mitchell came to Colonial Williamsburg during a period of time where we were having some financial stress, and I have to compliment him publicly because Mitchell Reiss made some very, very difficult financial decisions to try to move Colonial Williamsburg Foundation in the right direction. And for that, I thank you. Mitchell is the eighth president of the Colonial Williamsburg. And going back once again to tell you just how chronologically mature I am, I have known seven of those eight personally. The only one that I did not know is the first one whose residence was in New York City, which was slightly before my time, but I have had the privilege of knowing the other seven of them, and Mitchell has done an extraordinary job. So if you would join me in welcoming Mitchell Reiss to the dais.

The Honorable Mitchell B. Reiss:

Thank you, Senator. Distinguished visitors, ladies and gentlemen, friends. On behalf of all of us at Colonial Williamsburg, it's my pleasure to welcome you and to host this important gathering at the Williamsburg Lodge. 243 years after its founding, the United States remains the world's best example of representative democracy. We trace back this proud heritage 400 years to the distinguished, to the historic events we've gathered to commemorate today, the meeting of the

General Assembly at the church in Jamestown, where our forefathers laid the foundation stone for America's system of self-government.

Few acts in history have had such lasting and world altering consequences. This legacy extends to Colonial Williamsburg where Virginia's capital moved in 1699 after a fire destroyed the statehouse in Jamestown. Here at the Capitol, the historic work of this body continued. On May 15, 1776, Virginia became the first colony to speak for American independence. These historic events are the shared heritage of all Americans regardless of when they or their ancestors entered our national narrative. They also serve as a source of hope and of inspiration for oppressed and persecuted peoples striving for freedom and more just systems of government across the world.

When President George W. Bush visited Jamestown 12 years ago, to observe its 400th anniversary, he declared it a chance to renew our commitment to help others around the world to realize the great blessings of liberty. The advance of freedom, the President said that day in 2007 is the great story of our time. So it is still in 2019. But I'm acutely aware today that as a nation, we find ourselves at a crossroads. Our relationships with even some of our strongest democratic allies have shifted. Our approach to world affairs and our nation's role in them has also shifted. The old instinct to advocate for global freedom and democracy is no longer a foregone conclusion. To the contrary, in recent years, it has been questioned and openly criticized not only at the highest levels of our government, but throughout the country.

A recent survey found that only 19% of Americans believe that promoting democracy and democratic values around the globe should be a top priority of American foreign policy. So the timing of this historic moment at Jamestown, and the occasion that it provides for this forum on the future of representative democracy, could not be more important. This is a critical conversation for all of us to be having. I wish you a robust discussion and a relaxing time at Colonial Williamsburg these next few days. Thank you very much.

The Honorable Thomas K. Norment, Jr.:

Mitchell, thank you very much. And thank you for your leadership. One of the great tenants of Virginia's form of government is citizen legislators. And there have been discussions over the years as to whether or not we should expand the role and responsibility of legislators in Virginia. And we have vigilantly hung on and defended the concept of a citizen legislature. I have the opportunity to make two more very brief introductions. And these are congressional representatives, we'll hear from two of them briefly tonight, but I also see my good friend, Congressman Bobby Scott is with us, and Bobby has known me so long he can remember when I was... I have to preempt Congressman Scott because I started to say he has known me so long, he knew me when I was a Democrat.

Before I was elected to the Senate of Virginia, I had the opportunity and some days the pleasure of being in local government, as the chairman of the James City County Board of Supervisors, and Chad, who's on the New York County Board of Supervisors knows of once I speak as long with Walt's, remember. After one term of that I decided to run for the senate of Virginia, and there was a remarkable difference. When you start out in local government, you have the closest Nexus to the people that you are representing. I remember I lived about three minutes from

where the James City County Board of Supervisors met. By the time I could get home they were knocking on my door and calling on the phone about votes that I would cast.

At least now it takes a little time to go 50 miles on that. The reason I mentioned that is a long-term friend of mine and a gentleman that I have enormous respect for who represents Virginia's first congressional district, is Rob Wittman. And Rob started out actually being on the town council of Downtown Montrose. And for those of you who don't know where that metropolitan area is, it is on the fringes of Westmoreland County.

And I remember as a kid when we went on vacations camping at Westmoreland State Park, a big night on the town for the Norment family was a dinner at the pharmacy, the pharmacy in Montrose. After serving a term on the Montrose town council, Rob was elected to the Westmoreland County Board of Supervisors where ultimately he was selected as the chairperson. He was subsequently elected to be the member of the House of Representatives from that area on the untimely death of Joanne when she left us, but he's done a wonderful job.

You may have heard comments earlier today. And Rob, I think you made them down at Jamestown, that we have the largest naval presence of any place, not just in America, but in the world. Rob serves on the Armed Services Committee, but most important, he is the chairman of the SeaPower Subcommittee on that, and we thank you very much for your advocacy on that. So I'm looking forward to hearing from Rob and after that, I will introduce the second Congressman, but come on down, a man of the people. You did a wonderful job on your remarks today. And thank you for your service, sir.

The Honorable Robert J. Wittman:

Well, Senator Norment, thank you so much. Thanks so much for those very kind, kind remarks and good evening.

Audience:

Good evening.

The Honorable Robert J. Wittman:

Gosh, hasn't this been a spectacular day. And it continues now, gosh, what a great perspective on what has made and what continues to make our country great. That is people coming together with a concept, an ideal to say that we as a nation, are going to treasure those individual liberties and freedoms, those freedoms that we are, been given by our creator, and the government there to protect those. It is really, really amazing how that concept started in its infancy right here in Jamestown, and has grown through the years to what we know today and listen, there've been some challenges along the way. But it is still absolutely the best form of government in the history of mankind.

And as a lifelong public servant, and a direct descendant of the first legislative body we honor today, my time here in the General Assembly is just a true honor for me. I feel a strong sense of gratitude to what's being honored today. And it was here 400 years ago that representatives first gathered to give voice to the will of the people. That's an important concept, making sure

government is a directive of the people. A government driving its power from the governed is what makes our nation unique.

This was the unseen vision of a group of British settlers, that a nation born from something so small could succeed in this experiment of democracy. That same vision holds true today. As legislators, we strive every day to ensure that the voice of the people is heard, and that their government works for them. William Faulkner once said, "We must be free not because we claim freedom, but because we practice it." Today we reflect on what it means to be an American. What it means to be free, to have the freedom to assemble, practice any religion, speak without fear or persecution, access reliable news, and petition our government and expect action.

These values are at the core of our democracy, a democracy that was born right here in the Commonwealth of Virginia, four centuries ago. Now, working within a democracy is not easy. And our history is a testament to that. As I said, we've had a lot of ups and downs, a lot of challenges. We've waged war, we've rebuilt in times of depression. We have celebrated in times of prosperity, and we have fought for what we believe in is right in aiming to create, as you heard earlier, a more perfect union. My time in the General Assembly is one of the most rewarding highlights of my career, as I got to play a role in what is an unfolding rich history here in Virginia and foreign nations.

Those who came before me shaped the history by putting their neighbors and countrymen first. That task came in to me and my colleagues and one day will be passed on to many more in the future who will continue that great legacy that we hold dear in this nation. This long history of putting community and country before self is still extraordinarily strong here in Virginia. It inspires not only us to be as inspired as those who have come before us, but it will also inspire the next generation of leaders. It is an honor to celebrate this history with you today and as we look forward to the next 400 years of democracy, let us strive for an even stronger and more prosperous America. May God bless each of you and may God continue to bless our great Commonwealth of Virginia.

The Honorable Thomas K. Norment, Jr.:

Congressman, thank you very much. There's been a concerted focus to make sure that this commemoration is ecumenical. And while there is some background noise out there that may go on with strident and conflicting political views and ideologies, we have had Republicans and Democrats come together today to undertake this commemoration.

I'm very pleased to introduce the Congresswoman from the second congressional district. And while she is a freshman Congress person, her presence is incredibly important. As I mentioned earlier in reciting some of the comments from Rob Wittman, that we have the strongest and largest naval presence in this area of Virginia of anywhere in the world. And Congressman Luria is a Navy veteran of 20 years I believe and served in command positions. She received her background education from the United States Naval Academy. I'm sorry, you couldn't get in VMI but we would have liked to have had you there, we would have loved to have had you, we were looking for a few good women, that would have really been good.

But Congressman Luria has been, even in spite of her freshman status, has been a very vocal supporter, an ardent advocate on behalf of the Navy and our United States security. I had the privilege of sharing the dais with her on the Fourth of July, where there was a commemorative reading of the Declaration of Independence down in front of the 18th century courthouse on the Duke of Gloucester street, and she was eloquent. And so if I may invite you to the dais and you would please join me in welcoming Congressman Elaine Luria.

The Honorable Elaine G. Luria:

Good evening, and I said to Senator Norment on the way up, he set the expectations high that I be eloquent again. But it's my pleasure to join in welcoming you to the forum on the Future of Representative Democracy. My name is Elaine Luria, and I have the pleasure of representing Williamsburg in the US Congress. Whether you're from here or elsewhere in America or from outside our nation. We're glad that you're here with us to celebrate representative democracy and our long tradition of a government for the people. I want to thank American evolution, the College of William & Mary, and the many renowned speakers that we'll hear from over the next few days for making this conference possible. Learning from our history ensures a better future for America.

Virginia has played a key role in the development of America. Jamestown, Williamsburg, Yorktown were some of the sites of many of the events that led to the creation of our United States. The very ground that we are standing on is indeed the cradle of our nation. 400 years ago, on a hot and humid day, much like today, our first elected legislative assembly convened here in Jamestown. And today this is the oldest continuous lawmaking body in the new world, and it effectively established democracy in America.

This first Legislative Assembly created the foundation from which our democracy could build. And as our nation has grown, our democracy has evolved. And today we have a sacred responsibility to keep working towards a more perfect union. 400 years later, I am proud to be part of a Virginia congressional delegation that meets regularly across party lines and works together to find common ground but representative democracy should never be taken for granted. Today, let us reflect on how we can protect it for future generations.

I challenge you to be active participants in our democratic system. We must talk to and respect our fellow Americans with whom we disagree, because democracy requires compromise. Let's honor the first Legislative Assembly by renewing our commitment towards promoting and securing representative democracy. Our past can inform our future for a better tomorrow. Thank you so much for your time, enjoy this evening and the opportunity to visit Williamsburg and to participate in this forum to reflect on the foundations of our democracy.

The Honorable Thomas K. Norment, Jr.:

Congressman, thank you very much. For those of you that may have been in the Jamestown church early this morning when we started the commemorative session, we heard some eloquent remarks from Governor Yeardley. And he was surrounded with his six councilors who advised him during that period of 1619. And even Governor Yeardley, I think that he had a vision of

some comments that Prime Minister Disraeli was going to make some centuries thereafter, where he said that "In order for remarks to be immortal, they do not have to be eternal."

So consequently, what we are going to do at this point after we have heard from the president of the College, the president of the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Speaker Cox, myself, our two Congressman, we're going to take a brief respite and you can enjoy the libations before we convene in the Virginia room for some further comments and a delectable dinner. So thank all of you very much for participating in this portion of the program.

We're going to start the evening hearing from two remarkable leaders who are incredibly well known to everyone in the Commonwealth of Virginia, if not around the country. And of course, I am referring to our two United States senators from the Commonwealth of Virginia. We all owe them a great deal of gratitude and appreciation this evening. They shared with me that they have just flown down from Washington DC and almost immediately upon conclusion of their comments, even perhaps before they can digest the salad, they have to return to Washington DC because the Senate and the Congress are now considering their modest budget.

And for those of us that work on state government we know the pressures of a budget. I cannot even imagine the stress that they are dealing with in Washington DC. But it is so incredibly important that our two United States senators be there to put their imprint on that budget and to advocate for those issues that are so critically important to the Commonwealth of Virginia. Obviously, I know both of these gentlemen very well. I've had the privilege of serving with them in the legislative branch, when they were the chief executive officers of the Commonwealth of Virginia and serving as governors.

There are many, many things that we work together on and reached across the aisle and I think accomplished some extraordinary things that have improved the quality of life for all Virginians. Yes, there may be some that say, "We don't agree on everything." And that's perfectly all right. That is part of the legislative process, that if we have a meaningful exchange of dialogue and the exchange of ideas and work towards a compromise, I think you'll always come out with a better product at the end of it.

The first gentleman that I would like to introduce to you is my good friend, who I've known for many, many years. And that is Senator Timothy Kaine. All of you may have known about the servant's heart that Tim Kaine has demonstrated over his entire life. He was elected as the mayor of Richmond, Virginia in 1998 and moved the capital of Virginia forward in so many ways. He was elected as the 70th Lieutenant Governor in the Commonwealth of Virginia and served with distinction between 2006 and 2010 and missed most of my parliamentary maneuvers which he must feel very blessed about. Excuse me, he was elected as governor of Virginia, I'm sorry, in 2006 through 2010 and then Senate in 2013.

Some of you may recall that even though Tim has been a bipartisan democrat, that his father-in-law Linwood Holton was the first Republican governor elected in the Commonwealth of Virginia and has been a revered political figure since then. Recently his wife was named as the

interim president I believe of George Mason University, and she's starting to outshine you, Mr. Senator, on that.

But Senator Kaine is known for many things, and they were very nice to give me some notes, but let me tell you the things that I remember about Senator Kaine. One was back in April of 2007, and if I recall correctly, he was on his way to Japan. And we received the horrific news of the tragedy that took place at Virginia Tech.

The plane turned around and Governor Kaine returned to Blacksburg, Virginia, where extemporaneously he delivered some of the most eloquent and moving and heartfelt remarks that I think I have ever heard from a public servant. And for those of you who may not have heard those remarks, I suggest to you that you go on the internet and observe them, because it will be a quality experience and well worth your time. That was not such a joyous occasion, and it is an incident that still haunts us to this very day.

But not so very long after that, about 30 days later on May the 13th of 2007, I had the privilege of being with Senator Tim Kaine not too very far from here, down at Jamestown as we were undertaking the commemoration of the 400th anniversary of the founding of America. And it was an extraordinary day with many educational programs and some entertainment programs. And I recall very vividly what took place that evening because Senator Kaine, I still have the picture on my wall in my office in the General Assembly of Tim Kaine, Bruce Hornsby, and Ricky Skaggs on the stage together. Now as they were harmonizing, and Tim Kaine was playing the harmonica with the exuberance that is just marvelous. And that is a recollection that I have very vividly in my mind.

So if you would please join me in welcoming the former 70th governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia, but one of our esteemed and outstanding United States Senators, Tim Kaine.

### **Recalling Our Past; Envisioning Our Future**

**The Honorable Timothy M. Kaine, United States Senator from Virginia**

**The Honorable Mark R. Warner, United States Senator from Virginia**

The Honorable Timothy M. Kaine:

Thank you so very much. Thank you. I want to thank my friend Tommy [Norment] for his kind words and his long-time friendship. I said to him when I came up, "The best thing about that musical performance [during America's Anniversary Weekend in 2007] is they turned my microphone down." So you're right, I was playing [the harmonica] enthusiastically, but I was not subjecting the crowd to a musical amateurism.

This is such a treat to be here with friends: Speaker Cox, Tommy Norment, and so many good friends who are here. Senator Warner and I are happy to be here together, but as Senator Norment mentioned, Mark and I are voting this evening. John Warner remembers this very well, that you always know the votes that will take place on a day, you just don't know what time they will take place. And so we're sorry that we're with you just for the beginning, but we so wanted

to be with you, and the governor was kind enough to send his plane to bring us down and bring us back.

It is always good to be here in Williamsburg. As Tommy said, I have a very special feeling about this place. I was inaugurated here in 2006, and together so many of us welcomed Queen Elizabeth here in 2007. On each occasion, we commemorated, as we are commemorating tonight, Virginia's amazing history. In that case, it was the inauguration of the earliest governors in Williamsburg, Patrick Henry and Thomas Jefferson. And then the establishment of the English colony at Jamestown. But in each event, we not only talked about the past; we talked about how far we have come from our earliest days and especially about how far we have left to go.

Anniversaries like today's, when we commemorate 400 years of representative democracy, growing from the tiny acorn of its origin on Jamestown Island and the Virginia General Assembly, remind us of the words of William Faulkner: "the past isn't dead, it's not even past". And we know in Virginia that the past is full of immense pain and controversy. It's impossible to talk about where we have been without controversy. It's impossible to talk about where we are without controversy. It's impossible to talk about where we might be going without controversy.

There has been pain and controversy today due to heartfelt feelings about the participation of President Trump in these events. Some believe obviously that inviting a president to a celebration such as this, much as Teddy Roosevelt came to the Jamestown 300th Commemoration, or President George W. Bush to the 400th, is a natural extension of respect that we owe to the executive of the world's greatest democracy. Others believe that the current president evinces disrespect for democracy and particularly for the American form of liberal democracy in which minorities and immigrants are of course due respect equal to all others. And I am one, among many Virginians, who actually believe in both of the propositions that I just stated.

When the controversy arose, I thought first of the good people who had spent years, many of whom very close friends, organizing this commemoration. And I felt bad for them. Because no one wants to plan a celebration and then have it marred by a dispute. But the dispute is honest, and real, and appropriate. And it's directly connected to our commemoration of 400 years of messy, imperfect, but yes, representative democracy in Virginia and in the New World. The entire history of our Commonwealth and our country is the story of a gap, wider at times and narrower at others, between the perfect equality ideal articulated in the Declaration of Independence and the reality of a society unable to completely live by them.

That's the source of concern raised by groups like the Legislative Black Caucus: not disagreement with the president, which will always be the case, whatever the party of the president or whatever the party of Congress or legislators, but rather dread created when America's leader refuses to condemn white supremacy, even as it manifests itself in murderous hate in Virginia. In other words, the dispute is about the most fundamental among our principles. So you know, it would have been nice to have a commemoration free of any controversy, but who are we trying to kid? Is it realistic to think that a true accounting of 400 years of representative democracy could not court controversy?

The General Assembly, formed in 1619, has been engaged in one controversy after the next over four centuries. Beginning in the 17th century, the General Assembly played the pivotal role in creating the monstrous legal architecture of slavery in the English colonies. And we will grapple with that central fact of American life next month at Point Comfort, where “20 and odd” slaves arrived in August 1619. In the 18th century, this General Assembly helped create an American gift to the world, the notion that a person can worship or not in a manner of his or her own choosing, without being preferred or punished for that choice. And additionally, this General Assembly became pivotal in the ratification of the Bill of Rights to the American Constitution. In the 19th century, this General Assembly gathered in 1861 and created a convention that paved the way for Virginia seceding from the nation four months later. In the 20th century, this General Assembly first fought to maintain racial segregation in all areas of civic life, but then evolved and fought to become the first southern state to pass a law prohibiting discrimination in housing.

And in the 21st century, this General Assembly is deeply involved in all the controversies of the day: abortion, the rights of LGBTQ persons, the Equal Rights Amendment, gun safety, our environment, immigration, the Affordable Care Act, the rights of labor, tax policy, and oh yes, disputes over specialty license plates. Lots and lots of bills about specialty license plates.

So a commemoration of four centuries of the General Assembly that was all celebration and good cheer would be hollow and it would be false. Because the General Assembly is a body that is defined by controversy. Is the General Assembly defined by controversy because of its inherent structure? No. Is the General Assembly a body defined by controversy because of unique characteristics of Virginians? No. It is a body defined by controversy because it is composed of human beings. And we human beings are a quarrelsome lot with vastly different perspectives, each of us with a unique mix of insight and imperfection and each of us capable of great accomplishment and great error.

In fact, a way to look at the General Assembly or any legislative democracy is that the body exists precisely because of our human differences, our failures, and our injustices. The General Assembly, or a legislative democracy, is an attempt to structure dialogue about our disputes and our challenges and our problems. Because people disagree with each other, we need a forum and we need a structure where human controversies can be civilly, one can always hope, discussed and resolved, at least for the time being. And a legislative body that is unwilling to address controversy or redress injustice would have no purpose.

The title settled on for the Virginia legislative body captures this notion. The General Assembly. General means common. It is an open and inclusive word, even as the membership in this body has been anything but open and inclusive for much of its history. Assembly just means gathering. It's not a stuffy word, it's not a formal word. Common people gather periodically to do their best in establishing the rules by which we live. There is no guarantee that the body will act wisely. But the most important thing is that the body is continuous, meaning that the mistakes of today can always be corrected tomorrow.

When I was governor, and I wonder if Mark had the same experience, it was common for the General Assembly to put about 1,000 bills on my desk by the end of the legislative session. And I would have the opportunity to sign them, amend them, or veto them. In my first year as governor, as I was undergoing that rigorous process, I noticed that only a small portion of the bills were new laws. The vast majority were amendments or fixes or improvements to existing laws by fixing mistakes through incremental improvements, a part of our ongoing evolution. So many mistakes have been made and then corrected by the Virginia General Assembly, by Congress, by everyday people. So many mistakes await correction still. This shall always be so. The mistakes of the General Assembly in 2119, when Tommy Norment will be leading the 500th commemoration of the General Assembly, those mistakes will need correction from succeeding General Assemblies.

I conclude with the words of another writer, Faulkner's Irish contemporary, Samuel Beckett. "Ever tried, ever failed. No matter. Try again, fail again. Fail better." May God ever give us, the General Assembly, Virginians, Americans, the courage to try, the humility to recognize our mistakes, and the resolve to keep trying and keep improving. Thank you.

The Honorable Thomas K. Norment, Jr.:

Senator Kaine, back on May the 13th of 2007 during that musical rendition, it may have been very appropriate for them to cut your microphone off on that harmonica, but we did not cut your microphone off tonight. You're absolutely melodious in your presentation, and I thank you for it. I am a little perplexed though in the 28 years that I've been in the General Assembly I can't recall one mistake that I made, but yet you vetoed every bill that ever got across your desk with my name on it. And the temptation for retribution this evening, while it is tempting, I shall not do. And I would say to you, and I mean this, friends, very sincerely, where they may be what you termed as a gap in our political approach towards governance on some issues, there has never been a gap in our friendship, and for that I value it very much.

And speaking of friends, I was remiss as I looked out on table A3 and I saw the Honorable John Warner who served us for so many years in the United States Senate. Senator, welcome back, and it's indeed a pleasure to see you, my friend.

One of the things I recall during Senator John Warner's illustrious career is that he always made things crystal clear. The clarity of trying to deal with things.

And one of the things that made life very easy for me particularly when I get to the dais and have moments of seniority is that we had another Warner that was elected. At least I could keep the same name right with the predicate of Senator in front of it. And of course, I'm speaking to another very dear friend and I mean that sincerely, Mark Warner.

Anyone that has followed Mark Warner's career knows that he's been incredibly successful in life. He was a successful investor and a successful entrepreneur, successful state party chairman (which I haven't forgiven you yet for, Mark), a successful governor. Governor Warner was elected in 2001 and served through 2002 through 2006, and in 2008, was elected to the United States Senate.

Governor Warner and I had the privilege of working on many things together. And one of the issues that stands out in my mind was a vivid reminder of the tenacity of Senator Warner. He came up with the idea of a new approach on tax reform in the Commonwealth of Virginia. And he took something that I was totally unfamiliar with called a PowerPoint presentation, and he went around the state with his PowerPoint presentation, trying his best to convince Virginians of the need to adopt a new form of tax reform.

Senator Warner, I have to thank you. In my office, I still have the poster where I supported you on that one half a cent sales tax increase where I was on the most wanted list in Virginia. But it was the right thing to do, and while there may still be some debates about it, as a result of that policy decision on tax issues, I think that we have improved the quality of life in Virginia, in education and public service, and health and human resources. Doesn't mean that we don't continue to evolve, but you certainly left your imprint on that. So I say to you, my good friend, while you were the only governor to put me on a poster, I still embrace your friendship with great affection. Thank you for your leadership, particularly on the Intelligence Committee where you are the vice chairman and are a continued voice of reason. So, ladies and gentlemen, if you would please welcome my dear friend, the senior senator from the Commonwealth of Virginia, Mark Warner.

The Honorable Mark R. Warner:

Mr. Majority Leader, Tommy, thank you for those comments. I would also remind you that that vote you took along with folks from both parties in this room also helped earn Virginia the recognition of being the best managed state, the best state for business, and the best state for public education. So even if it did gain you a certain spot on Grover Norquist's poster, I think you should carry that with a great deal of pride.

Let me also just say, I am very honored to be here. But I am a little tired after 25 years in Virginia politics that every time I'm in the same room with John Warner, he gets the better of it. So, John, it is great to see you. Thank you for your years of friendship, mentorship. I appreciate that.

I want to also acknowledge and recognize that we have another great Virginia senator and former governor, my dear friend, George Allen and his lovely wife Susan. George, thank you. We also have members of the House here. Remember, they have the long recess. We in the Senate are still working. And you made mention of the fact, Tommy, at the beginning that Tim and I had a challenge of getting here and we have to get off and head back in that Governor's plane, and boy, don't you miss that, Tim. But we knew it was going to be a challenge. But neither Tim nor I were brave enough to incur the wrath of Ben Dendy.

So we are very, very happy to be here, and to be again with so many great Virginians who've helped build our Commonwealth in so many extraordinary ways over many, many, many years. So tonight, we commemorate the anniversary of our democracy, and I've been asked to consider a little bit about its past and our future.

Now, as Tim went through, and I know other speakers today and tomorrow, we face significant threats today, but we have actually since our founding. We have come to the brink of disintegration more than once. Yet the truth is American democracy has endured almost a quarter of a millennium. The Speaker knows not many governments can claim that.

And at every stage of our history, we have been tested either by foreign adversaries, internal divisions, or technological changes. And in each and every step, I believe we've been tempted to depart from the path our Constitution still chartered so well towards a more perfect union.

Now there are shelves full of books, analyzing the how and why we survived those upheavals, threats, and even internal divisions. But I would observe that if you look through all of those challenges, at its core, whenever we have been confronted, what has gotten us through has been our faith and trust in our democratic institutions. The notion that we are a country with free elections, the notions that our founders had an enormous brilliance in creating a system of representative government with three branches and a whole unique set of checks and balances. And through thick and thin, we all acknowledge and respected that we all had to live with a certain amount of respect for rule of law and our Constitution.

Now, we face threats going forward. But I would argue, not only is our democracy worth defending, it requires defending if we're going to pass it on to future generations. Now, the truth is and why we should take great pride is Virginians, whether born or like me adopted as a Virginian, so many of the ideas that birthed our country's democracy actually originated right here in the Commonwealth long before our country was even founded.

And they have ultimately produced this enduring union. A union that with all our challenges, I believe, is still continually engaged in the pursuit of justice and shared American values.

So tonight, we celebrate that rich 400-year tradition. We celebrate what I think is the principle of our democratic republic. And this doesn't matter whether you're a Democrat, Republican, Independent, Libertarian or even vegetarian. And that is the notion that in our democratic republic, the power flows from the people to the government, and not the other way around.

But as Tim acknowledged, and I think the president did, and I think the governor did earlier, as we celebrate tonight, we also have to recognize and consider all of our history, the good, the bad, and the ugly. Representative democracy has endured in Virginia and the United States for centuries. But it looks a lot different today, and I believe for the good, than it looked centuries ago.

So while we celebrate 400 years of representative democracy, if we look at democracy in America in 2019, we've got to acknowledge that the democracy we have today represents literally millions of people who the framers never actually intended to have the fruits of democracy, whether it be women, African Americans, Native Americans, those without property, just to name a few.

And the truth is that our democracy that represents all of those voices isn't quite so old. Matter of fact, for many, that full voice in representative democracy may be only decades old. The 400th Commemoration confronts us as well with this uncomfortable truth. The year that 400 years ago planted the seeds of democracy here in America, as Tim and others have mentioned, also was the same year that the first enslaved Africans came to our country.

And throughout our history, and even today, America's original sin I believe has stood in the way of us fully living up to the values that we celebrate tonight. That we need to acknowledge at different times, Virginia has not only been the mother of presidents, but also the capital of the Confederacy, the home of massive resistance and the birthplace of Barbara Johns, who had the courage to take that on even as a young person. Now while our nation's struggles with race illustrate the defects that we've not yet resolved, the fact is on the overarching of our history, it is always moving towards justice. And I think we all need to continue to commit ourselves to that theme.

Candidly, from where I sit in the United States Senate, particularly in the role, my role as vice chairman of the Intelligence Committee, we face significant challenges in 2019. Around the world, authoritarian and anti-democratic regimes seek to dislodge the United States from its position of leadership in the world. For the first time, the very internal workings of our democracy were attacked by a foreign nation in 2016. And that attack showed in many ways the vulnerabilities our system has, posed by cyber and informational warfare. I fear at times that faith amongst the great number of our American fellow citizens in our democracy for many is at an all-time low.

Meanwhile, an ascendant China has a clear plan that they have articulated, go look at the China 2025 document, to end American economic and technological dominance. These and other regimes are in effect offering a competing model to nations around the world, and a model that emphasizes surveillance of its people, an authoritarian form of business leadership, and a complete rejection of the notions of freedom and democracy that we celebrate tonight.

And the truth is, the past few years have made clear that I believe we're at a crossroads. And how we respond is going to judge us for future generations. But again, with the benefit of a 400-year anniversary, we can look back and see that we've faced similar challenges. When we think about the notion of America at its founding, think about how radical the notion in a world 400 years ago, where the governing philosophy of every, virtually every industrial nation was at the divine right of kings.

Think how audacious it was that a group of Americans, led mostly by a group of Virginians, had the notional idea of representative democracy. When we think about the questions that we're asking constantly, it seems like the television every time, "What does it mean to be an American? Who is an American? Where do they come from?" Well, that is again, not a new issue. That tension has been tested time and again since Adams and Jefferson's battle over the Alien and Sedition Act.

We've seen as well in the 20th century anti-democratic philosophies like fascism and communism. But in every case, it was democracy that prevailed, I believe at the end of the day, because of our values. But the threats we face are not only ideological or in terms of foreign powers, we also face enormous changes in our life. Over the past few decades, our economy and society have undergone major changes due to globalization and changing technologies. For many Americans, 2019 seems almost unrecognizable.

But once again, if we look back at our history, we've been there before. I think if you think about 400 years ago, the idea of America as a colony was one of the very first acts of globalization. And yet we came through all of that. And the truth is, our democracy has had no other alternative, but to constantly adapt to changing technologies that have disrupted American life, from electricity and railroads, to radio and television, and now to social media.

Let me say as somebody who has been wrestling with these issues on a regular basis, and there's nothing Democrat or Republican about them or liberal or conservative, they really are issues I think that are more framed in the sense of future versus past. I do have worries. Some of the challenges we face in 2019, many of them wrought by technology, are of a nature that we've never seen before.

Today in America, over 65% of all Americans get all of their news from Facebook and Google. There are more Americans that on a daily basis get their news from Facebook and Google and other social media platforms than all the Americans who get their news from newspapers and television combined.

And the truth is, the internal workings of these platforms and the algorithms that drive them can oftentimes, as we've seen and increasingly, I'm afraid, we will see more unless we put some rules of the road in place, these algorithms can be manipulated by adversaries, both foreign and domestic, who at the end of most days don't want to actually bring us together, but use these tools of information to spread falseness, to spread the most extreme voices on both the left and the right. And for many, at least in terms of the foreign adversaries, their goal is nothing more than to pit one American against another.

We've seen as well vulnerabilities in our voting machines, in our voting systems. I believe we need to make sure and try to unite around the idea that our election infrastructure is as vital to our democracy as our power grids and other assets, and they ought to be treated with that same type of respect and protection in a non-partisan way.

We also have to make sure that our economy is resilient enough to withstand the changes brought about by technology. I've been spending a lot of time again, particularly Secretary Gates, focused on the emergence of China and seeing the delta between our spend and their spend on issues like artificial intelligence, 5G, quantum computing, automation. There are great opportunities in each of these changes. But there's also the possibility that these changes could leave wide swaths of Americans behind. And the fact is, we've got to make sure, and I say this with some trepidation in this audience, as someone who has benefited from our economic system, and I think when it works at its best, there's been no system that has brought more people

out of poverty than capitalism. But I worry at times that too often, too many, in modern American capitalism today focus on short term, quarter to quarter value, rather than long term value creation. And that's not a system that can survive.

And finally, as the Commonwealth reminds us, we continue to face unresolved tensions around issues of race and identity that aren't going to go away. That we have to engage with directly if our democracy's going to survive. Now, I've got ideas on all of those, but I'm not going to offer you, unlike some of my 25 friends who are running for president, tonight my plan on those. You can tune in later tonight.

But I would argue that if we strip away the specific policy plans, that our framers again gave us some pretty good tools in the forms of representative democracy. We think just back over our history, time and again, people who've been marginalized in our society have demanded a seat at the table. And now in our representative bodies, both here in Virginia and in Congress, and we've got a ways to go, but our representative bodies look more like Virginia and more like America than they ever have in the past. And I think that's a good thing. The fact is, as well, the genius of a checks and balance system. We could have set up another system. Parliamentary systems work all right. And those systems if you win, you get to run the show until you get to lose.

But our founders set up something different. This notion of an independent Senate, an independent House, an independent president, and if anything was going to work, we'd all have to figure out ways to work together. Candidly, where I work, we've not been doing a very good job. Richmond still does a better job on that. This is an area we have to improve upon. But getting it right, and I still would not trade away our system for another. To make sure that we move forward, I think we have to go back and choose leaders who embrace our democratic traditions and appeal, as Abraham Lincoln did, to our better angels of our nature. And that's always been that leaders in Virginia who've done that have served our Commonwealth the best.

We must defend with our words and our actions, as well, the notion that American patriotism is not rooted in race, region, or partisan identity, but in the sense of a common purpose and shared American values. Now, I believe that democracy has been and will continue to be the best system to move Virginia and America forward. I believe those were the ideas that formed the General Assembly 400 years ago.

And for those of you who've had the honor of serving in the Virginia General Assembly, I commend you for a job well done. We've got enormous challenges in front of us. But there is nothing that, if we stay true to these values, we can't succeed at as Virginians and Americans. Thank you so much for having me tonight. God bless you. God bless Virginia and God bless the United States of America.

The Honorable Thomas K. Norment, Jr.:

I learned a long time ago that being the speaker and the delivery of messages between you and a meal or you and a cocktail is never an envious position to be, but there is one other very, very important message I would like to share with you, and it is a very personal message. I mentioned to some of you today earlier that I grew up here in Williamsburg in a "townie" and I grew up in a

loving and very enduring family, but we were fairly modest, and frequently I had to take on employment in order to buy some of the goodies that I wanted as I was growing up. First job that I ever had was counting cars at the visitor center for Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. My job was to walk through the parking lot and mark down which state the cars were from. Fortunately, I progressed a little bit after that and my next job with the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation was a greener job.

I had the opportunity to work in the landscaping department and I was very fortunate to do that. When I graduated from Virginia Military Institute, I literally had no resources to go to law school, which I'd made a commitment to do and I was very blessed to be hired as what they then called a waiter but now known as servers at the Kings Arms Tavern in Colonial Williamsburg and the law school was so generous that I think they put me on the installment plan for the first semester's tuition, but I'm very, very appreciative of that which Colonial Williamsburg has afforded me over the years.

As I said, I've known seven of the eight presidents. Also the gentleman I'd like to share some remarks with you has been one of my dearest friends and I think one of the great examples of leadership in this community, and he was individually responsible for me reaching an opportunity that I never even dreamed of as I was counting cars, cutting grass or waiting tables, and that was to go on the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation Board of Trustees with many, many esteemed individuals that have served there.

Along with the executive committee members I recognize at this reception, there is a gentleman that has been incredibly instrumental in the planning for this event, crafting the program, recruiting speakers, and much, much more this evening. We had planned to make a very special presentation to him before some health issues challenged him, and it made it impossible for him to join us here in Williamsburg this evening. But I am prayerful that he and his wife are watching online as we stream this.

I'm referring of course to our dear friend and my personal friend Colin Campbell, the former president of the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, and before that the president of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, and before that the president of Wesleyan University. When you think about leaders that made our 400th year of democracy strong, you think about some of the same qualities that Colin Campbell exhibited during his presidency here at Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. Always a gentleman, a fierce patriot, a scholar, a public servant, and a trusted leader.

They do not manufacture in mass individuals like Colin Campbell on a machine. He is a true American original and one of a kind. Truly a unique individual, especially in the context of our community. It has been the great privilege of many of us here and many thousands of others to work alongside of him and to soak in his infectious enthusiasm, to see him put principles into practice and to see his servant's heart at work. Remarkably, he worked quietly, frequently letting others take credit and not wanting a lot of accolades made over him. But I can tell you personally that he has made an enormous positive impact on the life of this community, the life of this Republic, and the life of this commemoration.

So I say to you Colin and Nancy if you're watching now or if you subsequently see this later, please know that we extend an enormous thank you. We miss you and we miss you and wish you a full and speedy recovery. God bless your family.

Now if I was still a server, I would be running out with the next portion of our dinner. Thank you all so very much.

The Honorable M. Kirkland Cox:

We have a very special program to conclude the evening's festivities. Before I introduce our keynote speaker, however, let me recognize several folks in the audience this evening. First, President Rowe recognized him earlier this evening. On behalf of the 2019 Commemoration, I want to formally welcome and thank the Chancellor of William & Mary and the great American leader, former Secretary of Defense Robert Gates, Secretary Gates.

Also present this evening and participating in our program tomorrow is a former Transportation Secretary, former White House chief of staff, and current chair of the National Endowment of Democracy, Andrew Card and Mrs. Card.

The Jamestown Colony was first and foremost an entrepreneurial investment. It was a startup. And like many startups, it almost failed. But then along came a visionary Englishman named Sir Edwin Sandys. And with the great charter of 1618, the colony's whole system was overhauled. One of the reforms accomplished through the new charter was the creation of the legislative assembly in the colony, the seminal event that has brought us here this week. But another crucial reform was the beginning of a widespread private property ownership and the opening of the door to entrepreneurship. It was these later reforms that turned Jamestown from an economic basket case into an economic marvel. And the rest, as they say is history.

You may have noticed that all year long American Evolution's program focuses on three core values, democracy, diversity and opportunity. Rightly so today we've heard a lot about democracy and diversity.

The commemoration also salutes the core value of opportunity because over time, those economic reforms combined with the extension of political freedoms to make America the land of opportunity we know today. There are few people in America who are better qualified to speak to us on the subject of democracy and entrepreneurship and the relationship between economic and political freedoms than Carly Fiorina, our keynote speaker this evening.

Her business experience spans from secretary to CEO, from public to private, and from profit to nonprofit. She was the first woman to lead a Fortune 50 company, and under her leadership at Hewlett Packard, growth quadrupled, and HP became the 11th largest company in the United States.

But she's done so much more. Since leaving HP she is focused on giving back. She's the founder and chairman of Unlocking Potential, a nonprofit that supports local leaders resolving problems

in their communities. She's also founded the One Woman Initiative in partnership with Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice to engage and empower women in Pakistan, Egypt, India, and the Philippines through increased access to economic opportunity. For public service, including chairing the CIA's external advisory board after 9/11. And of course, the unbelievably arduous undertaking of a campaign for president of the United States. On a personal note, she's absolutely the best debater I've ever heard. To top it all off, she's a bestselling author, though I have no clue now how she finds time to write also.

You can see from this record of leadership in business, politics, and community service that Carly Fiorina literally personifies one of Jamestown's greatest legacies, the revolutionary idea that when talent and creative genius are unleashed in a system of politically and economic freedom, the result is limitless opportunity, the very definition of the American dream. Please welcome Carly Fiorina.

### **Democracy and Entrepreneurship**

#### **Carly Fiorina, CEO of Hewlett-Packard (1995–2005) and Founder and Chair of Carly Fiorina Enterprises and Unlocking Potential**

Carly Fiorina:

Thank you and good evening.

Audience:

Good evening.

Carly Fiorina:

Thank you and good evening. I am well aware, as your after-dinner speaker, that you have heard lots of wonderful speeches, all day long, and indeed many wonderful speeches this evening. And so as I was thinking about bringing up the rear, so to speak, as your after-dinner entertainment, the words of advice of my 6th grade teacher, Mr. Cross, came to mind. When Mr. Cross would assign us a paper, we would all ask him, "How long should it be?" And Mr. Cross would say, "Long enough to cover the subject, short enough to be interesting." I hope I will follow his advice.

I want to begin tonight on a point of personal privilege, if I may. I'd also like to add my thanks to three people who have been special in my arrival here tonight. The first is Colin Campbell. I first met Colin Campbell when I began my service as a Trustee on the Board here at Colonial Williamsburg. And it is Colin who first called me during the planning of this event. His passion for the preservation of history is truly inspiring, and his leadership of Colonial Williamsburg is legendary. And I know we all wish both Colin and Nancy [Campbell] the very, very best. I spoke with him earlier this afternoon, and he so wished he could be with all of us.

Thanks as well go to our current CEO here at Colonial Williamsburg, Mitchell Reiss, whose strong leadership has been very important in consequential times here. And finally, I'd also like to thank Frank Atkinson, who was very helpful to me in preparing for this evening.

My grandmother was a Virginian, and although I was born in Texas and most people think of me as a Californian, in fact I moved to Virginia in 1982, I met my husband Frank, who is right down there in front, here, and we raised our family here. And Frank and I returned to Virginia about 8 years ago. This is the place where I have always felt most at home, and so as a Virginian, it's really a special honor for me to be asked to speak with you tonight.

As you've heard so often today, Virginia and Virginians have been at the very center of our national experience. Powhatan Indians, English men and women, enslaved Africans, all of their descendants, all of the many, many people - native born, immigrants, or transplant - who have worked and struggled and strived and succeeded here over the generations. Famous names and unsung heroes alike, the people of Virginia have made history.

All around us, from that first landing in Jamestown to the present day, the most momentous events in our shared history have occurred here. Virginia is the place where both democracy and slavery were born. Virginia was the heartbeat of both the Revolutionary and the Civil Wars. It is a place famous for the soaring oratory that founded a nation and a symbol of Jim Crow segregation and oppression.

And in the tension of that searing contradiction, between liberty and enslavement, Virginia has always been a crucible for an ideal, that we are all created equal. And that we are all endowed by God, not government, with certain inalienable rights, among them, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Faced with both the heroes and the horrors of our history, we are tempted so often to simplify the past or to focus only on those elements that serve a particular rhetorical or political purpose. Overlooking their all too human contradictions and failures, we place some people on lofty pedestals while completely ignoring others. In the end, however, when the full truth about a historical figure or historic event is inevitably revealed, these efforts to shade our history rather than fully reveal it breed cynicism or indifference or resentment. And that is a great loss.

The surging popularity of genealogy or apps like 23andMe speak to the deep, intuitive longing by all of us to understand who we are by learning about who and what came before us. We can never fully understand the present. And therefore we cannot effectively face the future unless we fully understand the past.

As a Trustee here at Colonial Williamsburg, I have the privilege of serving with many notable people. Among them is the renowned historian Edward Ayers, and he has this to say, and I quote, "Nostalgia for the past and a love of history are not the same thing. Nostalgia dims and diminishes the past by softening its contours. History honors the past by taking its struggles seriously."

And so tonight, as we have today and as you will over the next few days, let us speak of our history and what it means to our present and our future. Concerned by the economic success of the Spaniards in exploiting the New World to the south and the incursions of the French to the

north, the English monarchy decided it was time to catch up. And so the Crown granted to the Virginia Company a charter to explore the New World. And so, as you know, in 1607, 104 men and boys arrived on three sailing ships and established Jamestown.

By the winter of 1608 and 1609, dissension, disease, and death had decimated the settlement to just one survivor. And so, faced with abysmal failure, the Virginia Company asked the Crown for a new charter. They realized that the people actually living in Jamestown were in a better position to choose the best course of action than people that sat an ocean and a literal world away.

The Company's goal in this new charter was to establish local lines of authority and local decision-making. The charter, granted in 1609, called for a sole governor, advised by counselors appointed by the Crown. The first Governor, Sir Thomas West, arrived in 1610. He decided everything about daily life, from how often men were to attend worship services, twice a day, to the punishment for every transgression, large or small. The governor's code, lest you doubted his authority, was called "Lawes Divine, Morall, and Martial." His power was absolute and his authority was unquestioned.

In 1612, tobacco was introduced to Jamestown, and this cash crop became profitable. Nevertheless, Jamestown continued to disappoint its investors. Disease, malnutrition, death were ever present. Potential colonists and investors were attracted by other places, like the West Indies and Bermuda. The promise of a harsh life dictated by the harsh laws of a near-dictator wasn't very appealing to other potential colonists or investors.

In other words, to compete and succeed, Jamestown needed an overhaul. In 1618, Sir Edwin Sandys of the Virginia Company, as you heard Kirk mentioned, created what is known as the "Great Charter." And this new charter dramatically reduced the power of the Governor and created the General Assembly, whose members, the burgesses, would be elected by the people, represent the people, and enact laws on behalf of the people.

And the Great Charter, as you also heard mentioned, introduced property ownership. It did so to spur growth. Any investor who came to Jamestown would be awarded 100 acres of land. And adventurers, who paid their own passage to Jamestown, were to be granted 50 acres and an additional 50 acres for any additional person they brought along with them.

1619, the year we are here to celebrate, was indeed a momentous year. Because both the political and economic reforms of the Great Charter were implemented. The General Assembly held its first meeting 400 years ago today. Property ownership for the first time could be purchased or earned. The first women settlers arrived, and so now, men were no longer simply working for wages from the Virginia Company. Men and women were working for themselves, for their families, and for their futures. And so began representative democracy and entrepreneurship, foundations upon which the strength and the wealth of this nation have been built.

In truth, economic necessity forced political and economic freedoms to achieve economic gain. Power had to be relinquished, and risks had to be taken.

And of course also in 1619, the first enslaved Africans arrived, bound in chains, for the entirety of their journey across an ocean, in the literal hellhole of the slave ship. And while we know from contemporaneous accounts that many residents of Jamestown were truly horrified by unspeakably cruel treatment endured by these new arrivals, we also know that investors recognized that this new source of labor could ensure manpower for the increasingly lucrative but very labor intensive tobacco crops. And so also here began the normalization of the idea that some are more human than others and the institutionalization of human slavery. And this shame of our nation also built a great deal of the wealth of our nation and entwined itself in our social fabric.

I studied history and philosophy in college, and I remember well reading Plato for the first time. Plato observed that ideals and principles can feel abstract because we cannot touch them or talk with them or observe them. Against the bright colors, the loud noises, the hurly-burly distractions of the real world, ideals and principles can feel as faint and as silent as flickering shadows cast by firelight in a cave.

And yet, Plato said, ideals and principles are real and powerful. They can drive change. When insight into what feeds the human spirit and experience about what works in the real world are combined with principles and ideals, then the world can change.

And this interplay between practicality and ideals is America's story. Practicality and idealism are our gift to the world.

So what practical, real world fundamentals can we distill from the early history of Jamestown? I think there are four, and I think we all know them to be true.

First, the people closest to the problem know best how to solve it. Decision-making far away in England just didn't work. Only someone in Jamestown, familiar with what was happening here, could make the necessary and sound decisions. This is so obvious - the people closest to the problem know best how to solve it - but we so frequently forget it in life. Whenever I have encountered a festering problem, whether in a team or a business or in a community, I have always begun by asking the people most impacted by that problem and therefore [who] know it best what they would do. And whether or not they have titles or positions or power, those people closest to the problem always, always have good ideas about how to make things better. Sadly, we so often fail to ask them.

Second, power concentrated is power abused and potential squandered. The power concentrated in a single governor was abused to dictate every aspect of life. The exercise of that power ultimately failed. Faced with no ability to influence outcomes, potential investors saw inadequate payoff for their risk and their effort. Resentment over harsh conditions and a lack of control over their own lives meant the people of Jamestown saw no stake in their future, and they applied less than their full energy, motivation, and creativity to the challenges at hand. Potential new settlers were going somewhere else.

Sometimes we try to convince ourselves that if power is only concentrated in good hands or the right hands, then it will not be abused, and the best outcomes will be achieved. Both business experience and political history teach us otherwise. Pure motives, good intentions, and even promising beginnings cannot change the reality that no group of few people is smart enough or capable enough to make all the myriad of right decisions on behalf of the many. And the exercise of that power becomes an end in itself. It is why so often the driving purpose of the powerful becomes self-preservation. And eventually, when the many have grown frustrated enough, they check out, move on, or rebel.

Third, people will not achieve their full potential and perform at their best unless they are working for their own benefit, not just for someone else's. Ambition, energy, creativity, and hard work are in direct proportion for all of us to how much stake someone has in the outcome of their efforts. If my efforts cannot impact my future, then why waste my efforts? If I have no stake in my future, why build it?

A corollary is what we learn when land was granted to anyone who paid their own passage to America. It is hard to predict someone else's success. People have more potential than we can see by looking at them or their current circumstances. Someone needs to take a chance on all of us.

Economists disagree about many things. Whither goest interest rates? When will the next recession come? But all economists agree on one thing: when more people participate in an economy, because they have a stake in the fruits of their labor, the more economic growth is achieved. I have learned over and over again that everyone has more potential than they or we realize. In the right circumstances, people can amaze and surprise you with their capacity. The best leaders are those who know that success is achieved always by unlocking potential in others. Indeed, this is a leader's highest calling.

And finally, fourth, our own self-interest, particularly our economic interest, can blind us to the suffering of others and cause us to ignore both our principles and what we know to be true. Perhaps the very real fear of starvation and loss of life in Jamestown made it easier to ignore the cruelties of slavery. So often, the fear of losing something makes it easier to demonize or dehumanize someone else.

People closest to the problem know best how to solve it. Power concentrated is power abused. People need a stake in their own lives to achieve their full potential, and when people apply their best efforts, we all benefit and growth is achieved. We are all human, and therefore, flawed. Our fears - of loss, of power, of wealth, of status, or way of life - can cause us to look the other way and ignore self-evident truths. These fundamentals have forged our nation.

Our Constitution and Bill of Rights recognized the importance of local decision-making and hence enshrined state's rights. Because New York should no more tell Virginia what to do than England could. The federal government was given important, enumerated, but limited powers, so that power concentrated in the nation's capital should not be abused. Three branches of

government were designed to achieve checks on that power and balance between centers of power.

Inspired by their own experiences of building their own life and a future for themselves, and lifted up as well by philosophers like Locke, Hobbes, Rousseau, Montesquieu, and others, immortal words were written by the inheritors of the lessons of Jamestown: that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, among these life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. They formed a government, of the people, by the people, and for the people. Once liberty and self-determination are tasted, they are very hard to relinquish.

Entrepreneurialism was born here, and entrepreneurs of all kinds flourished here. They built businesses and invented new ones. And people have always come from all over the world to do the same. Immigration and entrepreneurship founded our nation and continue to sustain it.

And of course the contradiction between inspiring words and limitless opportunity for some and the reality of enslavement for others was always obvious and became more and more glaring as time went on. Before the Constitutional Convention in 1767, Arthur Lee wrote in the Virginia Gazette, "Freedom is unquestionably the birthright of all mankind, of Africans as well as Europeans." Many enslaved people resisted and inspired others to do the same.

Virginians had been at the heart of that resistance throughout our nation's history, from the 17th century to the present day, whether engaging in work stoppage on a plantation or a rebellion or engaging in a sit-in at a segregated counter or a protest.

And throughout our history as well people of goodwill have strived to rise above our divisions and applied both our common sense experience and our inspiring ideals to build a better, more prosperous future for everyone.

Diversity, democracy, opportunity: these are the themes of this commemoration, for good reason. Despite all of our flaws and contradictions, diversity, democracy, and opportunity have built this nation. We know that people closest to the problem know best how to solve it. We know that power concentrated is power abused. We know that talent, creativity, the capacity for hard work, ensured potential, are not determined by someone's past or where one comes from or what one looks like. We know that when someone is willing to take a risk and make an investment of time, energy, money, they should have a stake in the future they help create, and that economic and political freedom go hand in hand. We have always been a practical people.

The story of Jamestown reminds us of other truths as well that are important. Lasting change does not happen all at once. Positive change always happens from the ground up, driven by people trying to make a better life. Smaller, incremental experiences are important preparation for the groundbreaking declarations. Setback and failure can be as clarifying as progress and success. Leaders are not always those with enormous power or lofty positions. Leaders are those who change the order of things for the better, wherever they are. And those leaders come in all sizes, shapes, colors, and kinds and from many different circumstances.

When we are at our best, our ideals and principles are shaped by these fundamental truths about all people, gained through experience. And when we fall short, our ideals and principles help guide us to a better path. Here in this country, more things have been more possible for more people of all kinds, from more places, than anywhere else on earth.

This is not nostalgia. These are the facts of our history. Our economy, powered by the idea that anyone can have a stake in the future by taking a risk and making an investment, has driven the economy of the world. Our representative government has inspired the world. This is the only country in the world, and indeed in all of human history, founded not on ethnicity or territory or religion, but instead on a unique combination of practical experience and inspiring ideas.

On a smaller scale, for each of us in our own lives, let us carry Jamestown forward. When we are disappointed by a lack of progress on the national stage, look for inspiration in what is happening in our own communities. When we grow frustrated by people in power who seem to have forgotten those they serve, we should look for those real leaders all around us who change the order of things for the better right where they are. When setbacks occur, learn the lesson they teach and move forward. When problem solving falters, ask those who know the problem best for guidance.

And so, to someone who does not like history and doesn't know about Jamestown, to that someone who might ask, "What difference does Jamestown make?" --

Our answer tonight, over the next few days, and hopefully in the Commonwealth and in our nation going forward --

"What difference does the Jamestown of 400 years ago make?"

All the difference to you and me, and all the difference in the world. Thank you so very much and good night.

## **Welcome**

**The Honorable M. Kirkland Cox, Speaker of the House of Delegates of Virginia**

**The Honorable Thomas K. Norment, Jr., Majority Leader of the Senate of Virginia**

The Honorable M. Kirkland Cox:

Well, thank you so much, Dr. LaVeist, and a hearty welcome and thanks to all of you who are here today for what promises to be an excellent program. I want to begin the way good manners say to begin, by acknowledging and thanking our hosts for today's program. First, my co-chair for the commemoration and the Majority Leader of the Senate, Tommy Norment. He deserves a very rich round of applause. We will hear from him in a few moments.

Next, our senior volunteer leadership, the Executive Committee, members of American Evolution commemoration: Paul Koonce, George Martin, Jeanne Zeidler, Senator Ryan

McDougle, and especially... and I mean especially... the planning co-chairs for the Future of Democracy Forum, Frank Atkinson and Ben Dendy, who put in just countless hours, so let's give them a nice round of applause.

We will have an opportunity to thank our first-rate professional staff and consultants later in the program, but I want to acknowledge here the outstanding leadership of our 2019 Commemoration Executive Director, Kathy Spangler. And once again, Kathy has just put in endless hours. And the Executive Director of the host agency, the Jamestown-Yorktown Foundation, my good friend, Phil Emerson. Phil.

We appreciated the dedicated work of all our volunteers and professional team members who have made this event possible, and I want to call your attention to the back of your program booklet, where you will find a list of the planning group for this forum, so thanks to all of you. You get to applaud a lot early in the morning.

We also appreciate our wonderful host and partners for this program, the great team here at William & Mary. Senator Norment will be presenting President Katherine Rowe shortly for remarks, but please join me in thanking her and the fine team over at the university for making this excellent venue available to us, and for much other invaluable help.

Finally, in the front of your program, you will find the sponsors who have made not only this forum, but the entire commemoration, possible. Many of our sponsor representatives are here this morning or will be joining us during the course of these two days, so I want to welcome and salute them, and I know you will all join me in expressing our appreciation.

Some people save the thanks for last, but that is where I wanted to begin, because none of this would be possible without the people and organizations I have mentioned. And if I could, I do want to mention a few others. Ed Ferguson and Felipe Dickerson of the British Embassy; I look right out and see my really good friend from the Supreme Court, Justice Bill Mims, and I think we've also had at one time Elizabeth McClanahan and Cleo Powell, so I certainly want to thank of them; and also Congressman Bob Goodlatte, who's been with us a lot and so just want to make sure we give a shout-out to Congressman Goodlatte.

So it's been 400 years since representative government America began a few miles from here... amazing. One thing we know is that an awful lot can happen in 400 years. Over that time, Virginia has given the nation and the world a lot of leaders and a lot of leadership. Our first governor, Patrick Henry, stirred the people to revolution with his great cry, "Give me liberty or give me death," but he said a lot of other important things in that speech, too, and one of them is especially relevant to our business here today. He said, "I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided, and that is the lamp of experience. I know of no other way of judging the future but by the past."

We Virginians are sometimes taken to task for spending too much time looking back at the glory days gone by, so I have to tell a joke. How many Virginians does it take to screw in a light bulb? Answer: a dozen. One to screw in the bulb, and 11 to talk about how good the old bulb was. That

was not very good laughter. That's okay. We probably deserve that. But thank goodness we Virginians do take seriously our duty as stewards of America's most important memories, the people and the places, the events and the stories that give meaning to our national experience and provide that lamp that helps light our path forward.

We heard many wonderful reflections yesterday, but did you notice this? One thing no one said was how great things were 400 years ago. In fact, things started out rather badly. Jamestown, that first capital, was not the marble temple on a hill that Jefferson fashioned for us in Richmond. It was a place, frankly, of hardship, starvation, trial and error, some things right, and frankly, some things wrong. And yet, from that first flickering light came a glimpse of something better. It was the first faint glow of a very bright idea, the idea that people could govern themselves through their own freely chosen representatives.

Like so much of our history, that idea had to be worked over time... defined, refined, expanded, extended, and in a dangerous world, frankly, defended. How did this happen? The answer is that people came together much like we are doing here today, to seek and find a better way forward. They reflected on what had gone before, on the lessons of history, and their own experience. They expressed their views and listened to the views of others, and more often than not, they debated and disagreed often vigorously before they found ground for compromise and consensus.

As iron sharpens iron, the proverb says, so one person sharpens another. It is in that spirit that here in this forum, and in yesterday's programs, and all throughout this commemoration year, we have welcomed a range of voices and a variety of perspectives to discussion. Our national journey, our American evolution, has never been about preaching to the choir, nor has it been about separating ourselves into self-reinforcing circles of strident sameness and smug self-certainty. It has been about listening and learning from each other... That freedom, that courage to listen and to learn, to remember our past and forge our future is the North Star of our democracy. That's the light aloft that leads us across the dark sea. That's the lamp Patrick Henry said will lead Americans to freedom.

And so, we welcome you all here today, and look forward to the lights today's discussion will shine on our path into the future. So now, let me hand it over to Senator Norment for some reflections and an introduction. Senator Norment.

The Honorable Thomas K. Norment, Jr.:  
Well done, my friend.

Good morning, and welcome to the heart of the Historic Triangle, which, in fact, is the true venue of American democracy. I am Tommy Norment.

Mr. Speaker, I listened very attentively to your comments, and you were very generous in thanking everyone who has been involved in preparing and presenting this commemoration, and I support all of your comments.

However, there was one conspicuous absence that you did not recognize and express appreciation to, and that is you, Mr. Speaker. I have enjoyed sharing the co-chairmanship of this commemoration with you, but only, as my mother would say, I have only been a pretty face. I would say that you have, in fact, carried the major responsibility of this commemoration, and I can appreciate the energy and effort that you have put into this.

In 2007, I shared a similar position as Chairman of the Jamestown-Yorktown Foundation, and also Chairman of the Management Committee, so I thank you so very much for what you have done, and if you all would please join me in expressing your appreciation to Speaker Cox.

Before I carry out the expectations, this morning's program, I want to say a word about the College of William & Mary. This university where we gather this morning... and we will soon hear from the college president and the chancellor... but the president is going to talk about the chancellor, and the chancellor is going to talk about the future of representative democracy, so I thought I would say a little bit about the college.

But I would share with you one of the historical points that frequently is lost about this college; the first chancellor of this college was a gentleman by the name of George Washington, and we will soon hear from the current chancellor, the former Secretary of State.

Like the Speaker's remarks just a few moments ago and the various eloquent remarks we heard yesterday in spite of a sophomoric personally-focused grandstand act, much has been said, quite appropriately, about the importance of recalling learning from the past. Seldom, though, is there more reflection on where or how this recalling of learning actually takes place. Without education, without the College of William & Mary, the alma mater of a nation that gave us the renaissance man known as Thomas Jefferson; without a school in New Jersey that refined the genius of James Madison; without the academy in Cambridge that gave us John Adams; without these venues of learning, where would the visionaries of our forefathers have been? They learned, and what they knew, they changed the world.

So let's not forget, as we spend and invest our taxpayers' dollars in higher education, along with other core services, including the focus on STEM, that without the liberal arts education, the America we know would not exist. Those generations, who learned from the past, from the books and professors and the rigors of studies in the classics and history, and all the ways that liberal arts education equipped them to have and learn the capacities of critical thinking and reasonable analysis and persuasive communications, would not have existed.

I had the privilege of teaching at the Marshall Wythe School of Law for 10 years, and I was very mindful on an essay that the former president, W. Taylor Reveley III, wrote, and it called William & Mary the first "Why?" and he recited what Thomas Jefferson, who was then-governor, said to George Wythe in 1779. And Governor Jefferson said to George Wythe, encouraging him to form the law school, "Find students who have a liberal arts education."

This is what prepared the founders and the framers, and the generations before them and after them. This is what enabled them to shape this great American evolution that is now entering its

fifth century. And that fifth century will not be nearly as bright as the fourth. It simply cannot and will not be another American century of progress and improvement unless... unless we recommit ourselves to the supporting and investing and championing the cause of communication and the value of a higher education system.

I have been focusing on higher education in Richmond for many years, as has the Speaker and many other legislators, but it is a constant issue. I hope that we will encourage all of you, the many wise and influential people who have gathered here this morning, to continue this cause, because William & Mary and Thomas Jefferson, in so many ways, have distinguished this college and focused on the importance of a higher education.

Here at the College of William & Mary, there is a great historical and educational legacy. This Public Ivy has made contributions to the nation that are second to none, but it is the future, the future of what universities can be and what they can contribute in the years and decades ahead that is the focus of our 28th President of the College of William & Mary. In Katherine Rowe, William & Mary has a leader that sees the power of both technology and history; of the arts as well as the sciences; of good citizenship and service to the communities, as well as personal and corporate success. What I admire about Madam President is that in her world, it has never been the terms “either” or “or”; it has always been “both” and “and.”

It is a whole that is greater than the sum of the parts. Anything is a perspective and approach that she has gained through experience, she is willing to advocate. She has been an expert and an innovator in education and its use of technology and the digital humanities. She has been a professor, a dean, a provost, and now, the president, and she has also been an outstanding entrepreneur.

In envisioning the future of higher education, she is both a passionate advocate for liberal arts and a champion of college preparation that addresses the pressing needs and talents of our tech economy. It is indeed my distinct pleasure to introduce to you the president of the College of William & Mary, President Katherine Rowe.

Dr. Katherine A. Rowe:  
Good morning!

Audience:  
Good morning!

Dr. Katherine A. Rowe:  
That's wonderful. Thank you, Majority Leader Norment, for those inspiring words about the power of higher education to sustain a thriving democracy. You and Kirk Cox have been vocal advocates for your whole careers for that power, and we in Virginia's higher education community are incredibly grateful and appreciative of that advocacy.

It's my great honor to welcome our distinguished guests... so many here today at William & Mary... and to our beloved Kaplan Arena. And I'm enormously proud to introduce our keynote speaker for today, William & Mary's 24th chancellor, the Honorable Robert M. Gates.

Chancellor Gates is the model for statesmanship that we look to now and for the future. He has dedicated his career to public service, serving eight U.S. Presidents. He leads with a restless and compassionate intelligence. His unwavering dedication to those who serve our nation with their lives earned him the trust and devotion of our Armed Services.

His career of service began early at William & Mary. Not many know that he drove the Williamsburg-James City County school bus while he was a student, and that he was Assistant Troop Leader for our local Boy Scouts, and that Senator Norment was one of his Boy Scouts, as we discovered last night.

After graduating from William & Mary in 1965, he joined the CIA as an intelligence officer, and was the first career officer to scale the agency's ranks to become its director. He served as President of Texas A&M University from 2002 to 2006, when President Bush called him back to Washington to serve as Secretary of Defense. As Secretary, he led our armed forces at a time when the country was in the midst of two wars and a global fight against terrorism. In 2009, he accepted President Obama's request that he continue to lead in the Cabinet, becoming the first Secretary of Defense to serve under presidents of different political parties.

Chancellor Gates received the Presidential Medal of Freedom for his steadfast commitment to the security of the American people. And in 2012, William & Mary's Board of Visitors invested him as Chancellor, and we're so grateful that he agreed to be re-invested for a second seven-year term just this February.

Through his unparalleled career, Chancellor Gates illuminates the meaning of duty in the 21st century. In his memoir titled *Duty*, he recalls remarks he gave upon being reappointed in 2009. He writes about his dedication to do what was necessary to protect the troops and give them the equipment that they needed to be successful in their mission, and to return home safely. As he writes, "Mindful that we are engaged in two wars and face other serious challenges at home and around the world, and with a profound sense of personal responsibility to and for our men and women in uniform and their families, I must do my duty, as they do theirs. How could I do otherwise?"

That call to duty has profound importance now, at a moment when so many young adults in this country are hungry to be called into service. As I know well from my time with students at William & Mary, this is a generation that is outwardly turned, dedicated to commitments beyond their own interests and their own success... dedicated to improving their communities, their workplaces, their businesses, and their world. And as I've often said, the most important obligation of educators today is to teach the young people of this nation how to fulfill that call to their greatest capacity.

Chancellor Gates recognizes the critical importance to our nation of that deep sense of responsibility in this generation. He knows that their belief in democracy will be our country's most powerful asset if we cultivate it. We're so fortunate to have him as a teacher for this next generation, to call them into leadership and public service with the authority, insight, and compassion that he brings. Please join me in welcoming Chancellor Robert Gates.

**Framing Our American Evolution: Democracy, Diversity, and Opportunity**  
**The Honorable Robert M. Gates, Chancellor of William & Mary and United States Secretary of Defense (2006 – 2011)**

Thank you Katherine [Rowe] for that overly generous introduction. It's a pleasure to be with all of you here at William & Mary on campus. Of course I have to tell you, it's a pleasure to be anywhere but Washington, D.C.

We are here to celebrate the 400th anniversary of the creation of representative government in America. We're also here to commemorate the 400th anniversary of the arrival of slaves on these shores.

The glory of representative government and the shameful burden of slavery together have shaped the history of our country. We have spent more than two centuries making representative democracy more representative and eliminating slavery and overcoming its awful legacy. We've made dramatic progress in both endeavors, but the paralysis in Washington and signs of persistent racism demonstrate that four centuries after Jamestown, and 232 years after the Constitution was signed, the United States of America remains very much a work in progress.

So much that defines America first took root here in Virginia along the banks of the James River. That first representative assembly convened in the Jamestown church on July 30th, 1619 in response to instructions from the Virginia Company to establish one equal and uniform government over all Virginia and to provide just laws for the happy guiding and governing of the people there inhabiting. The First Assembly met from July 30th until August 4th and was comprised of the governor, four counselors, and 22 burgesses chosen by the free, white, male inhabitants of every town, corporation, and large plantation.

In those tough early days, getting the people's business done was often a matter of sheer survival. Of course, that didn't stop the earliest American politicians from behaving like, well, like politicians. The historian Richard Brookhiser wrote of Jamestown, "Its leaders were always fighting." The typical 17th century account argues that everything would have gone well if everyone besides the author had not done wrong. Sounds like a lot of modern DC memoirs.

Just a few weeks after that first assembly, the first Africans arrived in Tidewater. They were from Angola, captured in wars between the Portuguese and African kingdoms. 350 Africans were put on board a ship, the San Juan Bautista, bound for Veracruz, Mexico. The ship was attacked by English privateers, who took 50 to 60 of the Africans, and they arrived not far from Jamestown at the end of August, 1619.

By March 1620, 32 Africans were recorded living in Virginia. They would be the first of hundreds of thousands of African slaves in British North America. 170 years later, in the first U.S. census in 1790, nearly 20% of 4 million Americans were African; roughly 800,000 slaves.

From the first representative assembly 400 years ago, elected by free white men, to universal suffrage, it has been a prolonged and tortuous path. During the colonial and revolutionary period, voting was limited to property owners, almost all of whom were white, male Protestants over 21. Just 6% of Americans were eligible to vote for George Washington for president. Only in 1856 did the last state abolish property ownership as a requirement to vote.

The 14th Amendment to the Constitution in 1868 granted citizenship to former slaves, and in 1870, the 15th Amendment stated explicitly that the right to vote could not be denied by either the federal or state governments based on race. But African-Americans in many parts of the country would have to wait another 95 years, until the Voting Rights Act of 1965, for state-level obstacles to voting to be removed.

It took 301 years from that first representative assembly in Jamestown for women to be granted the right to vote. And Native Americans would have to wait until 1947 for the right to vote, 333 years after Chief Powhatan's favorite daughter, Pocahontas, married John Rolfe.

Progress toward ensuring that representative government is truly representative of all the people has been agonizingly slow. And we know that there still lurk various electoral stratagems to suppress voter registration and turnout.

But progress there has been, and today virtually everyone 18 or older, other than convicted felons, who wants to vote can do so. After many long and painful struggles to expand voting rights, more's the pity so many choose not to exercise them.

Beset by rancor and division, from that first meeting of the Burgesses and later the Continental Congress and Constitutional Convention, the survival and progress of Virginia and subsequently the United States would depend on finding ways to overcome differences.

This balance, this calibration of principle and compromise was a feature of the early history of the Commonwealth of Virginia, and the key to the founding and ultimate success of our Republic. Bold and compelling statements of principle are found in documents such as Virginia's Declaration of Rights, which informed America's Declaration of Independence, and Virginia's Declaration of Religious Freedom, which prefigured the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment.

But the core principles behind these declarations were turned into enduring structures of governance largely through deliberation and compromise. The Virginia Plan, for example, a compromise presented at the Constitutional Convention, sought to balance the interests of small and large states in a bicameral legislature.

Another critical compromise was the agreement to tolerate slavery, even though the slave trade would be prohibited in 1808. Without that compromise, the southern states would never have agreed to ratify the Constitution, and there would have been no United States of America. With the compromise, a great wrong was embedded in our foundational document, and the seeds of civil war were sown. The founders, even many of the slaveholders among them, acknowledged slavery was an abomination, antithetical to the Declaration of Independence many of them had signed. Most hoped it would disappear for economic reasons.

But for 80 years, Americans would live with the stark contradiction between the existence of slavery within its borders and the first principle of the Declaration, that all men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights. That contradiction was resolved only by the blood of more than 600,000 Americans.

I recount this history not for its own sake, but because I believe that the example of the Founding Fathers, who stood on principle whenever they could, yet compromised when necessary to create and then sustain the nation, has important lessons for today. It is a lesson I'm afraid too many of today's politicians, members of today's representative assemblies, have failed to understand in an era of zero-sum politics and scorched-earth, ideological warfare.

Virtues such as civility, mutual respect, putting country before self and country before party, seem today to be quaint historical relics, to be put on display at the Smithsonian, perhaps next to Mr. Rogers' sweater or Julia Child's kitchen.

After 400 years of representative government, we recognize that vitriol and nastiness in politics are nothing new, nor is the failure of our political system to deal with issues that deeply divide the country along ideological, cultural and regional lines. In more recent decades, crises such as assassinations, Vietnam, Watergate, Iran-Contra, impeachment, and a contested presidential election have all convulsed the American political system. But in each case, however painful and divisive these episodes were, our governing institutions recovered their equilibrium and their ability to function.

So what of the future of representative democracy? I do believe that we are in uncharted territory when it comes to the dysfunction in our political system. It appears that, as a result of several polarizing trends in American politics and culture, we have lost the ability to execute even the basic functions of government, much less effectively address the most difficult and divisive problems facing our country.

Now politicians in Congress do make easy targets. George Washington in 1778 wrote of Congress in terms that sound quite relevant to today. I quote, "Party disputes and personal quarrels are the great business of the day, while great and accumulated debt, ruined finances, depreciated money, and want of credit were postponed from day to day, from week to week, as if our affairs were the most promising aspect."

James Monroe wrote to Jefferson in 1785, "The majority of the US in Congress assembled are competent only to the inferior duties of government."

On an even more acerbic note, Mark Twain once labeled members of Congress as America's only native criminal class. The humorist Will Rogers wryly noted, "I don't make jokes. I just watch the government and report the facts."

But our problems go much deeper than individual personalities. The predicament we are in today is the result of several structural changes over the last several decades. The first, the highly gerrymandered system of drawing congressional districts to create safe seats for incumbents, both Democratic and Republican. This means that in all but a few dozen congressional districts, the primaries are the real election, thus making most elected representatives in both parties beholden to their party's most hardcore ideological base.

Second, wave elections sweep one party into power after another, each seized with ideological zeal and the righteousness of its agenda. And this has made it difficult, if not impossible, to sustain policies and programs or even foreign commitments consistently beyond one presidency or one Congress. And this [comes] at a time when addressing our very real and very deep problems here at home will require continuity of effort over many years.

Third, we have seen the transformation of our two major political parties from big tent organizations, with room for people of widely differing points of view, to increasingly ideological movements, where to stray from orthodoxy results in shunning or even excommunication. A transformation from pragmatic flexibility to political conformity.

Fourth, we confront a phenomenon the Founders failed to foresee: career politicians. Men and women who have spent decades in political office and are determined to remain there until they die. There are too many men and women in Congress for whom Washington D.C. has become their real home. Men and women for whom staying in office is their primary goal and getting re-elected is more important than doing what's right for the country.

The distinguished historian Gordon Wood wrote in his book, *Empire of Liberty*, that the revolutionary leaders did not conceive of politics as a profession and office holding as a career. He quoted Jefferson, that "In a virtuous government...public offices are what they should be - burdens to those appointed to them which it would be wrong to decline, though foreseen to bring intense labor and great private loss."

Fifth, a 24/7 digital and cable media environment now provides a forum, and wide dissemination, for the most extreme and vitriolic views, leading to a coarsening and dumbing down of the national political dialogue.

As a result of these and other polarizing factors, the moderate center, the foundation of our political system and its stability, is not holding. Moderation is now equated with lacking principles. Compromise means selling out.

Yet our entire system of representative government, since July 30th, 1619, has depended on compromise. Not only is the Constitution itself a bundle of huge compromises, it creates a system of governance, of checks and balances that can only work through compromise.

Critical ideas for progress in our history have often come from thinkers and ideologues on both the left and the right. But the laws and the policies that ultimately have implemented the best of those ideas have come from the vital political center. So just at a time when this country, our representative democracy, needs more bipartisan strategies and policies to deal with our most serious long-term problems, most of the trends are pointing in the opposite direction.

I entered public service 53 years ago next month. I worked for eight presidents, and I have known many politicians over the last five decades. And I never met one who had a monopoly on revealed truth. At a time when our country faces deep problems at home and serious challenges abroad, we have too many leaders across the political spectrum whose outsized egos are coupled with undersized backbones. People who think they alone have the right answers, who demonize those who think differently, who refuse to listen and to take other points of view into account.

Now despite all the serious problems I've just described, strangely enough, I remain an optimist about the future of representative government and the future of the United States.

I am so partly because of historical perspective. From the beginning, we Americans have periodically gone into a funk, believing our best days are behind us, that we have no worthy leaders. One of our most esteemed statesmen wrote, "We have not men fit for the times. We are deficient in genius, in education, in everything. I feel unutterable anxiety." That was John Adams in 1774.

In 1897, Harper's Weekly Magazine editorialized, "It's a gloomy moment in the history of our country. Not in the lifetime of most men has there been so much grave and deep apprehension. Never has the future seemed so uncertain as it does at this time. The political cauldron seethes and bubbles with uncertainty. It is a solemn moment for our troubles; no man can see the end."

Or the historian James MacGregor Burns, who wrote in 1963, "We are [at] a critical stage of the somber and inexorable cycle that seems to have gripped the public affairs of the nation."

Mired in government deadlock, we underestimate the extent to which our system was designed for deadlock and inaction.

Looking at the future from a different angle, we should also take some comfort from the fact that from the convening of that first assembly 400 years ago, American politics has always been a contact sport - and a fairly dirty one at that. Founding Fathers we revere today tore each other apart in the press and behind closed doors. John Adams was called a "hideous hermaphroditical character, who has neither the force nor firmness of a man nor the gentleness and sensibility of a woman." Jefferson's sex life was fodder for gossips and pamphleteers. Our first Treasury Secretary Alexander Hamilton was killed in a duel following a dispute with the former Vice

President Aaron Burr. And even George Washington wasn't immune to the slings and arrows of critics, who among other things accused him of monarchical aspirations.

I'm optimistic for other reasons. Today, more than any other time in the last four hundred years, all Americans, all Americans, have the opportunity to participate in shaping our country's future. To put their shoulder to the wheel to get America unstuck and moving forward again together.

Our diversity today has deep roots in pain and prejudice, from African slaves, to the Irish fleeing the potato famine, East European and Russian Jews fleeing pogroms, Chinese coming to build our railroads, Koreans and Vietnamese fleeing war and oppression, Mexicans and other Hispanics seeking opportunity and safety, and others who have come here from every continent, country, and island. The founders adopted as the country's motto *e pluribus unum*, one out of many. Although they were referring to the 13 colonies becoming one country, the motto I think applies in a different way today. It captures the reality that people from many lands have come here over the past four centuries, some voluntarily, some as slaves, but today, if we're to survive and prosper as a country, it must be as one people, Americans. *E pluribus unum*.

I'm optimistic because of our young people. As President of Texas A&M University, Chancellor of William & Mary, Secretary of Defense under two presidents and during two wars, and national president of the Boy Scouts, I think I have some claim to interacting with more young people from every walk of life than almost anyone. And they fill me with hope. They are involved in their communities. They care about issues. They are willing to put their lives on the line for our country, and they are committed to building a better America. They have values. They detest hypocrisy. They want integrity in their leaders.

I'm especially deeply encouraged to see veterans of our wars in Iraq and Afghanistan being elected to Congress. When young, they put on their uniform to serve the country. I believe their sense of purpose and sacrifice will be a great asset for all of us.

And finally, I'm optimistic because even though we have a lot of work to do and enormous obstacles ahead of us, we do have the power and the means to overcome them, just as this country has overcome challenges in the past. But it will take embracing those attributes of the Burgesses 400 years ago - a willingness to make tough decisions, the clear-eyed realism to see the world as it is rather than as we would like it to be, the willingness to listen and to learn from one another, an ability to see and understand other points of view, and the wisdom to calibrate principle and compromise for the greater good of the country.

No country in the world is as openly self-critical as the United States. We talk incessantly about our faults and our deficiencies. Mistrust of government is buried deep in the American DNA.

But no other country has been so successful over the centuries in reforming itself and remedying its deficiencies, sometimes at extraordinary cost in blood and treasure. We've come a long way since 1619 in extending representative government to ensure that it represents all the people and in trying to overcome the legacy of slavery. The good and the evil that appeared nearly simultaneously 400 years ago on a little patch of ground 10 miles from here.

America continues to be a work in progress to ensure liberty and opportunity for all. The French Nobel Prize recipient Anatole France once wrote, “To accomplish great things, we must not only act, but also dream. Not only plan, but also believe.” We must dream, we must believe, and we must act to realize the full potential of representative government, achieve the aspiration of our founders to form a more perfect union, and to preserve and strengthen what Abraham Lincoln called “the last best hope of the Earth.”

Thank you.

### **Majority Rule, Minority Rights, and Individual Liberties**

**David M. Rubenstein, Co-Founder and Co-Executive Chairman of the Carlyle Group**  
**Professor Annette Gordon-Reed, Charles Warren Professor of American Legal History, Harvard Law School; Professor of History, Harvard University Faculty of Arts & Sciences**  
**The Honorable Eric I. Cantor, United States Representative from Virginia (2001 – 2014); House Majority Leader (2011 – 2014)**  
**The Honorable Robert C. Scott, United States Representative from Virginia**  
**The Honorable Andrew H. Card, Jr., Chairman of the National Endowment for Democracy; United States Secretary of Transportation (1992–1993); White House Chief of Staff (2001–2006)**

David M. Rubenstein:

Thank you. For all of you wondering, this will be the best panel today so make sure you pay attention to this because no panel will be better. Let me introduce the people we have on the panel before we begin. On my immediate left is Annette Gordon-Reed. Annette Gordon-Reed is a graduate of Dartmouth and Harvard Law School. She is now the Charles Warren professor of legal history at Harvard Law School, also a professor at the history department at Harvard. She's also the winner of a Genius Award from the MacArthur Foundation and she wrote a book on Thomas Jefferson and Sally Hemings which won the Pulitzer Prize. She's a distinguished author of many other books as well. One of the most highly regarded scholars in the area of Thomas Jefferson and slavery and other things related to the beginning of our country's history and relating to legal history as well. Annette Gordon-Reed thank you for coming.

Professor Annette Gordon-Reed:

Glad to be here.

David M. Rubenstein:

On her left is Congressman Bobby Scott. Congressman Bobby Scott has been a member of the Congress of the United States for 25 years. He is now the chair of the Education and Labor Committee. He previously served about 15 years or so in the Virginia House of Delegates and the Virginia Senate. He's a graduate of Harvard and the Boston College of Law. Thank you very much for coming.

The Honorable Robert C. Scott:

Thank you.

David M. Rubenstein:

To his left is Eric Cantor. Eric Cantor served for 25 years in the Virginia legislature and also the Congress and rose up to be the House majority leader. He's a graduate of George Washington University and the William and Mary School of Law. He's now vice chairman of Moelis and Company, which is a distinguished investment firm. Thank you very much for coming.

The Honorable Andrew H. Card, Jr. is a person you may remember who served as chief of staff under George W Bush. Prior to that, he had served as secretary of transportation under George Herbert Walker Bush. He's served as acting dean of the Bush School of Public Policy at Texas A&M and also has served as president of Franklin Pierce College in New Hampshire where he now resides. He's a graduate of the University of South Carolina. Thank you for coming.

We were going to have opening statements but I thought they'd be too boring and long so I've gotten rid of that. We're just going to go to some questions and try to make this a lively conversation about majority rule and minority rights. Obviously you can say democracy started more or less in ancient Greece where they recognized the value of majority rule but they also recognized that minority rights have to be protected, but figuring out to protect minority rights is not that easy. Annette, let me ask you an opening question. Thomas Jefferson wrote a sentence that some people would say is the most famous sentence in the English language: "We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal." But how could he have written that when he had two slaves with him and he had 200 slaves that he owned? How could he have written that and what did he really mean by all men are created equal?

Professor Annette Gordon-Reed:

I think he was born into slave society and to a community that he was used to. I think he meant that we were moving towards an ideal. Jefferson believed in progress. He wasn't at the place where we'd want him to be on this subject, but he saw himself as a person of the Enlightenment and he thought that we were on a journey: that with education and with time people would come to see the light and understand that slavery was wrong, even though he didn't... at his particular moment... have the will or whatever you want to call it to rid himself of the institution personally. I think he meant all men are created equal in terms of their basic worth. Obviously all men are not created equal in terms of their talent and their capacities, but that people should have equal dignity and that was the sort of lesson that the Enlightenment was supposed to be teaching people that we would work towards.

David M. Rubenstein:

Why didn't he say all men and women are created equal?

Professor Annette Gordon-Reed:

Because he thought of men and women together. Mankind was taken as including every particular person. He didn't think that men and women were equal in their capacities... in strength and so forth... but their basic worth.

David M. Rubenstein:  
If you could have dinner with Thomas Jefferson-

Professor Annette Gordon-Reed:  
Oh god. That would be something.

David M. Rubenstein:  
What one question would you want to ask Thomas Jefferson?

Professor Annette Gordon-Reed:  
I'd ask him if he was going to make white men send their children back to Africa. Jefferson didn't believe that blacks and whites... and most people didn't. Washington, Madison... I don't know about Washington. Washington never said anything about this. Madison, Marshall, all of those people didn't believe that you could have a multiracial society for the reason we're talking about now. We're going to be discussing democracy and community. I would ask him... given what happened in Virginia where so many people were not just slave owners but people who had their families involved in this... would he make them go back to Africa.

David M. Rubenstein:  
Congressman, I should've said that you were the first African American to be elected to the Congress since Reconstruction from Virginia. When you first got elected to Congress, when you got there did you say to yourself, "How did I get here?" Or "How did these other people get here?" Were you impressed with the quality of members that you ran into in your first year in Congress?

The Honorable Robert C. Scott:  
You're aware of the joke that a guy comes to Congress and says, "When I first got here, I was wondering how I could've possibly gotten to somewhere like this." Then after about six months he looks around and says, "I wonder how these other people got here." I had served in the legislature, so I knew the political process. I think it's a great training ground to serve in Congress. The people that served back then... You could see a lot of the older members had a different attitude, a different point of view, and a different ability to work together. There were a lot more friendships, and it was a lot less partisan. It was also at a time where there were conservative Democrats and liberal Republicans, so you didn't have the party divide that you had. It was a different group.

Since then, it's become much more partisan and much more difficult to work together.

David M. Rubenstein:  
Let's talk about that for a moment. The theory behind majority rule is that the majority rule should prevail. You should protect minority rights but you should listen to the minority as well. The way the House of Representatives works now is that the majority doesn't pay any attention to the minority. When the Republicans were in control they didn't pay attention to Democrats. Democrats are in control and they don't pay attention to Republicans, more or less. Do you think that's a good system? Do you think there's any way that could be changed in the near future?

The Honorable Robert C. Scott:

A few years ago, there was a strategy from the Republicans not to participate. When we did the Affordable Care Act we had a healthcare crisis. Something needed to be done. There are staff people who will tell you that in negotiations with the other side they were told that there was nothing you can put in this bill that will get our members' support. You had no vote in the House or the Senate. When you have a crisis and have to deal with it and the other side doesn't participate, you have no choice but to go forward.

Today, with the House being Democrat and the Republican Senate, there's really no constructive purpose to developing a totally partisan bill. It can pass the House, but if it's a partisan Democratic bill it's not going anywhere in the Senate. You have an incentive to try to work together today so that your legislation can actually pass the House and Senate and be signed by the president.

David M. Rubenstein:

You're the chair of the Education Committee, so education is obviously something you know a great deal about. When our founding fathers were creating the Constitution, they didn't think that the average person was educated enough to vote for the president of the United States so they didn't have a direct popular election for president of the United States. We have a, quote, Electoral College system which can result in the majority candidate with the most popular votes not getting elected president of the United States. We've seen that a couple of times in this century. Do you think the system should be changed?

The Honorable Robert C. Scott:

First of all, the Electoral College now is not an election of representatives to make their individual choice. The Electoral College essentially just reports the results and you have a state by state election rather than a straight popular vote. If you're going to have a national election the first thing you need is national rules. Voter registration rules vary from state to state. The qualifications for elections vary from state to state. Whether felons can vote or not varies from state to state. You need a national election. But I think the discussion ought to be not whether there's a mathematical curiosity that you can win one and lose the other. A baseball could score 10 runs in the first game of the World Series and lose the next four 1-0 and have 10 to 4 but lose the World Series. That's because the rules were set that you get scores by winning games. The rules in the count in the Electoral College is you get scores by winning states.

The analysis ought to be what kind of candidate would do better in a straight popular than an Electoral College vote, and is that good or bad? You have a lot of things that you want to consider. In an electoral college, independent candidates don't do well because they have to do well all over the country. It can't just be a regional candidate. You don't have third parties doing well, so you have a one on one race. If you're going to have a straight popular vote where you can have regional candidates all over the place, are you going to require a majority vote or can somebody win with a plurality? When people discuss this, they don't have any discussion about... President Trump said that had it been a straight popular vote he would've run a different campaign. He wouldn't have wasted time in Wisconsin. That was going to be close one way or

the other. He would've been running up the score in Alabama and Mississippi. Does that help create a better candidate or not?

One thing that frustrates me about the discussion is that the discussion is just about the mathematical curiosity that you can win one and lose the other and that's the end of the discussion.

David M. Rubenstein:

Would you be in favor of a constitutional amendment that changed it or not?

The Honorable Robert C. Scott:

I'd want a discussion first of all, because you're saying a constitutional amendment to change it... You haven't said whether or not this is going to be a plurality vote. You haven't said what happens to third party candidates. You haven't said whether you're going to have national rules. Don't just jump to let's do it without any analysis. I think that misses the point.

David M. Rubenstein:

You'd like to have a study of it before you decide what to do, right?

The Honorable Robert C. Scott:

And then know what you're doing before you do it.

David M. Rubenstein:

That's what Congress always does, right?

The Honorable Robert C. Scott:

Unfortunately, you're absolutely right.

David M. Rubenstein:

Congressman Cantor, let me ask you a couple questions. You're in the business world and the investment world now. There are a lot of big egos in that world. Are the egos bigger in that world or in Congress?

The Honorable Eric I. Cantor:

David, I would say equal opportunity for big egos for sure, because I've seen them both now. I do say that in the private sector there's a regulator on ego and that's the search for profit and returns. That's your world and you live it every day. In a way, a business deal... an M&A transaction... it's all about trying to find winners on both sides. I'm reminded of why this guy is so good, because in the deliberative way that Bobby Scott goes about thinking of issues... I can tell you though that in Congress there isn't a lot of mitigant on ego because it's really about power and credit; not with somebody like Bobby, but in the forces that work in the Congress. It's very difficult now to get away from one way or the other: "My way or the highway." You don't have these forces that separate ego from the results.

David M. Rubenstein:

When you first were elected to Congress you were in the minority, right?

The Honorable Eric I. Cantor:

I was in the majority when I was first elected to Congress.

David M. Rubenstein:

The Republicans controlled Congress?

The Honorable Eric I. Cantor:

Yes.

David M. Rubenstein:

The point that I was asking Congressman Scott... Why is it that Republicans control the Congress they say to the Democrats, "We're not going to pay attention to you. We don't care what your views are. We have the majority"? Why not just have a more collaborative system where it's bipartisan? Why has the system gone away from that?

The Honorable Eric I. Cantor:

I tell you, I look to my left here and Andy Card... When he was chief of staff to President Bush, there was an occurrence after... If you remember, the 2000 election was fairly contested, and it lingered. It was the Bush-Gore election. If I remember, it was nighty where we would have the minority come to the floor protesting the illegitimacy of the president until 9/11. 9/11 was my first year in Congress and I recall the leadership that was expressed by the White House and President Bush, and how we really did see a Congress that came together for a while. As you say, the rules now in the House allow for if you have simple majority, absolute power. It has now devolved into "My way or the highway" when we're in charge, and then we're not you're relegated.

If you're asking, "Is it that way?" Yes. Will it change is the real issue. Bobby talked about the fact that when you have a divided Congress in the end you'll either not do much, which is currently the state, or you get to a point where you're going to have to compromise.

David M. Rubenstein:

You were in the minority as well in the House for a while, right?

The Honorable Eric I. Cantor:

I was in the minority in the House, and down in Richmond I was in the minority.

David M. Rubenstein:

But you're also a minority. Like me, you're Jewish. There aren't that many Jewish Republicans in the House. Were you a minority when you were in the minority and why do you think there're so few Jewish Republicans in the House?

The Honorable Eric I. Cantor:

We can have a whole panel on that. I will say one thing about being a Virginian and being a religious minority, if you will. It was something that was maybe meant to be, but my first seat in the chamber of the House of Delegates was right under the Statute of Religious Freedom that was carved into the granite behind my head. Every single day I'd come into that chamber and look at that. So yes, I always was in a minority in a minority. When we were in a minority status in the legislature in the House of Delegates... in fact, I never served in the majority in the House of Delegates. We came to parity just before I ran for Congress.

Listen, David, you know that American Jewish community is one made largely of... let's just say... more recent immigrants within the last century or so. There is some mentality about where the Democratic Party, I think, did a lot better job of reaching out to the Jewish community. It is much more liberal on the spectrum, tend not to be conservative as I am. I do think that now there's, unfortunately, some solidifying of that to my dismay.

David M. Rubenstein:

Before we talk, Andy, about some of the issues that we're supposed to talk about, you're going to be remembered forever for a scene that has been played over on television from time to time. When 9/11 happened, you were with President Bush in Florida, is that right?

The Honorable Andrew H. Card, Jr.:

The Emma E. Booker School in Sarasota, Florida.

David M. Rubenstein:

You were the person who went in and whispered in his ear that something had happened in the World Trade Center. What did you whisper in his ear and what were you thinking when you were first told about it?

The Honorable Andrew H. Card, Jr.:

I'll put things in context. When we arrived at the school, there was a buzz in the air. Karl Rove, for example, said, "Anybody hear about a plane crash in New York City?" We arrived to this classroom that had been converted to a White House command center. We go in there. I went into the classroom with the president. I was going to sit with second graders to see if it was ready for him. I looked around. I saw the second graders lined up and ready to come into the school. They were excited. I saw a misspelled word on a bulletin board. I said, "Get a book and cover it up." I didn't want a potato moment. I saw the press pool gathering with Ari Fleischer getting ready to come into the room.

I then stepped into the holding room and I was standing right next to the president and the principal of the school when a Navy Captain by the name of Deb Loewer, who was the acting national security advisor on the trip, the director of the White House Situation Room, came up to the president and said, "Sir, it appears a small twin-engine prop plane crashed into one of the towers at the World Trade Center in New York City." The principal, the president, and I had the same reaction: "Oh, what a horrible accident. The pilot must've had a heart attack or something." That was literally spoken.

Then the principal opened the door to the classroom, and she and the president walked the classroom. The door shut. I'm standing there, and Captain Loewer comes up to me and says, "Sir, it appears it was not a small twin-engine prop plane. It was a commercial jet liner." My mind flashed to the fear that the passengers on the plane must've had. They had to know it wasn't gaining altitude. I don't know why that's where my mind went, but that's where it went. A nanosecond later, Captain Loewer came up to me again and said, "Oh my god, another plane hit the other tower at the World Trade Center." I stood at the door, and my mind flashed to three initials: UBL, Osama Bin Laden. I knew about Al Qaeda. I knew about the attacks on the World Trade Center in 1992, early '93. Then I performed a test that chiefs of staff have to perform all the time: does the president need to know? This was an obvious test to pass: yes.

I decided that I was going to pass on two facts and make one editorial comment, and I was going to do nothing to invite the president to have a conversation with me. I presumed that he was sitting underneath the boom microphone. I knew he was sitting center stage in a classroom and there was a press pool watching everything that he was doing.

I thought about what I would say, I opened the door to the classroom, and as I stepped into the classroom I came in from behind the president. He did not see me coming in. The teacher of the second graders was conducting a dialogue between the students and the president. "Say good morning to the president." "Good morning, Mr. President." This stilted dialogue is taking place. I didn't want to interrupt it. The press pool included Ann Compton: right there. Ann Compton saw me enter from the behind the president's back, and she looked at me and said, "What's up?" I responded, "Two planes." Ann responded, "What?!" Then the teacher told the students to take out their books. They were going to read with the president, *My Pet Goat*.

As they were reaching for their books under their desks, I walked in and walked up behind the president. He did not see me coming and did not know that I was there. I leaned down and I whispered into his right ear, "A second plane hit the second tower. America is under attack." That was all I said to him. I stood back from him so that he couldn't ask me a question. He never turned around. I could see his head bobbing up and down. I paused. He did not get out of his chair. I was pleased with how he responded. He did nothing to introduce fear to those second graders. He also did nothing to demonstrate fear to the media that would've translated it to the satisfaction of the terrorists all around the world.

I then went back to the door to the holding room. Again, I looked at the president. I could see his head bobbing up and down. I saw the students completely engrossed in their books oblivious to my commentary to the president. I saw the press pool. They had all turned and were now talking to Ari Fleischer and not looking at the president. In my left peripheral vision I saw Secretary Rod Paige, the Secretary of Education, the principal of the school, and a White House staffer named Sandy Crest, who was education expert, and they were mouthing, "What's up?"

I then stepped into the holding room. The door shut behind me. The first thing I said was, "Get the FBI director on the phone." Bob Mueller had only been the FBI director for 10 days. "Get a line open to the vice president. Get a line open to the White House Situation Room." To the crew of Air Force One, I said, "Go back and get on the plane. We're going to have to get out of here."

To the Secret Service, I said, "Prepare to get the motorcade going." To Dan Bartlett, the acting communications director on the trip, I said, "Get some remarks written for the president. We have 650 people in an auditorium or a gymnasium. The president will have to say something to them, but he can't say anything we do not know to be the truth."

The president came into the holding room after about seven and a half minutes. It didn't seem that long. The first thing he said was, "Get the FBI director on the phone," and we could say, "He's right here, Mr. President." I watched the president step up to his responsibility. I'm convinced that when he was sitting in that chair he focused on his oath of office: preserve, protect, and defend. That's when I believe he became president.

The rest of that day is history. I feel no fear in raising it with you, because we all promised we'd never forget. It's an iconic photograph. I am not iconic, but it does define a day and I don't want you to remember the day because I whispered in the president's ear. I want you to remember because of what I said to the president, the world changed, 3,000 people died that day... many of them were heroes, civilians, EMTs, and responders... and that thousands more joined the military because of what happened that day and 3,000 of them made sacrifices so that we could be here today.

Thank you for giving me the chance to say...

David M. Rubenstein:

Whatever happened to that FBI director? Bob Mueller, is he still around?

The Honorable Andrew H. Card, Jr.:

He went on to have a very distinguished career. He will now be known for many more things than just the fact that he was the FBI director for 10 days when September 11, 2001, happened.

David M. Rubenstein:

You worked for President Bush 41 and 43.

The Honorable Andrew H. Card, Jr.:

And President Bush Ronald Reagan, his predecessor.

David M. Rubenstein:

Between 41, 43, and Ronald Reagan, who was the smartest of those?

The Honorable Andrew H. Card, Jr.:

I think George H.W. Bush was probably the most intelligent.

David M. Rubenstein:

Who was the nicest person to work for?

The Honorable Andrew H. Card, Jr.:

Ronald Reagan was the nicest person. George Bush is just nice all the time, so by definition George H.W. Bush is just a nice person. Ronald Reagan: a fabulous communicator, very inviting, great understanding of how to make things simple that are very difficult. He could describe things well and a joy to work with. Please understand... People ask me frequently to compare the three presidents. I have to compare them in the context of who I was at the time. I was a young staffer for President Reagan working as special assistant to the president for inter-governmental affairs. My liaison with the governors was the primary job. Ronald Reagan had been a governor. The governors were his friends. I was dealing with his friends, but every time I saw him I felt as if I was going to see my grandfather, and you know that if you disagree with your grandfather you usually don't tell them.

George H.W. Bush was kind of like my dad. When I would go see him... and I had a very close relationship with him... I could tell him that I disagreed with him, but then I felt guilty the entire day. George W. Bush was like my brother. I could go see George Bush, say, "What were you thinking?!" And he'd yell back at me, "What were you thinking?" We'd have great conversations. The context was very different. George H.W. Bush truly the nicest, Ronald Reagan the one who could translate very well and make you feel comfortable, and George W. Bush was very good at making decisions and had the courage to make a decision and didn't wring his hands in the process.

David M. Rubenstein:  
Of the three, who was the best painter?

The Honorable Andrew H. Card, Jr.:  
George W. Bush loved Winston Churchill. Winston Churchill's bust was in the Oval Office his entire presidency. When he found out that Winston Churchill became a painter after he left office, I remember him saying, "I think I'm going to become a painter," and I'm thinking, "Right..." He's an outstanding painter. Very distinctive. You should want to buy one of his paintings or at least get him to donate one for a charity that you can auction off.

David M. Rubenstein:  
Let me ask you about students of Harvard Law School. The students of Harvard Law School occupied the dean's office for quite some time a year or two ago. Why is it that students... not just Harvard Law School students... seem to not want to let certain speakers express their views on campuses when their views are not the ones that the majority of the students have? Is that a problem?

Professor Annette Gordon-Reed:  
I think some students feel that way, and this is sort of a rite of passage. I protested when I was a student. Didn't you protest when you were a student?

David M. Rubenstein:  
I can't remember that.

Professor Annette Gordon-Reed:

You wouldn't tell us if you did. But I think that's unfortunate: shouting people down, preventing people from speaking is not the way to go. But I think people see it as a part of activism. It's part of a youthful sense of passion... of conviction... about their ideals. But I think that's under challenge.

David M. Rubenstein:

When slavery was prevalent in the United States, what were white people thinking, that blacks were not the same species? How could they justify slavery?

Professor Annette Gordon-Reed:

You're white. You should tell me what they were thinking.

David M. Rubenstein:

My people weren't here then.

Professor Annette Gordon-Reed:

No, your people weren't here then. Some of them were. I think they were thinking that Africans were different. It started out with Africans as heathens: people who were not Christian and therefore you could enslave people who were not Christians. These were people some of whom were captured in war, and you could enslave people like that. They were seen as different and that's been the problem... Mr. Gates was taking at the very beginning of the history of incorporating people who were seen as different as part of the community.

Part of a democracy... part of the reason you have to go with majority rule is you think that the majority cares about the minority. You can have friends and you can have groups of people that you could have power over but you don't exercise total power over them because you care about them. The difficulty that we've had is having a community... to have all Americans thinking that the children of other Americans are their children, whatever color they are, whatever religion they are, all of those things. That's been the real difficulty: how do you get this community together and at the same time the majority not exact too much power over the minority.

David M. Rubenstein:

You won the Pulitzer Prize for the Hemingses of Monticello. For those people that might not have read the book... and I highly recommend it. It's a great book.

Professor Annette Gordon-Reed:

Thank you.

David M. Rubenstein:

What was Thomas Jefferson's attraction to Sally Hemings? Did she remind him of his wife in some ways because of something you might mention? What was the nature of that relationship in your view?

Professor Annette Gordon-Reed:

We don't really know how these two people felt about each other because they never wrote about that. Sally Hemings was the daughter of John Wayles and Jefferson's wife was also the daughter of John Whales, so they were half-sisters. It's clear that he thought that Sally Hemings and her five siblings... who were his wife's half-siblings... were different to him. He treated them differently than he treated the other enslaved people at Monticello. I think he saw them through the prism of his feelings about his wife. They were marked for a different sort of life at Monticello. How they actually felt about each other we don't really know. This is something that went on for 38 years. That's a long time.

David M. Rubenstein:

We have some 20,000 letters from Thomas Jefferson. Does he ever mention Sally Hemings?

Professor Annette Gordon-Reed:

Only in passing. Once they come back from France, she pretty much disappears off the radar screen. That's part of the thing about slavery that people don't think about; it's not just people making others work for nothing, it's the creation of tangled bloodlines that created a lot of complications for people in Virginia and all over the South.

David M. Rubenstein:

Some people say that Thomas Jefferson did not have a relationship with Sally Hemings. It was his brother. What do you say to that?

Professor Annette Gordon-Reed:

There's no evidence for that.

David M. Rubenstein:

Other than that...

Professor Annette Gordon-Reed:

Other than that people don't want it to be Jefferson, but it doesn't really matter. Even if they are, these are still family members who are enslaved and that's the big part of the story.

David M. Rubenstein:

Congressman, a lot of people would like to be a member of Congress. People are running all the time. Why do people want to be a member of Congress when the compensation is so low? You haven't increased the compensation for more than 10 years. You have 60 members of the House living in their offices because they can't afford two homes. How do you deal with that problem yourself and what do you members of Congress say about it privately? Wouldn't they like to have more compensation to justify the work they're doing?

The Honorable Robert C. Scott:

I think the problem emanates from the fact that members of Congress are the only employees in the country that travel as part of their job and not get a per diem spending the night out of town. If there were a per diem... if housing were reimbursed... you wouldn't have nearly the problem

that you have today, but having to maintain two homes... and the Washington expenses are not even...

There's a special deduction that members of Congress get for housing expenses in Washington. The special deduction is up to 3,000 dollars, which is about a month's worth. The rest isn't even deductible. After tax expenses and housing in Washington... It makes the arithmetic problematic. I'm single, so I don't have the problem, but if you're trying to have a family... particularly if somebody is in college... the arithmetic is very difficult.

Part of the problem is that if you look at different compensation levels, members of Congress used to be paid the same as federal judges. They were connected. Raise the judicial salaries, raise congressional salaries. You could figure out what judges ought to make and that's what you get. We de-linked a few years ago because... as you've indicated... we've refused to even do cost of living increases. Judges' salaries have gone up. They're now about a third higher than congressional salaries over that time.

Judicial salaries are way under what they ought to be. It used to be a federal judge would make about the same as a law school dean at a modest law school. That's about 400,000 dollars now. If you look at who you're picking for judges, if it's somebody around 45 years old, that means they're been at a law firm for 20 years. Go to a major law firm and somebody on a partner track, and see what somebody with 20 years experience is making. It's probably half a million dollars. If that's the peg for congressmen, the problem is that salaries for professionals are so far out of line. As Jim Webb would frequently comment, 30, 40 years ago a CEO would make about 30 times more than the average employee. Now it's about 300 times. The salary differential for upper income people is so far out of line. But if we had compensation for housing, I think we could easily make due on the salaries we're getting.

David M. Rubenstein:

Your former colleague is now in the business world. Have you ever considered going into the higher calling of private equity or something like that?

The Honorable Robert C. Scott:

No. I've saved money going along, but I look at what I'm doing as more fulfilling than just making a lot of money.

David M. Rubenstein:

Eric, allow me to ask you a question. Be very serious about it. Not that everything hasn't been serious. In 1776, our country had three million people more or less. Half a million slaves, so you had roughly two and a half million white people. Women couldn't be in public service, so you had one and a quarter million white Christian males. Out of that, you got Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, Benjamin Franklin, John Adams, among others Alexander Hamilton. Now we have 330 million Americans. Where are the Thomas Jeffersons, the Benjamin Franklins, the James Madisons? Are they all in the investment world and private equity? Where are these people? Where are the great leaders? We used to have so few people and we had such great leaders and now we don't.

The Honorable Eric I. Cantor:

You know, I'm listening to Bobby talk, and we always had a relationship. We had civil disagreement. I understand that it's a hardship for members of Congress when they're making 175,000 dollars a year, but you compare that to the median income in the US, and it's significantly higher, which is part of the reason why I can't foresee it going up any time soon. But if you think about it, the vision of Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, and we're talking John Adams and it was really about... especially with Jefferson. Somehow that phrase citizens' legislature to me connotes their vision. We weren't really meant to make careers out of Washington.

Your question about when does one end that and then go live under the laws that he or she passes... I think that's really missing today. I always say that I know that Richmond has changed in a way since I have served there, but there is this notion of a limited government because the legislative session is so limited in Richmond. Maybe that would change the fabric of Congress to a great extent if the body would assume some sense of limited power. I think we've got a totally different context today about leadership.

Professor Annette Gordon-Reed:

Jefferson made a lot of money as president. He made a lot of money as president.

David M. Rubenstein:

Doing what?

Professor Annette Gordon-Reed:

Being president. He got a salary being president. If he had saved that, he might've not have been in such a... But he spent a lot of money entertaining people. That's the way he did politics.

David M. Rubenstein:

Didn't he die more or less broke?

Professor Annette Gordon-Reed:

Yeah, but he spent a lot of his own money entertaining in Washington: having Federalists and Republicans come together and dinner parties and so forth. That was his form of diplomacy. But you're right. It's a very different time period. Being a congressperson, though, is, in fact, a job, and it's a serious job with the administrative state and keeping tabs of all those things really... It's not a gentleman's occupation any more. It's an actual job, and people should be paid for their job.

The Honorable Andrew H. Card, Jr.:

Our founding fathers were worried about this. James Madison, when he wrote the amendments to the Constitution that were required in order to get the Constitution passed... not least of which was the one talking about minority rights: our voices are free, our faith is free, our ability to assemble is free, and we can petition the government to address our grievances... a little known fact is that James Madison actually wrote 12 amendments to the Constitution. 10 were adopted and then one lingered. It sat and sat and sat. It was submitted the same time that the first

amendment of the Constitution was sent to the states for ratification. It wasn't ratified until May of 1792. It's the 27th Amendment to the Constitution, and it says, "Congress shall not pass a pay raise without an intervening election." That's what our founding fathers thought about the pay for members of Congress.

David M. Rubenstein:

The reason that amendment was not ratified in the early days was that the legislatures didn't want members of Congress to ever get a salary increase after an election or before an election. They didn't want any salary increases. That's actually why it didn't.

Eric, let me ask you this. When you were in Congress, you represented Orange County and James Madison's house was in Orange County. If you had a chance to ever meet James Madison, what would you want to ask him?

The Honorable Eric I. Cantor:

It's a fascinating story. Andy talked about the Bill of Rights, essentially. Madison came to that and promised to be for amending the document he had so much ownership over, because he needed to get elected. He needed to get reelected in the new Congress. It's a fascinating story about going out and to understand what his campaign plan was. Those of us who have run for public office... and Bobby can sympathize with this... it has now gotten very sophisticated. There's an overlay of digitalization. There's obviously these districts that have been drawn in a gerrymandered way.

Madison, he was probably the first victim of gerrymandering. When the legislature in Virginia... the anti-Federalists... decided they wanted to keep him out and he lost the bid for Senate appointment... But when he went and ran... and knowing the district the way I do, and the southern district has changed now. There's Orange County, which is a very rural county now outside of Charlottesville, but it was Culpeper that was the anchor in his district.

The story is told about how he went to play for those votes. He went into neighboring Louisa, which was tiny, but somehow Louisa was very energized by Madison and had a much more and disproportionate turnout. To read about that, I'd want to ask him about his strategy. Today, to then overlay what we do about campaigns, how we go base turnout, how you go in to try and get the independents in the middle to vote for you. It'd be fascinating.

David M. Rubenstein:

For those who don't know the history of it, James Madison was against a bill of rights in the Constitutional Convention. It was brought up by George Mason. At the end, James Madison said, "We don't need a bill of rights because each state has its own constitutional bill of rights." But in the end, to get the Constitution approved, he recognized that you probably need a bill of rights.

Then because he was in favor of a constitution being ratified by Virginia, and Patrick Henry was against it, Patrick Henry made certain that the state legislature in Virginia did not appoint James Madison to the Senate. Therefore, he had to run in a district that was gerrymandered, and he had to run against a guy named James Monroe.

The Honorable Eric I. Cantor:

And in the discussion that we're about today in protecting minority rights and the rights to religious freedom and the right to assemble, it was the Baptists in the district that he had to play to. They were a group, not just individuals, so it got into this whole discussion about the right to assembly. But it was his commitment to that group to get them on board with him and the pastors in the Baptist community so that he could gain election.

David M. Rubenstein:

So Virginia... I'm sorry, yes.

The Honorable Robert C. Scott:

I want to comment on this because of the recent Supreme Court case... you're talking about gerrymandering... just gave a free license to partisan gerrymandering. There was a suggestion that partisan gerrymandering couldn't be totally controlled, but at some point it gets so ridiculous that you're denying people rights. The Supreme Court essentially said that states have a free license on this and they can do anything they want. Whatever shenanigans are going on now may actually get worse.

We've had a lot of comments about career politician and being one, there's a view that the less you know the better job you can do. There's something that comes with experience. You get to know your district. You get to know the issues. You get to become part of the debate. If members of Congress are in and out, and you see this in some of the state legislatures... the only people that know what's going on would be the executive branch and the lobbyists, and I'm not sure that's a step forward.

David M. Rubenstein:

Virginia used to be called the Home of Presidents because we had George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, James Monroe, among others. You two are from Virginia, and you've been in political life. Why don't you guys run for president?

The Honorable Robert C. Scott:

With everybody running I'm not sure whether...

The Honorable Eric I. Cantor:

I think we have enough candidates on his side right now.

The Honorable Andrew H. Card, Jr.

It's not too late.

David M. Rubenstein:

Andy, you live in New Hampshire. How has New Hampshire been able to preserve being the first primary for so long? What's going to happen up in New Hampshire? You're living there now. What's going to happen in New Hampshire?

The Honorable Andrew H. Card, Jr.:

The purest democratic state... and I'm not talking Democrat as a label. It's democracy as we know it. There are 400 legislators in the state legislature in New Hampshire. They get paid 100 dollars a year. They have a hard time finding people to run. One out of every 20 citizens in New Hampshire is involved in government somehow: local government, state government. It's the most democratically active state in the Union. It prides itself on being the first primary challenge to go through for president of the United States. They like to say, "The road to the White House always goes through New Hampshire." If it weren't for being such a democratic state... lowercase D... candidates would not come there.

The first nation's primary is very important. The secretary of state... who has been there forever... protects it at all costs. He's a Democrat, but it doesn't make a difference. He is protecting the right of New Hampshire to vote first, and he'll continue to do it. It's a privilege to work there and live there. They do practice their democracy using all of the privileges that they're given, especially the right to speak. They are very outspoken in New Hampshire and politics is the dominant topic. It's also the biggest stage in the world for about four weeks every four years.

David M. Rubenstein:

In your distinguished public life, who is the most impressive person you ever met?

The Honorable Andrew H. Card, Jr.:

The most impressive person? George H.W. Bush is at the top of my list. Number two would be James A Baker III. Number three would be former British Prime Ministers Tony Blair and Margaret Thatcher. Those are the people who I had the greatest...

David M. Rubenstein:

All right. Eric, who was the most impressive person you met in Congress or in public life?

The Honorable Eric I. Cantor:

I will say this, and some who are in here will remember this name. When I first elected to the House of Delegates, I was young.

David M. Rubenstein:

Still young.

The Honorable Eric I. Cantor:

Just had a kid get married, so I'm not so young any more. I was 28 years old in my first term. There was a Democratic legislator from Roanoke County... I can see Ken and everybody is shaking his head... Dicky Cranwell. He'd have this country lawyer regime... this "Awh shucks" stuff... but there is no one I've run into since... and it could've just been my stage in life that I was a kid in this process to see how he maneuvered at the time. I believe he was leader at the time. He had the ability to affect an outcome and intimidate, but he could be kind. It was very impressive. A very unlikely person to say was most impressive, but I saw him wield that process.

David M. Rubenstein:

Congressman, who was the most impressive person you met in public life?

The Honorable Robert C. Scott:

A bunch of them. In the state senate I worked with Doug Wilder and Hunter Andrews. If you're talking about learning how to do skullduggery behind the scenes, those two... In the House of Representatives, Nancy Pelosi, because she can spot 218 votes from a mile away. She can keep this motley crew of Democrats together under one tent better than anybody going. But if you want to be like somebody, you'd be John Warner.

David M. Rubenstein:

And Annette, anybody you had as a student that went on to great fame or fortune that you think is very impressive, or anybody on the faculty? Is there somebody on the faculty with you that is maybe running for president?

Professor Annette Gordon-Reed:

Maybe. A former colleague, Elizabeth Warren.

I'd say the most impressive person I've met in public life would be Vernon Jordan. I did a memoir with him. I helped him write his memoirs. He's someone who is maddeningly always right. Even if I disagree with him, five years later I realize that he was right.

David M. Rubenstein:

Most impressive voice, as well.

Professor Annette Gordon-Reed:

Most impressive voice and a person who has such a wide range of experiences that that's why he can say, "This is what's going to happen."

David M. Rubenstein:

Final question for the remaining minute: are you optimistic about the country's future, or more pessimistic?

Professor Annette Gordon-Reed:

Very optimistic. My daughter... and I see young people... my students, who... not the people who are protesting and stopping people from speaking but are engaged in politics. They are active. They think that they can play a role. And I want to say that Jefferson had a real envy of New England because of this notion of participatory democracy and people getting involved. He wanted that for Virginia and that's what he thought the university would do... would get people out... and a universal education system to have people participate. So I'm optimistic.

David M. Rubenstein:

Optimistic? Pessimistic?

The Honorable Robert C. Scott:

I'm optimistic about Virginia. The Virginia legislators instilled... when John Warner was there and when Eric was there... We get together and get along with ourselves better than any delegation, even Massachusetts's all Democrats. We get together on a bipartisan basis and work together better than anybody else. But I have a great concern about some of the things going on now. I'm reminded of Martin Luther King. He said something to the effect of, "This generation will have to answer not for the bad deeds of the bad people but for the appalling silence of good people." People are being silent about some of the things that are going on now that I think they are going to have to respond to.

David M. Rubenstein:  
Optimistic or pessimistic?

The Honorable Eric I. Cantor:

I'm optimistic. I spent a lot of time abroad now and I can tell you that the admiration and respect that other countries have for what we have... freedom... and I do believe it comes down to what the discussion is about over these several days. It's about the construct of laws that we have that afford the individual rights. When we're in countries that are... even if it's in Europe, much less in some of the more autocratic countries in the Middle East or Asia... there's a huge amount of respect, from business people to government people, about what we are. So I'm very optimistic.

David M. Rubenstein:  
Andy?

The Honorable Andrew H. Card, Jr.:

I'm optimistic because democracy is contagious. I want to make sure that it continues to be contagious. It's only contagious if America leads the way. We have to infect others with our democracy. But I do worry that we don't have civil digital dialogue. Our dialogue is more civil than our tweets. I worry about the social media aspects and its impact on our democracy because I want there to be free speech but I want it to be reflecting an invitation for participation rather than extermination.

David M. Rubenstein:  
I want to thank all of you for a very interesting panel conversation. Thank you for paying attention. Thank you.

**A Conversation about Constitutions: Making the Rule of Law Stick**  
**W. Taylor Reveley III, President of William & Mary (2008–2018)**  
**Jeffrey Rosen, President and CEO of the National Constitution Center**  
**Professor A.E. Dick Howard, White Burkett Miller Professor of Law and Public Affairs at the University of Virginia**  
**The Honorable Roger L. Gregory, Chief Judge, United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit**

W. Taylor Reveley III:

Well friends, welcome. We are, as was just noted, here to talk about constitutions and the rule of law with the particular focus on if you've got a rule of law, how do you keep it? How do you nurture it? How do you make it stick?

And we've got three extraordinarily distinguished panelists to lead these conversations. Each of them is directly involved in the workings of constitutional democracy, studying it, thinking about it, writing about it, teaching about it, and in Judge Gregory's case, actually directly involved in its workings.

So let me introduce this august triumvirate. Roger Gregory, in the middle there, is the chief judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit. And Judge Gregory has served on that court for almost 20 years and is now its chief judge. He has the distinction of having been nominated for the court by both President Clinton and President George W. Bush, and he was confirmed by the Senate 93 to one.

Judge Gregory is the first African American to serve on the Fourth Circuit, and before going on the bench he practiced law for almost 20 years including founding a law firm with Doug Wilder, the first African American governor of Virginia.

A.E. Dick Howard is a chaired professor of law and public affairs at the University of Virginia where he has served on the faculty longer than any other mortal, mortal dead or alive. He's still going strong 55 years into the mission. And Professor Howard has devoted his professional life to probing the mysteries of the US Supreme Court and to understanding constitutions. He was the principal draftsman of the last revision of Virginia's Constitution in 1968, and he has helped write constitutions in many other countries. Dick has been acclaimed as one of the great Virginians of the 20th century.

Jeff Rosen, here on my left, is the president and CEO of the National Constitution Center which helps citizens learn on a nonpartisan basis about the US Constitution. He's also a professor to the George Washington University Law School and a contributing editor of the *Atlantic* magazine. Professor Rosen is an absolutely prolific scholar and a writer, and I think it's fair to say he is one of our country's most compelling analysts and commentators on legal matters, if not perhaps the most compelling.

You all have probably read the description of this panel in the program for today, rule of men or rule of law, society without checks and balances where people are at the mercy of the edicts of politicians and bureaucrats is not a democracy and will strangle liberty and opportunity. What's the role of constitutions in making the rule of law take hold in emerging representative systems, and what makes a constitution last? You cannot build a free society without the rule of law being paramount. The question is how to make the rule of law stick.

Now when it comes to the rule of law, it seems to me that past experience makes pretty clear that it's often easier for a country to talk the talk than to walk the walk. Constitutions are written and adopted around the globe with provisions for the protection of civil rights, independent judiciary checks and balances and much more, but when it comes to implementing these constitutional

provisions, the rule of law often cannot compete with the rule of power, privilege, greed. So what factors really do account for the success of the rule of law in some countries, but not others?

And once a rule of law takes hold, how can it be nourished over time? How can it be made to stick? And are there reasons for us to believe that the rule of law will hold increasingly in the centuries to come, or has the rule of law had its brief moment in the sun? And now constitutional democracies are an endangered species sinking in a sea of enormous technological change and societal alienation. Now these are questions I will brace our august panel with at the end of their presentations, assuming they leave enough time to get to the questions.

The rule –battle- for this panel will be: each panelist gets eight to 10 minutes uninterrupted to give his perspective on constitutions and the rule of law, and then we will have a conversation together along the lines that I've just sketched. And let's begin with Judge Gregory in the middle, he is actively involved in making constitutional democracy work as a judge, and he obviously has thoughts about the role of an independent judiciary in a functioning rule of law. Judge Gregory, you are unleashed.

The Honorable Roger L. Gregory:

Thank you, Taylor. As any good trial lawyer would know, when you have great experts you just make sure you get out of their way and let them win the case for you. In this case I have great experts so my job is easy in that regard. I suppose it's also easy too because the role of the judiciary, I guess one would expect that I would say, it is absolutely essential, and that is my answer, but that answer is because it is true.

In September 17th, 1787, when our framers came out of that musty room in Philadelphia, I'm not sure was a reporter, but a journalist, it sounded like, would ask a good question, and they asked Ben Franklin, they said, "What have you wrought?" and he said, "A republic, if you can keep it." It was important because he said if you can keep it, he wasn't speaking to the people who had just forged this document to bring forth a new nation to see the idea of self-governance.

He said this republic will be here if you keep it. And Taylor, I think the Constitution has stuck, it sticks, and I think it will stick as long as we, the people, understand that it belongs to us. The idea that the people seated this power to a government for its purpose... It amazes me that many lawyers, most lawyers, don't cite the preamble when they come before our courts. I look through their briefs, I've never seen... these are constitutional issues, very pressing constitutional issues.

The reason I say that is because our framers spoke in broad language, general language, broad principles, so everything is not there just for the text to read, but the preamble said after saying that we do this in order to establish a more perfect union, it was also first mandate to establish justice. So I say that the preamble should be cited because whatever we do when we toy with the interpretation is that the end mission is always justice.

Therefore I would always argue, if I were the litigant representing the party, if there is a question, if there is a doubt, if there is a bent, then it must be toward justice. As Dr. King said that the moral arc of the universe is long, but it always bends toward justice. That is probably the

most enduring thing that the framers gave us with the preamble, because it said that art must bend to what should be established.

So the biggest tool that we have as a judiciary is that we're independent, and as the Federalist Paper 78 says, a constitution is the fundamental law and judges shall regard it as such. But it also said, in terms of judicial review, that establishes the rule of law, that it becomes the primary law, the guiding posts. Not men and women, but the law. But further, Federalist Paper 78 says that it is the proper and peculiar province of the courts to interpret the law.

Proper, peculiar province of the courts. That's a heavy assignment to interpret the law and judicial review as it came through that in terms of understanding, but I say this, that power was entrusted to us by the people, and I think the most important part of the analogy I would give, it's like an anvil. It's the anvil upon which the Constitution is worked, you see? Because it has to be worked, not beat with a hammer, beating people down, but if you will, to make it a tool that it becomes a utility for self-government.

Because so much the framer left open. For example, most people hear on television, the police shows, Miranda rights, but that's not in the Constitution. But it is in the Constitution that you shall not be made to give testimony against yourself, so the spirit is that it shouldn't be a place that you are somehow coerced or intimidated or not know your rights. So what grew from that, but that's a judicial creation for the purpose of carrying out the spirit of what the framers did.

And that's what we're always trying to do, find out not just by the text, you can't work it just by reading, it has to be textual as in contextual, there's history in the classic forms of government. We have a republic, from the Roman sense, and republic comes from the Latin *res*, which means thing, and *publicas*, which means public. And in a translation, it means belonging to the public. That's what they gave us, and that's why Ben Franklin said, "I'm giving you a republic if you keep it."

So as a judge, I toiled through these cases, and I've had some incredible cases since I've been on the Fourth Circuit. I'm not going to bore you with naming some of them, and you know some of them, but they're always difficult, they're tough. And that's what the whole challenge is as a judge, to make sure that self-governance is preserved, that rights are protected, because again it's the people that gave it.

And I love this, going back to the Federalist Papers 78, it talks about in terms of judicial review and nullifying the acts of Congress that are contrary to the Constitution or acts of the executive, it says that when you get to... first ascertain what the Constitution is, and this is what keeps me in check, because the people gave me this power, a very sacred one. First ascertain what the Constitution says and understand it, then ascertain what the statute or the act is, and then determine whether or not there is an irreconcilable variance, they talked about.

And if it is so, I love this, think about this, I love this. You understand exactly what they're saying. They said if there is, then you always prefer the Constitution over the statute, not because you want to do it, but because the intention of the people which is expressed in the Constitution

should always prevail over the intention of its agents. Oh, I love that phrase, because again, you own it. You gave it to me with the sacred trust that I will do so without fear or favor, but interpreting the Constitution, making it a living document, on the anvil to make it a tool that is useful, that can carry out self-government.

I remember I was on a big case and I was about to come out for our oral arguments, and I could hear crowds of people outside circling the court and they had placards and I was just about to go in, and I thought how wonderful this country is, that people are free to assemble and to express their views. Now I can't look out there and try to count noses to see what should be the prevailing thought. No, like justice I'm blind to that, but I'm not blind to the point that it belongs to the people and that sacred trust must be kept in the confines of understanding that Constitution.

I'll never forget one of the greatest compliments I had since I've been chief, a man... I was introduced, I was at a church and sheepishly stood up, but he poked me on the back. He said to me, it was an African American man, he said, "The Fourth Circuit is a just circuit." So I thought he was just cheesing up to the judge, but it turns out that he had a habeas case and had won his case, but that's not the point when he said, "Judge Gregory, I went from an incarcerated person, and then 18 months later I owned a home. And you see this thing around my neck?"

He said, "This is the symbol I use. I go back to the prison and I tell other people where I was, how they can do something to change their lives." And that's what, to me, makes the judiciary and poring over the Constitution and trying to do what it dictates are important, because it gives a chance for all of us to understand self-governance and being who you can be, the highest person, all people, and making it inclusive.

And we talked about the glaring things left out of the Constitution. The right to vote is not defined, citizenship wasn't really defined. So that's why it's on an anvil, it is beaten not with a hammer but with a pen, with thoughts and understanding and a love, and yes, we have a republic. The question is we must keep people engaged, and I'm happy that the judiciary is a part of that role. My good friend Damon Keith who died not too long ago - I went to his funeral in Detroit in May - he wrote a case who would come out to be the Keith case that talked about executive privilege.

He said that democracies die behind closed doors. What I do must be transparent, that's why we write opinions. Read them, understand them, disagree with them, but know that they're done so, hopefully, prayerfully, and faithfully to be faithful to the rule of law, that self-governance will always prevail. Thank you.

W. Taylor Reveley III:  
Roger, thank you.

The Honorable Roger L. Gregory:  
Thank you.

W. Taylor Reveley III:  
We're glad you're on the Fourth Circuit.

The Honorable Roger L. Gregory:  
Thank you.

Professor Jeffrey Rosen:  
Hear, hear.

W. Taylor Reveley III:  
Professor Rosen, we've heard about the role of an independent judiciary in the rule of law, but address it as structural checks and balances a bit, that guide and constrain and ideally lead to compromise among the policy-making branches of government.

Professor Jeffrey Rosen:  
Thank you for that question and thank you for including me in this significant anniversary. It is a great honor to be here among three great Virginians. I was born in New York, I long lived in Washington DC, and now work in Philadelphia at the National Constitution Center right across from Independence Hall where Jefferson wrote the Declaration and Madison and those other great framers wrote the Constitution.

What was Madison thinking when he created the greatest document of human freedom ever created, and what was the centrality of these structural guarantees for the preservation of the rule of law? The summer before he came to Philadelphia, Madison had a reading project that had been set to him by Jefferson. Jefferson sent to Monticello to trunk full of books from Paris about the failures of ancient democracies, in particular Greece and Rome.

And Madison was concerned that America might go the way of Greece. In Federalist 55 he wrote, "In all large assemblies of any number comprised, passion never fails to wrest the scepter from reason, even if every Athenian had been Socrates, Athens would still have been a mob." So Madison is convinced from his reading that unchecked mobs deliberating face to face can be seized by passion and lead to faction, which he defined as any group, either a majority or a minority, animated by passion rather than reason, by self-interest rather than the public good, which Judge Gregory so memorably defined as the *res publica*.

So Madison and the other framers sent out to design a system where people would be ruled by reason rather than passion, and structural protections were at the core of that project. In particular Madison was concerned about mobs like Shays' Rebellion in Massachusetts where mobs of armed debtors tried to repudiate the debts from their creditors. So he wants to design a system that slows down deliberation, so that mobs and factions can't mobilize quickly or when they do mobilize, passion will dissipate.

He's particularly encouraged by the large size of the American Republic. He thinks because America is so big, it'll be hard for mobs to discover each other, and by the time they do they'll get tired and go home. And therefore their representatives will be able to deliberate thoughtfully

based on reason rather than passion. That's why representation, which again Judge Gregory so powerfully reminded us, is the core of a representative Republic, is key.

Unlike Athens, the framers didn't want direct democracy, they didn't want referenda or Brexit votes or Twitter polls, they wanted thoughtful representatives of the people to deliberate and compromise, and that's why it's so significant that we're here on the 400th anniversary of representation. How did they express these guarantees in the Constitution itself?

At the National Constitution Center, which I want you to visit if you haven't yet, we have the five earliest drafts of the Constitution ever written, including the very first draft written by that forgotten but heroic framer, James Wilson in Pennsylvania.

It was Wilson who wrote the first words that were ever written about the Constitution, and the very first draft of the Constitution, which you can see if the National Constitution Center, says in the preamble, "Resolved that the government of the United States shall consist of a legislative, executive, and judicial branch." That was it. Separation of powers. The idea of we the people came later, and that too was Wilson's words. Wilson initially said "we the people of the states of New Hampshire, Virginia, Massachusetts and Rhode Island and Providence Plantation."

It was only the third draft that said "we the people of the United States," signaling Wilson's belief that we the people of the United States as a whole were sovereign, rather than we the people of the individual states. Lincoln invoked Wilson's theory when he denied the South's ability to secede, but separation of powers was the crucial central innovation. Where did Wilson get the notion of separation of powers? Well, from the Revolutionary Era of state constitutions and in particular from the Virginia Declaration of Rights.

It's always so meaningful for a lover and scholar and learner about the Constitution to come to Virginia, because not only is Virginia responsible for the 400th anniversary of the rule of law, it's responsible for the Virginia Declaration of Rights of 1776, which Jefferson had by his side when he wrote the Declaration of Independence and Madison had by his side when he wrote the amendments that would eventually become the Bill of Rights.

We also have at the National Constitution Center one of the 12 original copies of the Bill of Rights, and you can find online the drafts of the amendments that Madison proposed but were not ultimately adopted, and that you can find this on the National Constitution Center's interactive Constitution app. And I want you to download it, not now obviously, because I'm talking, but after the panel. And there you will find two amendments that Madison drafted that he basically cut and pasted directly from Mason's Virginia Declaration of Rights.

The first directly channeled and basically reproduced what Jefferson put in the second sentence of the Declaration of Independence. All men are created equal, they are endowed by their creator with unalienable or natural rights from God or government, that government has to secure these rights and whenever it threatens them, it's the right of the people to alter and abolish it. That is the Lockean statement of natural rights principles that reminds us that governments must be

limited by constitutions, and when they threaten rights rather than protecting them, then people have the right and duty to change them.

But the second amendment that Madison proposed and was not adopted also comes from Mason's Virginia Declaration and it says that the legislative branch can never exercise judicial branch legislative powers nor the executive the powers of the other two. It was a separation of powers amendment, and it reiterated what the Virginia Declaration had emphasized, that it was crucially important for each branch to stay within its own lane in order to preserve the sovereignty of the people itself. Judge Gregory so powerfully quoted Hamilton's notion that whenever there's a conflict between the will of the people represented by the Constitution and the will of the representatives represented in ordinary legislation, you prefer the principle to the agent.

That's based on the idea that the three branches don't speak for the people, only we the people speak for ourselves. Our will is embodied in the Constitution, and judges can enforce it by ensuring that each branch stays to its own lane. And that's why Madison originally felt that a Bill of Rights was unnecessary or dangerous. Unnecessary because the Constitution itself was a Bill of Rights by limiting power and only granting specified enumerated powers to the Congress, to the executive, and to the judicial branch.

Madison thought there was no danger that Congress would make laws abridging speech, because it was granted no power to do so. And dangerous, Madison thought, because if you wrote down certain rights people might wrongly assume that if a right wasn't written down, it wasn't protected, and because Madison and all of the other framers thought our rights come from God or nature and not from government, it would be impossible to limit the number of rights in written declaration.

He changed his mind for prudential reasons, and we have the Bill of Rights taken largely from Mason's Virginia Declaration, but always and everywhere Madison and the other framers thought that Bills of Rights would be mere parchment barriers unless the structural guarantees of the Constitution were preserved, and that's why separation of powers is so crucial to the rule of law.

Now I'll just end by asking was Madison too optimistic that the separation of powers and checks and balances would ensure a rule by reason rather than passion? Remember, the whole system is based on the idea that when passionate factions or mobs get excited and try to mobilize, they won't be able to discover each other, and it's also based on the idea that thoughtful representatives of the people will set aside the self-interest of their partisan constituents and will deliberate in the public good.

Friends, we all know as we heard on the last panel, we are living in a world of Twitter and Facebook where mobs can mobilize immediately and quickly, where false news travels faster and further than fake news, because it is more appealing to the passions and when we are living in filter bubbles and echo chambers where both our representatives and the people themselves

are increasingly unwilling to listen thoughtfully to arguments on the other side and to allow our representatives the time to deliberate in the public good, that's the central question.

Is there enough time? And I want to recommend to you Gregory Weiner's wonderful book, *Madison's Metronome*, which taught me about the centrality of the speed bumps and cooling mechanisms that Madison thought would slow down deliberation to allow time for reason rather than passion to prevail. At a time when the speed of deliberation is undermining those speed bumps and cooling mechanisms, we need to talk seriously about whether the faith in reason can adequately be served by these structural mechanisms.

Ultimately I am optimistic that they can be, and when you contrast our complicated, checked, multifaceted system with that of the other cradle of Western democracy, Britain, which gave rise to the Magna Carta, which gave rise to the Virginia Declaration's due process clause, which gave rise to our due process clause, you see how an entire constitutional system can be upended by the misjudgment that fundamental decisions can be made on one-off votes.

Here in America thankfully it is not possible to amend the Constitution with a one-off vote, because you have to jump through lots of hoops, and that's by design and that's because of the framer's deep conviction that in order to preserve the will of we the people, we would never allow either the people themselves to make a quick decision, but would require several bites of the apple, and would also insist that each of the three branches can never presume to speak in our name, but that laws can only go into effect if they're consistent with the Constitution that has been ratified in our name. So that is the basis for my optimism, and that is why I'm so glad to be a part of this discussion.

W. Taylor Reveley III:

Jeff, thank you. That was powerful, and we will faithfully visit the National Constitution Center either in the flesh or via the internet or both.

Professor Jeffrey Rosen:  
Please do.

W. Taylor Reveley III:  
And we're glad you're there and leading it.

Professor Jeffrey Rosen:  
Thank you.

W. Taylor Reveley III:  
And now Professor Howard, we come to the vital matter of Constitution-writing and how a country, a nascent constitutional democracy, once it makes its constitution, puts it on paper, ratifies it, can nurture the rule of law and make it stick or not, and you are the world's leading expert on this subject.

Professor A.E. Dick Howard:

Thank you Taylor. The Berlin Wall came down in 1989, and I'm sure many of you in the room will remember the remarkable sequence of events, when one communist government after another tumbled, and Poland and Czechoslovakia and Hungary and the others. In a matter of weeks, communism seemed to have imploded in a region where it had taken hold for so many decades.

And I had the privilege... As one who teaches constitutional law, you can imagine what a remarkable opportunity it was to actually find myself sitting at the elbows of people making constitutions for their respective nations. And many of these people, I mean these were very good lawyers and judges. They were experts in their fields, but they never had lived in a place where you had any choice. I mean, the constitution which was the epitome of the symbol for the Communist world was the Soviet Constitution.

During this period in the 1990s, I was at a meeting in what was then Leninburg, now St Petersburg, and I was working with judges and lawyers. It was that brief moment when we actually thought Russia might become something like a liberal democracy. It seems a long time ago it doesn't it? I mean in the age of Putin, it's hard to remember there was even a glimmer of hope, but we were having these serious discussions. They had some very good people. I don't speak any Russian, so we were working through a translator.

She was doing a very good job, and I discovered at one point that she was translating the English language phrase rule of law as socialist legality. Well, that's not exactly quite what we mean in the Western world by rule of law. So I found myself immersed in this almost Madisonian enterprise. For a guy like me who loves constitutions, who couldn't be at Philadelphia in 1787... No matter what my students may think, I wasn't there. To actually see constitutions come into being; what a wonderful moment for me.

Now what I realized, I was watching some of our American friends land in airports and give advice and say, "Oh, you need a new constitution. I have one right here. We the people of fill-in-the-blanks," and I mean, as if it were a mechanical enterprise of some sort. Well, it's a lot more difficult than that. I quickly came to realize that constitutions are contextual. I mean contextual in the sense that their implementation, making them reality, depends on history and custom and tradition and practice and just the mentality of a country.

A wag once said that central Europeans carry more history in their backpack than they can consume locally. It's just their history preoccupies people in that region. I was at dinner one night in Budapest with some Hungarian friends, and we were talking about the revolutions of 1848, which is a big deal in Europe history. We don't study it in this country. And I asked my friends, I said, "You know, there was a café called the Café Pilvax. It was where liberals and reformers and young people would hang out, have a cup of coffee, talk about what they hoped life would be like if they could just get the Austrian Empire out of their hair."

And I said, "Maybe this café has another name now, maybe it's not a cafe anymore, but I just kind of would like to see this place." And when I posed that question, one of the women at the table, turning to her friends, pointing to me, said, "There, I told you he was Hungarian." I don't

have any Hungarian blood that I know about, but the assumption on her part was if you cared that much about Hungarian history, you have to be Hungarian.

And that really reinforced to me the lesson. I mean, I guess I'd have to say I cut my teeth on Constitution-making here in Virginia. I was born and raised in Virginia. I started teaching law at the University of Virginia. And soon after I was appointed, Governor Godwin appointed a commission on constitutional revision, and they asked me in turn if I would be their executive director. And being a young bright law professor, I said, "Sure, I'll write you a constitution." I didn't tell them I had not even read the old Virginia Constitution.

The first thing I did was go read it. I was amazed what I found in there. If you fought a duel in Virginia, you lost your right to vote. I mean, that sort of thing was in the old Constitution. So we went through the drafting stage. Then I was asked to work with the legislature and finally Governor Linwood Holton asked me if I would run the constitutional referendum campaign. So I had the chance to be involved in the drafting, the legislative adoption, the popular approval, the whole process itself. Just an amazing experience.

So I came out of that ready, I thought, to go to places like Prague and Budapest and Warsaw. I mean, I can tell you when you've been beat up on by the members of the Virginia legislature, Albania holds no terrors. There was nothing they could do. But I understood that constitutions are not abstract documents, they reflect reality. They are planted in the mentality of a people and their history and their aspirations and their way of thinking.

So in the region after 1989, the new constitutions that emerged were very Western oriented. They adopted principles like rule of law, constitutional supremacy, checks and balances, on and on. They were very influenced by the German basic law for example and by Western democracies. Well, that was an age of euphoria. If you remember what the expectations were, everybody said, "Wow, the world is changing." And some of you may have read Francis Fukuyama's book, I think it was published around 1992, called *The End of History and the Last Man*, and in it, he predicted that the wave of the future was liberal constitutional democracy. It might take longer in some places like China or Russia, but that's where the world was heading.

That was the 1990s, people don't talk that way anymore, do they? I mean, this is not what we now recognize, that that euphoria has vanished. I'll give you one example, one case study. I spent probably more time in Budapest than some of the other capitals, and I met a 26 year old graduate student named Viktor Orbán. Is that name familiar to you? Viktor Orbán.

He, at that time, was largely unknown. He was just emerging on the political scene. He was funded by George Soros to go to England and study there. That Viktor Orbán is today the prime minister of Hungary. He's the one, I'm sure you've been reading about him, who pronounces Hungary to be an illiberal democracy. An illiberal democracy. He is rejecting the Madisonian assumptions that we had hoped many of us might spread to that part of the world. Well, when you talk about illiberal democracy, it's not just Hungary.

Poland's Law and Justice Party has moved in that direction. They are imitating the Hungarians. And illiberal democracy has become a theme in many parts of the world, not only in places that are clearly authoritarian like China and Russia, but countries which had entered into the democratic world. I keep thinking of central Eastern Europe. 10 of those countries joined the European Union. We thought that would sort of really cement their sense of identification with Western values.

Well, today, what do we find? Nationalism, the power of people's affinity for their own sort, the sense that somehow the rest of the world doesn't respect you, that you want to restore a golden age, which is probably mythical, but it's a powerful image in the minds of people. Nationalism, populism, the sense that elites are running things, and they just don't get it. That they don't understand the ordinary people. That's one, so that Orbán and his party beat up on the bureaucrats in Brussels. All the bad things come out of Brussels.

And then finally authoritarianism, and that's the one that worries me the most. I accept that nationalism and populism are always going to be part of the political scene, but authoritarianism in effect rejects what we would call the rule of law. I will give you an example. If Turkey, Erdoğan is one of these authoritarian rulers. There's a law on the books in Turkey, in the Criminal Code, in section 301 of the Criminal Code, that makes it an offense, a criminal offense, to insult Turkishness.

To insult Turkishness. Now what does that mean? I mean, I think if I were charged with insulting Virginianism in a Virginia court, I think I would make a void for vagueness argument and say, "That sets no standard. That doesn't tell me what I'm not supposed to do." And that's precisely the point of a law like that, and there are laws like that in other places, it's meant to be a club in coordination with a co-opted judiciary. Those are the countries that need Judge Gregory's.

They're the countries where the good judges are being kicked out, aged out, they will set arbitrary age limits and get rid of the old ones, and they'll bring in friends of the party who will cozy up to the autocrat who's in power. It's not a pretty picture, it rejects the assumptions that we make about the structure which limits authority, which empowers people, but also protects minorities and other people at the same time.

I think it doesn't have to end badly. I don't want to end on a pessimistic note, but I think it poses an extraordinary challenge. What should Americans do about it? Well, I mean that's perhaps the... we might talk about that in a moment, but I think we can't tell them what to do. They finally have to be in charge of their own destiny, but I do think Americans can, first by example, by what we do in our own system, and secondly, by way of our foreign relations and policies we have abroad, can have some impact on it. So Taylor, there's my opening assessment.

W. Taylor Reveley III:

Good, thank you, Dick. Well, it seems pretty clear that simply writing and adopting a constitution that provides for an independent judiciary and has checks and balances protects human rights and so on and so forth, may be necessary to a rule of law, but it's certainly not sufficient. So allow me to ask each of you fellows what you think the one or two or at most three

most important factors are in determining whether a rule of law in a country that does that have a well written constitution, actually takes hold and endures and thrives?

What are the couple of factors that really seem to be the most important? You want to go first, Dick?

Professor A.E. Dick Howard:

Happy to. I mean, I've told you the story of problems in countries where I've worked myself and who I now watch from afar, and it seems to me that you do have to write a good Constitution. I mean, I don't think we should discount the importance of having a fundamental law which sets out clear guidelines, which empowers government, but limits government at the same time.

I think that's clearly important, but I think beyond that two or three things occur to me. One is that you absolutely have to have free and fair elections. And when I think about problems of places like Budapest, I think about problems of Virginia, problems of America. Partisan gerrymandering has already been mentioned this morning. It seems now the US Supreme Court and the decision this spring has said that there is no judicial remedy, that in effect they even toss that problem back to the states.

Virginia has an amendment pending to the state constitution, which would create a commission, partly legislators, partly citizens, to actually draw district lines. That's a running sword, seems to me, in a number of states in America.

So I would say free and fair elections, but that still, even that's not going to do it. Independent judges, judges who will stand up to the pressures. I think for example of the district judges back in the 1950s and '60s after both *Brown v. Board*, who were thrown out of country clubs and they were dismissed by their peers. They had to stand up to their own communities in order to enforce the Constitution.

The final comment I would make, Taylor, in terms of the substructure of the rule of law, is nurturing a constitutional culture. I think ultimately, you write a good Constitution, you can have good judges, you can have fair elections, but if the people themselves have not internalized the practices of constitutional democracy, then I think it's very difficult to imagine that it will work.

And I think one reason I'm glad to be here as part of this event today, is that in looking back to 1619, one realizes all those generations of people who, imperfectly perhaps, making mistakes along the way, but by the time we actually went to the stage of writing state and federal constitutions, we had in many ways practiced the art of self-government in the lower houses of the colonial assemblies. We were probably the most democratic bodies in the Atlantic world at that time.

And therefore, I think we entered on the stage of American, of republican democracy, having already some of the sense of what it takes to make a government work, the sort of respects you should have for other people and their views and how to bring this Republic into being.

W. Taylor Reveley III:

I'm not sure there's much left to say, but there's three of us remaining. Roger, what do you think?

The Honorable Roger L. Gregory:

Well, I have to agree, I think Dick was very comprehensive, and I agree, inclusion and access to the ballot and a free access and open is very important in a culture.

And I might mention Robert Dahl's *On Democracy* is a beautiful book. He talked about the logic of equality. And that is the sense that in the fifth century Greece and Periclean government, the Golden Age, they came... even though they were segregated, because women were not included, the enslaved weren't included, foreigners weren't included, but the men they included, they started with this idea that there was a logic of equality.

They felt each other capable of government, worthy of government, and they made sure they were educated and prepared. Think about this, the progeny came up, your turn, because everybody in their lifetime had a chance to be in that circle, if you will, the boule of government. And you said, "Wait a minute. When Sally gets her turn, I want to make sure she's prepared." Isn't that awesome? The whole idea, you have to invest in each other, because they will have their turn to govern.

My point is this, obviously, we don't have a democracy, we have representative government, self-government. But isn't that a wonderful idea of culture? That our democracy is so important that we want everyone to be prepared. A good education, good health, a good perspective of who they are and who they can be: that is the foundation to me of a constitution that sticks, because there are people who... We embrace each other and say, "You, like me, we are equal in worthiness to be embraced by this idea of constitutional government and representative government." And I think that is so much a part of the alchemy that goes into success.

W. Taylor Reveley III:

Yeah. Jeff.

Professor Jeffrey Rosen:

So Professor Howard and Judge Gregory have identified at least four crucial factors for the rule of law: an independent judiciary, free speech, checks and balances, and this crucial question of civic education. And I will echo that and illustrate it with an example that picks off on Dick's notion that Turkey bans insults to Turkishness.

So right now battles about the rule of law are being fought out online, because this is a time when Facebook and Google have more power over free speech and who can speak and who can be heard than any king or president or Supreme Court justice. So not long ago, Google was asked to adjudicate that very provision about insults to Turkishness, when a group of Greek football fans posted videos on YouTube saying that Kemal Atatürk, the founder of modern Turkey, was gay.

That is a crime in Turkey to insult Atatürk, and Turkey demanded that Google shut down YouTube in Turkey, because of this offense against insulting Turkishness. Google initially refused, because it's not illegal under Google's Terms of Service to insult foreign leaders, and Turkey shut down Google in Turkey and blocked it and then demanded that Google block YouTube everywhere in the world. That shows very powerfully both the pressure that foreign governments will influence and the unbelievable power of these platforms to either apply free speech values or not.

But this story has a follow-up, and that's that after Google took its stand, the European Union passed a new right called "the right to be forgotten on the internet." This amazing right means that anyone who insults someone else on the internet has the right to demand that the insult come down. So if someone were tweeting, "Jeff is talking too long during this final speech, I want this panel to end," after the panel I could sue you and demand that Google remove your tweet from the index. And Google would decide if I'm a public figure and your tweet is in the public interest, and if they guess wrong then they're liable for up to 2% of their annual income, which last year was 70 billion dollars. So this obviously concentrates the mind, and Google has removed 43% of its take down requests, including requests to take down articles about the right to be forgotten itself.

So the point of this story is that in the face of this new regulation, Google no longer has the ability to enforce a version of the American First Amendment, which is embraced by almost no other country in the world, but says that speech can only be bad if it's intended to and likely to cause imminent violence. That beautiful principle articulated by Madison and Jefferson when they opposed the Virginia and Kentucky resolutions... rather they opposed the Sedition Act of 1798 in the Virginia and Kentucky resolutions, embraced by the US Supreme Court but not embraced by any other country in the world. So that suggest the crucial need for a First Amendment with teeth, the ability of independent judges to enforce it, and decision makers who are accountable to those judges and are not just lawyers at private companies who have the ability to make decisions unchecked by separation of powers in the rule of law.

I just want to close by very much echoing Judge Gregory and Professor Howard emphasis on the importance of civic education. George Washington said that he believed that education in the science of government was crucial to the success of the American Republic, because unless citizens knew their liberties and had the self-discipline and self-restraint to master their passions and to devote themselves to the public interest, as Aristotle insisted in the *Nicomachean Ethics* in a conception of happiness, that Jefferson channeled in the Declaration. Unless all of us exercise that self-restraint, then the Republic would collapse.

And that's why the National Constitution Center was founded by Congress to inspire citizens of all perspectives to educate themselves about this beautiful document of human freedom and to listen respectfully to arguments on all sides, and that's why I'm so privileged to be part of it and that's why all of us together must dedicate ourselves to learning about the Constitution ourselves and inspiring our children and the next generation to learn about it as well.

W. Taylor Reveley III:

Yes. Alright last question. The panel, the wonderful panel that preceded us, the frisky panel, ended on a note of really gratifying optimism. So just how optimistic are we about the rule of law? Has it basically had its moment in the sun in the great constitutional democracies, the United States, Great Britain, not at random? Can it withstand social alienation, economic uncertainty, social media?

Just how optimistic are you about the rule of law going forward? We have the Chinese empire rising again, the Russian bear still out there growling, is the rule of law a coming thing for us or has it basically had its moment? Dick, how cheerful are you on this subject?

Professor A.E. Dick Howard:

Well, I know we haven't the time we would like to have, but I will end on a fundamentally optimistic note. Sort of a "yes, but kind of" answer to your question. And that is we have the tools to do it. I mean, America used to be called the city on the hill, the shining example, and all that. The Declaration of Independence, Jefferson's Declaration, begins on a note of addressing a world audience.

He's holding out the American example for other people to emulate or not, to accept or reject, and I think we've had a wonderful history down through the last two and a half centuries. Other places, they don't imitate the American example, they can't do that. They're not American, but they have put in place, a remarkable number of countries... think how few democracies there were before 1945. There has been the spread of democratic, constitutional, accountable, liberal government in so many lands.

It's under stress, we talk the Russian bear, the Chinese example, unfortunately so many people now look at China, for example, having created a middle class that didn't exist 30 years ago, and they look at that system as being an attractive one for them. So I think two things we Americans have to do to end on a note of optimism, one is to take a hard look at the problems here at home, partisan gerrymandering, the right to vote, the pressure on the courts and the like, to clean up our act in effect and make us the kind of example we would like to be.

And then remember the place we ought to have in the affairs of the world, not to retreat from the world, but to be part of the international scene and influence it as best we can. I think that will push us in the direction of an optimistic conclusion.

W. Taylor Reveley III:  
Roger.

The Honorable Roger L. Gregory:

I'll wrap up quickly. I would just say, yes, I'm very optimistic about the prospect of our carrying this further and that generations later will also be able to answer that, Mr. Franklin, yes, we did keep it. And a lot of that, Taylor, is two months ago in this very room where I addressed the 2019 law class of William & Mary. I looked out in the sea of beautiful faces and parents and loved ones, and the energy they had and they talked about the whole idea that the law is more

than themselves and that justice was something worthy to pursue, and to pursue truth even at the risk of failure.

I believe we'll still have generations like that, and they will come and they will know that self-governance is a wonderful form of government, but we have to work ourselves into the fullness of that form by reality and I believe we can by capacity and will. Thank you.

W. Taylor Reveley III:  
Jeff.

Professor Jeffrey Rosen:  
I am optimistic. At the end of the convention, Franklin looks at Washington's chair, which has a sun on it and says, "Throughout the convention I didn't know if it was a rising or setting Sun, but now I think it is rising." And you can't have the remarkable job that I do of hosting debates among citizens and learners of different perspectives about the Constitution without being optimistic.

I host a weekly podcast, *We the People*, where I summon the leading liberal and conservative scholars in the country to debate the constitutional issues of the week, and I have to share that just last week, a young couple wrote to me and said, "We've just gotten married, we met over the podcast, we debated constitutional issues. We initially disagreed, but we really loved learning about the dormant commerce clause and were so moved by the fact that the podcast got us together that we're spending our honeymoon, and we want to come to the National Constitution Center to see the Constitution." That's why I'm optimistic.

W. Taylor Reveley III:  
All right. Thank you all. Thank you all.

**Making Peace and Making Policy: Executive-Legislative Relations in a Polarized Era**  
**Ann Compton, ABC News' White House Correspondent (1973–2014)**  
**The Honorable Toi W. Hutchinson, Illinois State Senator; President of the National Conference of State Legislatures**  
**The Honorable George F. Allen, Governor of Virginia (1994–1998); United States Senator from Virginia (2001–2007)**  
**The Honorable James H. Hodges, Governor of South Carolina (1999–2003)**  
**The Honorable Eric I. Cantor, United States Representative from Virginia (2001–2014); Majority Leader (2011–2014)**  
**Karl C. Rove, Senior Advisor to President George W. Bush (2000–2007); Deputy Chief of Staff to President George W. Bush (2004–2007)**

Ann Compton:  
Thank you very much. We have an incredibly talented group of people to give you, hopefully, some real perspective you hadn't considered before in our topic today; let me introduce them one by one.

First, the Madam President of the National Conference of State Legislatures, representing Illinois' 40th Senate District, Senator Toi Hutchinson. Former United States Senator and former Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia, George Allen. The former Governor of South Carolina, Jim Hodges. Former Majority Leader of the U.S. House of Representatives, Virginia's own Eric Cantor. And finally, a former Senior Adviser and Deputy Chief of Staff in the White House to George W. Bush, the amazing Karl Rove.

Doesn't it always seem that the moment we're living in is the most chaotic, the most dysfunctional that we have ever seen in American politics? Except we know, looking back through history, it's really not. We want to talk today and have you all explore what it is at the federal level, and what it is at the state level, that has made government so dysfunctional and so problematic. And how, looking forward, are there ways that all of you, and all of you, can help get past that?

When I graduated from college in Virginia, I went right into my first job, I covered the Virginia state legislature for WDBJ television in Roanoke, and talk about dysfunctional. The first Republican Governor had just been elected since Reconstruction, with a Democratic Lieutenant Governor, and a Democratic Attorney General, who wanted to be the Democratic Governor.

And Capitol Square in Richmond was a war zone just to walk between the Attorney General's office and the Governor's mansion. And then the phone rang while I was down in the basement of the state capitol in the press room there, and it was ABC News asking if I would come up and be interviewed to be a network correspondent.

And in 1974, after just four years in Virginia, I went up and ABC News sends me into the White House up north lawn just weeks after President Richard Nixon had left on the south lawn; the only president in history to resign in disgrace. Talk about constitutional crises. Talk about times when the American fabric of our society was being torn apart with protests against the Vietnam War, Watergate, civil rights.

So let me ask each of you now to come up with some ideas, or some thoughts ... And I'm actually going to go out of order, and I'm going to start with Governor Allen, because ... I'm sorry, Governor Hodges, of South Carolina, because you come from a state that is now not only reliably red, in terms of voting, but a state where a Democratic presidential primary can be decisive for the Democrats.

And would you talk a little bit about not only your experience as Governor, but your experience on the national stage? You were one of the co-chairs of President Obama's campaign. Governor Hodges.

The Honorable James H. Hodges:

Well, Ann, first of all thank you for choosing beauty ahead of age by picking me first, rather than George. It is great to be here, and I very much enjoyed last night's presentation as well.

Let me just ... I think, as you pointed out, everybody believes that the times that they operated in were run better than what's currently happening; that's just always the case. I imagine that George Washington probably cursed Thomas Jefferson, and talked about how bad things were with Jefferson in charge, and it seems no different with people who were in political office.

I will say this, I think that, my observation growing up in a small mill town in South Carolina and seeing some of the changes that have occurred, I think I have an appreciation for why we have the trouble that we have. We're in a country that is politically divided roughly 50/50. When you look at elections and how people vote, generally in every election it's around 50/50, which means people have starkly different views of life in our country.

And you think of what we've been through in the past decade, you understand people's lack of trust in institutions. We've had wars, we've had the Great Recession, we have a situation where people who are over 60 were in jobs that seemed more permanent and now they're not. We've moved from defined benefit plans, to 401k plans, to sometimes no retirement at all. We've had people who've not had wage increases for periods of time, and we have opioid problems.

You go through the list of things that are going on, the rural communities in our country have suffered a great deal, and I think you'd begin to understand some of the issues that are out there, and people's lack of trust in institutions to solve those problems. Because they believe that whether it's corporate America, or banks, or elected officials like us, many of them believe they've been let down, and they have a lack of confidence.

And then you add to that... And I know this has been talked about here, we used to have sort of a water cooler conversation around what the three networks provided, or what the local newspaper provided in terms of news. And now we have this dispersed opportunity to get data that we want, and we have the ability to shut out things we don't want to hear.

And I think more and more people are choosing avenues where their views are reinforced rather than being educated. And I say all that as a prelude to understanding why things are harder now than they once were. And when you stack that on top of a system in Washington that seems to be designed around keeping things from happening, rather than making things happening, it leads to frustration, and not only for policymakers like Eric and others, but also for the American public.

But at the state level, I think there is a good reason why things work better. One is that virtually every state has to pass a budget every year, and you can jam a lot of things into the budget, and you're doing things that affect the teacher pay raises, and environment, and criminal justice, and things were very important to people, but you have to get that budget done.

So it makes states seem more functional, in many ways they probably are, because they have these impediments that they have to get done to be able to just keep things going.

Ann Compton:

Well, your colleague George Allen, you were not only Governor, but you've had the experience with a Democratic ... You're a Republican governor with a Democratic legislature. But, of

course, you come up and you arrive in Washington, and you've got the Washington experience as well. You once compared the pace in the United States Senate when you got there as, "Moving at the pace of a wounded sea slug." Wounded sea slug. What?

The Honorable George F. Allen:

Well that's true, I did say that. Generally, overall, I look at our country and our society from how I grew up, which was in a football family, and we ought to have a meritocracy. Where everyone, regardless of their background, their race, their religion, their ethnicity, whatever has that equal opportunity to compete and succeed on a level playing field, and I like to see action and things done.

And as Governor, I'd make more decisions in a morning than you do all week in the Senate. And in fact, my first act, my first mai- ... They call it a maiden speech in the Senate, was on behalf of a judicial candidate, Roger Gregory, who was in your previous panel on the judiciary. He's now Chief Judge of the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Mike Thomas and I met with him right after I got sworn in, and he had been nominated by President Clinton right at the end of his term. And typical of the Senate, it was held up, nothing happened, but he was on the bench. Now, the Republicans were in control of the Senate, President Bush was soon to be inaugurated a few weeks later. And Mike and I ... And I think that's you over there Chief Justice ... That is you, good, thank you, judicial recognition.

At any rate, I talked with the candidate to see what his judicial philosophy was. I was so proud to listen to him earlier today, I was glad to see everyone applauding his commitment to the rule of law and the Constitution, and our representative democracy. Well, I ended up thinking ... When I went in to see you, judge, I was skeptical, you're a Clinton appointee, and so forth. So I got to know him as a person, his qualifications, his capabilities, and my first speech on the Senate floor was to ask Senate colleagues to rise above politics, and process, and so forth, and Judge Roger Gregory as an individual.

And I remember Karl Rove actually said, "Oh, I saw that speech you made down there, what do you think of him?" I said, "Look, I talked to him, I may be wrong, but my point of view is you all ought to interview him as well, and I think you'll be just as impressed as I was." And it just took forever then even ... And so President Bush re-nominated him along with about a dozen other judges he nominated, and it just took forever to get the Senate to vote on him, and the most opposition was from fellow Republicans.

And I was just getting aggravated and more aggravated. I said, "Well, it doesn't matter, we got enough votes for him." And one of them, and I'll remain nameless, he said, "Well such, such, such, I'm still upset, President Clinton nominated him." I said, "I don't care." And I said, "Just vote darn it, just take it to a vote." And we finally got the vote, Justice Roger Gregory is the first African American to serve on the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals. I used Thad Cochran's desk for that final vote. Thad Cochran's, as John Warner knows, is Jefferson Davis's desk.

And there was a young person, Bill Thomas's son, who is a page, African American. They always asked Senators, "You want a drink of water?" I said, "Sure, why don't you get it?" And I said, "Hey, by the way, I'm going to give a speech now, and we're going to finally get a vote to have the first African American on the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, and I'm going to give this speech from Jefferson Davis's desk." And young Mr. Thomas said, "That's really cool."

But that's how the Senate operates, very slowly. The things that need to be done at the federal government to get in order: set priorities, they need to have, as Governor Hodges said, not just pass a budget, there needs to be a balanced budget; you set priorities, you can't say yes to everything. And I think the states with a convention are going to be the way that we propel the federal government to finally have a balanced budget.

Secondly, they need to get back to basics. It is awful. Susan and I are watching people when the government shutdown, because they don't pass a budget, and people supposed are going to get a loan or government workers, and I'm thinking, "My goodness, in the real world, if you don't get your job done on time, you don't get paid." And I think members of Congress, their salaries ought to be withheld if they don't get appropriations bills done on time and get back to basics.

And then at the state level, we need, I think, redistricting reform so we have more fair, compact, contiguous districts rather than these maps that look like somebody's flung spaghetti up against the state map, and that's your congressional districts. And I think voters ought to be choosing their leaders rather than politicians picking their voters.

Ann Compton:

Well thank you Governor. Let's divert over to the White House, Karl. You're the only one on this panel who didn't ... As far as I know, you've never run for office?

The Honorable George F. Allen:

It's too soon.

Ann Compton:

But boy you've been the brains-

Karl C. Rove:

She's demonstrating my superiority over my fellow-

The Honorable George F. Allen:

I just said-

Karl C. Rove:

Colleagues on the panel.

The Honorable George F. Allen:

You're too smart.

Karl C. Rove:  
I want to get-

Ann Compton:  
But-

Karl C. Rove:  
A life.

Ann Compton:  
But when you look at the tension between the legislative and the executive from your perch in the White House those years, and in campaigns, what do you blame for the kind of dysfunction?

Karl C. Rove:  
Well, first of all, thanks for having me. And second of all I'm going to do grave damage to Governor Hodges's reputation by largely agreeing with him. We are at a sort of disruptive moment in American politics where the two parties are at each other's throats, where Washington doesn't seem to work, where we're going through a populist moment; but the good news is we've been here many times before.

The first time that there was a physical altercation on the floor of the United States Congress was in 1796 when spitting Lyon of Vermont and Griswold of Connecticut went at each other with andirons pulled out of the fireplace in the House of Representatives chamber; we've had a populist moment before.

I mean, my sense is Governor Yeardley probably went home on the first day of the meeting of the House of Burgesses and said to his wife, who's got a fantastic name, Temperance Flowerdew Yeardley, probably said, "Honey, you can't imagine what a bunch of morons we have in House of Burgesses." And this has been happening continually, and if we think it's bad today, there are times that it's worse.

The Gilded Age makes today look like everybody's sitting around the fireplace singing Kum Ba Yah. We have one period in 1889 and 1890, where for five and a half months, the opening five and a half months of the 1889 legislative session, the House of Representatives doesn't pass a single bill in the first nearly five and a half months, because the Democrats, who are in the minority, announced they will not answer the roll call. And by doing that, they will deny the House the quorum to conduct business.

And it takes a U.S. Supreme Court decision, at the end of five and a half months of ... This isn't "We're going to shut down the government if you don't repeal Obamacare." This is, "We don't give a crap what you're going to try and do, we're not going to allow business in the House of Representatives to move forward."

So look, this is continual, I think, and we're going to have to work our way through this. Unfortunately, I think one of the things that's required to work our way through it is to have leadership at the White House that, basically, rises above the normal nip back and forth.

We came into office in 2001 under a slightly difficult circumstances. There was this little thing called Florida; you may remember it dimly. And as a result Bush felt compelled to make certain that his colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle understood he was the President of everybody.

So the first member of the U.S. House that he met with was George Miller, the ranking Democrat on Education and Labor, so he could talk about his education reform. And the first member of the Senate that he talked to was not the Republican leader, Senator Lott, it was Senator Kennedy because he wanted to send a signal.

And one thing that I learned is that the White House, the personal relationships between the President and the Congress, even with members perhaps, even most importantly with the members of the opposition, have to be aimed at cordiality. The President cannot get drawn into this stuff, he has to rise above it and be the adult in the room and take whatever is hurled his way.

Kennedy of Massachusetts said on July 4th, 2003, "Bush lied about WMC in Iraq." He knew that was a lie, he looked at the same intelligence, and came to the same conclusion that Bush had. Gave a speech at Georgetown, said, "Saddam has WMD, but we need to remove it by diplomacy, not force." But he was the guy who kicked it off, but that didn't keep Bush from holding his tongue, trying to set the record straight without getting personal, and working very closely with Kennedy for three years in 2005, '06, and '07 on comprehensive immigration reform.

But the President has to be that person, and it is not an easy job. I remember one time I got a call from Harry Reid, he said, "Karl, I gave a speech, I didn't read it beforehand, they just wrote it. And I called Bush a liar and a loser, and I didn't mean to call him a loser. Will you tell him I'm sorry?" I said, "Well Senator, I've got his schedule right here, and he's in the Oval, he doesn't have anything on the schedule, why don't we just plug you through, and you can talk to him yourself?" *Click*. But that's the job of the President. And whether they like it or not, the personal relationships matter.

And I cannot tell you how many people have come up to me, members of Democrats ... I see Representative Goodlatte here, and some of his colleagues on the Democratic side said, "You know, if you told ..." He said, a couple of them said, "If you told me I would have spent more time at the White House under a Republican President than a Democratic President, I would have laughed at you, but I did." And that was because Bush understood just simply being able to look at somebody as a human being, and not as some cutout that you bought on Amazon of your political opponents so you can take it around at all the town hall meetings and parade them to their face, that's important.

Ann Compton:

It's not often I get to say, "Madam President." And Madam President Toi Hutchinson, who is also Senator Toi Hutchinson of Illinois, you're here today representing state legislatures. And there is a sense, among many people, that maybe states work a lot better in terms of bipartisanship than the federal government. But what have you seen, how do you, both in the Illinois legislature and when you deal with both sides of the aisle in the National Conference of State Legislatures, what's the magic, what's the secret sauce?

The Honorable Toi W. Hutchinson:

Oh, if I had a secret sauce I could sell, boy, I don't know if I'd be doing this. Because when we're looking at this time, and a lot of people have mentioned that, the National Conference of State Legislatures is 7,383 legislators across the country, and they're both Democrat and Republican.

And the interesting thing about our conference is that you can have a conversation with someone for 10 minutes, and then go, "Are you a D or an R?" As opposed to what we're seeing across the country now where, if you tell me how you walk across the street, if you wait for the light, you're probably somebody who likes rules and order. If you cross in the middle of the street, you might be a libertarian like, "Don't tell me what to do." I mean, we look at almost everything through a partisan lens right now.

So what happens in the states is that, one of the things the Governor mentioned, we have rules and procedures and things that are put in place that you can't go around, so a budget has to be done at a certain time. There are constitutional things that say, "You have to do X by this time." And that requires conversation, that requires participation in a way that we don't see when it's constant, like a rolling calendar that never ends.

And in those moments, you get to what I think we're all alluding to, the personal relationships. What's missing, I think, in our body politic right now is if I know you, and I know how long it takes you to get to the Capitol, and I know who just had a new baby, and I know who just had new grandchildren, and I know who just got diagnosed with cancer, and I know why you ran for office, it's very difficult for me to stand up and call you a liar and un-American when I disagree with you, because I know you.

And so we're missing personal relationships with people, where people talk about the old days of yore where you could have Ronald Reagan and Tip O'Neill and things, they fight it out on the floor, and then share a drink afterwards. So one of the things in the Illinois State Senate, my home Senate, my home state, our Senate President makes it a point to have dinner with all the Democrats and all the Republicans over the course of the session; so every night he's having dinner with members of the thing. The first thing that we kick off in our Illinois State Senate is a joint dinner between Democrats and Republicans; it's the very first act we do after we settle the officers.

So when we add the fact that we're not talking to each other, we're living in a place where everyone's screaming at each other so much, that no one's talking to each other, that then gets exacerbated by this social media loop and echo chamber. That also bleeds into the way our

elections work, which means we never stop campaigning. We never stop campaigning. And if you never stop campaigning, it's almost impossible to govern.

So what we're seeing right now is this endless loop that's almost self-fulfilling its way all the way around. So I think states do operate slightly differently than the federal government, one because we're closer to home, two because we have rules and procedures in place that make us have to accomplish things by a time certain deadline.

And the other thing is that, most state legislators across the country will tell you, 90% of the bills that come out on the floor fly out unanimously, no big issues, very quietly, there's not there's not big partisan wrangling. You kind of understand that if you have a water problem in a district, is not Democratic water or Republican water, it's just water, and we need to be concerned about water.

And when you know that you're going to meet somebody in the grocery store next to the eggs, and they're going to stop you and go, "You know what, I heard that you did..." You know you're going to have those conversations, you tend to try to elevate a little bit better. Now, that doesn't mean that the 10% of things that we do do that are very partisan aren't significantly partisan. And they are so because so much of our national issues then nationalize our state politics at the local level.

And there's a danger in that because then, all of a sudden, water can become Republican water or Democratic water, and things that we didn't use to fight about, now we fight about like, "Why would we fight about infrastructure? We all know we need infrastructure, hard to be exceptional without infrastructure." So those are the things that didn't use to be partisan.

So this endless loop that we're in right now, I think there are state legislators across the country that are determined to know their colleagues, have to compromise and work with their colleagues, also understand that you can be polarized, but still get things done. And when I say, polarized, I mean like we can think totally differently, ideologically differently about things, but then that doesn't mean that we're not passing bills. And so polarization doesn't, necessarily, have to equal gridlock, and gridlock is much harder at the state level, considering the procedures and policies we have in place.

Ann Compton:

Thank you. Eric Cantor, you're the only one on the stage who has been Majority Leader of your party in the United States House of Representatives; talk about trying to get things done. What do you think ... Well, from your perspective on that, what do you think maybe has worked in the past, and how important is that relationship between members in the House of Representatives?

The Honorable Eric I. Cantor:

Well first of all, I'm not so sure there's one secret that's going to be the panacea to all of the ills that infect our system today. I would say that there is some validity to what the Senator was talking about in the legislative process, to know your colleagues, especially those on the other side of the aisle.

Because it's very tempting right now to sort of assume, almost in a way like a posture of an entrepreneur or a policy entrepreneur, where you're in competition with the other side, and you're ready and loaded for bear every day given the incoming assaults, attacks whatever it is verbally coming from the press or the other side.

But I wouldn't overrate that element, and maybe you call it social diplomacy, because I think a lot of us grew up in sort of that Ronald Reagan-Tip O'Neill sort of myth, in reality, back then about everyone was going to get along and have a drink at the end of the day together. I'm not so sure that ... I think we'd be disappointed if we rely on that.

So I think first, maybe incrementalism. Right now incrementalism is, I think, very underrated because in this age of no compromise, by definition, incremental progress is a compromise. But I think you need that in order to start to build the trust and respect among colleagues in the legislative body, so that you almost have like memory muscle that it's okay to work with other people that may not come from your perspective.

And I saw it at the federal level in Congress. This individual probably doesn't want me to say this right now, but I can tell you I had a great working relationship with Joe Biden. And he, obviously, was on the other side of the aisle as Vice President when I was Majority Leader, and we had a relationship where you could pick up the phone and call him, because we had experience in working almost on routine matters.

And so when we earn that kind of trust between each other, when it comes down to it ... And if you recall some of the debt ceiling days and everything else, we actually had the trust to understand we were going to tell each other the truth, and then we could deal with it one way or the other; but there was no monkeying around about it. So I won't say no BS, but it was a great productive relationship.

So, secondly I think the temptation right now, with things being so binary; it's either win or lose, it's your side or the other's. The temptation is, I think, to want to assume what moves the other side and assume that you are either going to get their vote or not, and really that assumption takes the place of any real conversation.

And we saw this on the Republican side of the aisle, we felt very strongly in the original days of President Obama's administration. And if you remember, it was right after the financial collapse and Lehman, Bear Stearns, all of that and the economy was shedding jobs 400,000 a month, and President Obama had said he wanted to do a bill, it was later dubbed the Stimulus Bill.

And in the end, I was Whip at the time so I took the brunt of this. Republicans didn't give up one vote for that bill. Now if you had one of their administration here today, they would say, "Well, wait a minute, we were bipartisan, because we inserted things in the bill that your party traditionally supported, there's no excuse for you not to support."

But remember, we are all political creatures. The leadership in the Congress, at the time, had the obligation to look for the priorities that our membership had, and our constituents wanted, so we could go back and tell them, and instead of a productive dialogue, there was just an assumption made. So I think, secondly, that assuming rather than engaging is probably an ill that you could easily repair.

And I'd say, lastly, the importance of remembering ... And this is something for me now in the commercial and the business world, it's very different, because it comes naturally. You've got to find a win/win situation if you're in business; I mean you have to. And whether you're dealing with publicly traded companies or not, so you have shareholders and the rest, but you've got people that need both to be able to say, "Win/win."

We got to remember that in the political context, because every single policymaker or elected official has a constituency that he or she is going to go home to. And believe me, that individual doesn't want to go home and say, "Hey, I got taken to the cleaners on that deal, but I voted for it anyway." Like that's not happening. So this, "My way or the highway, you win/I lose, I win/you lose; it's very difficult to see how you make progress.

And I think to the point that the governor made earlier, in this age of social media and the hyperbole that dominates the discussion online, it's a really difficult thing to achieve right now, when what we're really talking about is win/win for everybody.

Ann Compton:

Karl, you want to jump in there?

Karl C. Rove:

Yeah. I've never told you this, but I had an interesting experience in October of 2001 that reflected on your visit to the Cabinet Room. I have a great pal named Ben Stein, "Bueller, Bueller." So we were supposed to have dinner one night in Washington DC; we happened to both be there. And he called me up, and he said, "Karl, would you like to have dinner with Larry Summers?" And I said, "Yeah, but he's not going to want to have dinner with me." The National Economic Council Director for President Obama.

He said, "No, he'd love to meet you." Well, a weird story. So anyway, I end up having dinner, Ben Stein, the comic, and economist Larry Summers and his wife, who's a poetry professor at Harvard, and me. And during the course of dinner, Summers spends most of the dinner talking about the Indonesian economy. And I'm like, afterwards I said to Ben, "What was that all about?" "He wanted to show you he was the smartest guy in the room."

But during the course of the evening, Summers says to me, "You know, I don't understand why we only got ..." What was it, 11 Republicans to vote for the stimulus bill?

The Honorable Eric I. Cantor:

Zero.

Karl C. Rove:

See, zero. I think there were 11 in the Senate. But anyway, he said, "We didn't get any Republican votes for the bill." And I said, "Well, that's interesting." He said, "Can you explain that to me?" I said, "Yeah, let me ask you a couple of questions."

I said, "Were you in the Cabinet Room when the President cut off Eric Cantor, who's supposed to present the Republican options for the stimulus bill by saying, 'I won?'" He said, "Yeah, I was there." I said, "Well, did you see anything wrong with that?" He said, "No, we won."

I said, "Did you ever contemplate taking things out of your program, and asking the Republicans what they'd like to have in the package?" He said, "Oh no, no, we had the right package, we had the right package."

And I said, "Well did you ever go up to Capitol Hill and meet with the Republicans and say, 'Boys and girls, what do you want?'" "No, no, no, no, we had National Economic Council meetings, we made a decision about what was best for the economy." And I said, "Well, why should you be surprised that nobody voted for your bill if you didn't give them a seat at the table?"

Sometimes you gotta step back and say, "Okay, yeah, they maybe put some of your ideas there, but nobody said, "Hey Eric, what do you want? We'll shift out that, we'll put in your thing." And they have to do that even with little or no anticipation of getting your vote, because saying, "I won," is like saying, "I'm not going to pay attention to you."

And this goes back to what Toi said a little bit. You have to deal with people as real people, and sometimes the best thing ... the Governor when he was Governor. I know Governor Allen was forced to do it, because he was dealing with Democrats. You got to put in what the other side wants to have, some of it, in order to say, "We're all in this together."

But I thought it was very ... Of course, the dinner took place at a Korean restaurant in Washington, DC. Washington being the smallest town in America, so everything gets out, but nobody has ever reflected on this, showing that Larry Summers was not really followed around by the press. Though he did have a Secret Service detail, and an armored-up SUV, which I never saw the National Economic Council Director under Bush ever have.

But I've told every one of the NEC Directors under Bush that they ... Andy Card was a cheapskate. The SOB would not allow you to have portal to portal coverage by the Secret Service in an armored-up SUV, particularly if you were the National Economic Council Director.

Ann Compton:

Let me ask you, start with the Governors. Gerrymandering, even Bob Gates talked about gerrymandering being such a-

The Honorable George F. Allen:

Can y'all hear?

Audience:

No.

Ann Compton:

Okay, gerrymandering.

The Honorable James H. Hodges:

Gerrymandering.

Ann Compton:

And let me start with Governor Allen.

The Honorable George F. Allen:

The question is on gerrymandering. Gerrymandering, and we have one prime example, Eric Cantor up here on some of the problems in Washington. And in governance, generally, you need to listen to the other side. I see Chief Allston here ... there you are. I learned a lot as Governor listening to Virginia Indians, and how they had the paper genocide of Virginia Indians. Something I knew nothing about, it wasn't an issue I ran on, but you need to listen to people, and worry about all the people.

And it's best if you actually run an election based on an agenda and ideas, and if you're given the honor of serving, you keep your promises, and that helps. Karl with a Democratic controlled legislature, there were ... Every bill, and Frank Atkinson knows this, every bill we had to get a Democrat sponsor on truth in sentencing, and abolition pro, welfare reform, educational standards, and so forth. And juvenile justice is a prime example; let me get to gerrymandering, but it fits into this.

We had a whole commission on juvenile justice, worrying about juveniles who are really dangerous, and they were treated like they were stealing gum or hubcaps that didn't even exist anymore. Anyway, we have this commission to make streets safer, and some juveniles are very dangerous. The Democrats had another commission that looked at how you could turn kids around, who just needed structure in their life.

And so we're ready for a big confrontation; ours versus theirs. And I said, "Well, our crew was looking at the dangerous folks, these are looking at the ones that could be turned around. Why don't we bring out the best of both? Take the best of their ideas to turn kids around that need some structure and discipline in their life, and take ours." And it ended up passing like 95 to two or something like that.

Now, on gerrymandering, the problem now with computers, the computers are great, technology is great, but they come up with these districts that what legislators are worrying about is a primary; they're not worried about the general election. Eric Cantor getting knocked out ... Here

you have a majority leader, from our Commonwealth of Virginia, he gets knocked out in a primary, and he was accused of being too friendly with the Obama administration.

Ann Compton:  
Too moderate.

The Honorable George F. Allen:

Yeah, too moderate, he was buried under their saddle all the time; and at any rate, he gets knocked out. And then with this Ocasio-Cortez, Representative up in New York winning, the Democrats I think are finding that same fear. And part of this is because of redistricting that they end up, the politicians, create these districts that are just convoluted, long districts ... Heck I got hit by it when I was in Congress for 14 months. They found our log house on a gravel road in the foothills of the Blue Ridge, and stuck it in with Tom Bliley in the city, split it five different ways, and I ran for Governor. They probably should have left the district alone, and they wouldn't have had to deal with me as Governor.

But it's gotten so, truly, that the worry is, "Can I win my primary?" And so then if you get to a situation that Karl, or Eric, or Governor Hodges is talking about, where you find a consensus, that consensus or compromise is akin to capitulation. And so, we need to have districts that are counted as more compact, more contiguous. I'll just say in Virginia, they're splitting just so many precincts, people don't even know who they're voting for. You'll have a town in Culpepper with 15,000 people, and it's divided into three Senate districts. So who is responsible for the town of Culpepper? One of the three Senators in that district.

In Virginia, and this has to be solved at the state level, the Supreme Court made that decision. Virginia has a really good process going on right now, I see a lot of ... I see Vivian Watson, Ken Plum, and others here from the legislature. What you all passed is outstanding. It has an equal number of Republicans, Democrats, independents. To actually pass the map, you need at least one from the others, and if you pass it again next year, it goes to the voters for ratification.

And it's absolutely essential this gets done next year, regardless who's in charge, so that we don't have in Virginia federal judges, unelected, and commissioners from UC Irvine drawing legislative maps here in the Commonwealth of Virginia. So the states need to take the lead. I like what Virginia's doing. Other states have done it a different way, I think the Virginia approach that you all crafted last year is outstanding, and the best of all. And the legislature has to prove it which is important.

Ann Compton:  
So real quickly, Governor Hodges-

The Honorable George F. Allen:  
Yeah.

Ann Compton:  
And then Eric. And-

The Honorable James H. Hodges:  
Sure and let me-

Ann Compton:  
And I've got one for you.

The Honorable Toi W. Hutchinson:  
Okay.

The Honorable James H. Hodges:  
Well, when I think about gerrymandering, I have an older brother who, in 1984, told me that Walter Mondale was going to actually beat Ronald Reagan because 'everyone he knew' was voting for Mondale. And I told him I said, "Mark, you need to get out more often, I believe, because you might see things a little differently."

And I think about gerrymandering in those terms because districts are drawn like where ... And the perspective I have about this is, I think George talked about a number of important points about gerrymandering, but here's the thing that's most important is I had colleagues tell me when I was a legislator that they didn't believe that poverty existed in South Carolina.

And I thought, "You know, you would be better served living in a district where you had rich people and poor people, you had shop owners, you had corporations where you had to learn to navigate dealing with all those different constituencies."

And I found, over the years, that the best legislators ... And I'm sure it's true in Virginia, where those who serve communities where they have to deal with lots of different issues, navigate that politically and balance those interests, because that's really good policy.

And I think that's the big danger of gerrymandering and how we do reapportionment now. We are homogenizing districts in a way that people can't communicate effectively, and people don't really understand what's going on in their state.

Ann Compton:  
Eric.

The Honorable Eric I. Cantor:  
I think we are really ... The times we're in are sort of different now too than when this first controversy started. Because I know that since I've been in a legislative body, and it was a long time ago, it was right before George became Governor; so in 1991 was when I first served in the House of Delegates.

And I'll tell you, but if you look at what's happening today, I think that figure is, if you look at the Senate of the United States right now, only nine states out of 50, only nine have a divided senatorial delegation; meaning there were Republicans or Democrats together serving that state.

Which then tends to say, "Hey, it's not gerrymandering in the Senate, this is sort of self-selecting, if you will." And if you also then go look at and see that ... And I think it's less than a quarter of the population of the United States actually lives in a state where there's a divided government in the legislature.

So in a way, people are beginning to sort of live with or think like people they live with and choose to do that, which goes to, I think, the point that George made. If you stick to the priority of being community representatives and really make it so that you try and pay attention to political boundaries, you naturally force, I think what Governor Hodges is saying, to try and have an individual that can take into consideration more than just one way of looking at things.

Ann Compton:

For the National Conference of State Legislators, this is a huge issue.

The Honorable Toi W. Hutchinson:

Yeah, and we have a commission on it, and we study it, and this is a lot of conversation across the country about it. And I think what we're talking about is those district packing. And when there's national gerrymandering conversations, when they look at like the congressional delegations versus what is happening at the state legislators, we have examples, which all went up to the Supreme Court on whether or not there's going to be some intervention on this; they kicked it back to the states, essentially.

And right now ... I serve in a district in Illinois where, on paper, it doesn't look like I'm supposed to be the Senator at all; not at all. Most people would assume that an African American legislator's going to have an all African American district. It also goes to some other myths about that, essentially, white people can represent everybody, but black people are only going to be the representative for the black people.

And I don't represent a district that's like that. I end up having to learn to have conversations, listen better, listen harder, listen more, talk to various different people in ways that before I was elected, I didn't even know I had those muscles. It really does make you a better legislator when you are forced to listen to people who do not look like you, don't think like you, don't have the same experiences you have; and district-packing stops that.

So if you have an entire district where you only have to deal with your base of people, you never have to go outside of those things, you never have to figure out how anybody else lives. Then you come to the legislative body, and you're faced with this reality. How do you negotiate with someone you're supposed to kill? How do you do that?

It's really difficult to walk into a room and to negotiate. And what is negotiation? There's no such thing as negotiation absent good faith; there's no good faith, there's no trust. There's no trust if I don't know you. So we talk on a regular basis, legislators across the country, when we come to our national summit, it's going to be in Nashville, Tennessee, August 5th through the 8th, and that'll be a topic of ... It's one of the topics of conversation that we discuss.

Because when legislators are charged to do with this, we deal with so many more things today than simply pulling together districts that would have worked maybe 20, or 30, or 40 years ago. Because there is, what Eric said, the self-selection, and people are moving into places, and choosing to live next to people that they know, and that they're comfortable with, and that they share common ideals, and values, and history, and culture and all kinds of things.

And there's nothing, necessarily, inherently wrong with that, it's just that it's happening at the same time that the way we receive our media, the way we receive information is also self-selecting. We also now can stay in our own bubbles, we can stay in a place and in a zone, where we only listen to ideas that reinforce ways that we always think.

I remember being in a town hall meeting, I walked in, and I said, "Who in here wants me to tell you the truth?" And every hand shot up, they said, "Just tell it like it is, tell the truth." I said, "Wait a minute, because the minute I say something you don't agree with, you're going to stop clapping." And that's the difference between when you're campaigning, when you actually have to govern.

When I'm campaigning, I need smiles, I need claps, I need applause; when I'm governing, it's not sexy. Now I need to talk to people that I don't agree with. Now I need to get people in the room that think differently than I do. I need to figure out how to move the ball forward. And I cannot do that if there is no benefit to my constituencies that they see me doing that.

So we're living in a world now where you don't get a benefit for being bipartisan, you don't get a benefit for compromising. But you also have the large cognitive dissonance where they will turn around and say at the same time, "We just want you to get things done." How do you get things done if you send me in to kill him and I ain't... I can't negotiate, I can't kill him, I can't do anything, nothing's happening, nothing's happening.

And we all, then, end up so frustrated, and we end up systems where most generally people will talk about how they hate the institution, but if they know their person, they like their person. They like their person, they'll come out, they're like, "I hate Congress. Congress isn't doing anything. All politicians are liars and crooks and thieves; not you." They're like, "Oh we love you, you're doing such a good job, you're so wonderful." And I'm like, "Oh just me? Nobody I hang out with?" Everybody's like, really?

And then that gets reinforced, that gets shared, that gets, from Facebook, to Instagram, to Twitter, the memes that get across. It's always really kind, but also kind of heartbreaking whenever I walk up to someone, and they say, "I didn't know you'd be that ... I enjoyed talking to you.

The Honorable George F. Allen:  
Yeah.

The Honorable Toi W. Hutchinson:

I didn't know you thought that way." Or, "I disagree with everything you just said, but I appreciate the fact that you strongly believe what it is you just said; I'm going to give you a chance." Those encounters are becoming more and more rare, because we are able to come back into our own little corners, and not, when I see another person, when I look at you, when I see another person, I'm hoping that I'm not wondering whether or not ... you know, just in a real human space. Whether or not you're a Democrat or Republican, whether or not you're conservative, or liberal, or anywhere on this spectrum; but that I see a human being, a human being worthy of having a discussion with.

And my heart hurts with where we are today as a result of that. And I don't know if any of us knew, I don't know what the answers are to that. But I do know that it is worth continuing to fight about it, it's worth continuing to debate about it, it's worth being in the arena to try to solve it, because it's the only place where it's going to solve it. And I do think that that work happens absolutely in the states.

Ann Compton:

I want to turn to a question, and I'm going to start with Karl. Is the communications problem, the people finding their own comfort zone, the proliferation of cable news internet sites, the less influence of major networks, less influence of that morning newspaper ... I hope some of you still get them on your doorstep in the morning. Is it the fault of media? I tend to blame the digital age itself for changing these communications. Karl?

Karl C. Rove:

Yeah. Look, technology is the enemy. We must take all those machines and break the internet. We must destroy electricity and return to a purer, simpler, more faithful age. Look, yeah, social media is corrosive, social media is bringing us back to a point where we sort of cocoon in our own comfortable sources of information.

On the other hand, we've been there before. The country began in an age in which we got our information primarily from newspapers almost exclusively, and they were party organs, and they were party organs controlled by politicians. We had a big example not too far from here in Richmond, when in the run up to the 1800 campaign, the saying is Thomas Jefferson put a notorious slander and libelist in control of the *Richmond Whig*, and off he went writing bad editorials about John Adams.

And then he, after the election, wanted to be rewarded with a sinecure in the State Department so he could continue writing and have two salaries. And when that didn't happen, he proceeded to write the first editorial that Mr. Jefferson had sired a child by a slave. So Jefferson got a comeuppance for having hired the notorious Mr. Calder.

But we went through this age, and we went through an age of technological change. We think we're going through an age now, and we are, but think about the moment in the 1840s when, suddenly, information began to be shared instantaneously across the country. Before, it took weeks to get something to flow from Boston to New Orleans, and the invention of the telegraph brought about the instantaneous national news network, if you will.

Talk about the technological change in the 1870s when along comes cheap steam powered printing machines, and suddenly we have a proliferation of every kind of newspaper. There are 13 daily newspapers in the city of New York in 1896, which is down from their previous high. And again, you were picking the kind of information that you wanted. Imagine the technological revolutions of radio in the 1920s and television in the 1950s?

So our entire country's history has been one where how we receive information, how we process information, how we can check its sources and authenticity, have constantly been challenged by the change in technology. I will admit I think this is the most grave change in technology, because social media, in particular, is coarse, and vulgar, and corrosive.

And the internet is such that ... I have this great friend, she's about 94 years old. Polly Sal, she was one of the founders of the modern Republican Party of Virginia, and she sends me these emails that she sends around to her 200 fellow ancient, blue-haired, Republican women pals. And they're the most extraordinary ... "Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez is the son of aliens from Mars."

And, "Polly, this is not true." "Oh, okay, I'll send out an email correcting it to all my pals." And this goes on all the time, and you got to worry a little bit about it. I don't know what the answer is, but it is corrosive, there's no ifs, ands, or buts about it, and it's different; we got to find a way to deal with it.

Ann Compton:  
And-

The Honorable George F. Allen:  
Let me take a point that-

Ann Compton:  
Sure.

The Honorable George F. Allen:  
I look at the Internet as the greatest invention since the Gutenberg Press for the dissemination of ideas and information. Look, a representative democracy, who are the owners of the government? The people, and so the people decide. The reason newspapers are dying, people can get biased information for free on the internet. People realize that ... Human beings have a position and a view. Reporting, too much, has turned into columns and editorials.

And Karl, even before all of those wonderful milestones in history, if it weren't for the Gutenberg Press, who would have read those 95 theses that Martin Luther nailed to the church at Wittenberg? The Gutenberg Press got that idea out, those ideas that led to the Protestant Reformation; and I'm not promoting-

Karl C. Rove:

Spoken as a great Baptist, thank you sir.

The Honorable George F. Allen:

No, no, ooh no, German ... I believe Jefferson's view on, and the first freedom of religion where Jefferson said, "Whether somebody believes in one god, 10 gods, or no gods doesn't break my leg nor picks my pocket." So religious freedom means you believe what you want, and your rights are not enhanced nor diminished on account of it.

But the internet ... What I think of the social media that has changed compared to the newspapers, the letters to the editor, you had to put your name to it; now it's anonymous. And so there's just ranting, and hyperbole, and the media on top of it, they used to talk about sensational headlines; it's now click bait. The more clicks you get, the more advertising revenues you get in. So everything is hyped up, and it's not just the bloggers who do that, it's all of them; mainstream media-

The Honorable Toi W. Hutchinson:

There's no road-

The Honorable George F. Allen:

And so it's-

The Honorable Toi W. Hutchinson:

No bumpers, there's no guardrails.

The Honorable George F. Allen:

There's no bumpers, it's all called-

The Honorable Toi W. Hutchinson:

Yes.

The Honorable George F. Allen:

Freedom, and people need to recognize, just because it's in the newspaper, or just because it's on the internet, doesn't necessarily mean that it's true. You need to, as Reagan would say, "Trust but verify." In dealing-

The Honorable Eric I. Cantor:

But that's-

The Honorable George F. Allen:

With what you read online.

The Honorable Eric I. Cantor:

And we're about to see this go to the next stage when you've got video that is going to be put together-

The Honorable Toi W. Hutchinson:  
Right-

The Honorable Eric I. Cantor:  
Put together-

The Honorable Toi W. Hutchinson:  
Yeah.

The Honorable Eric I. Cantor:  
And these fake videos that are going to go in, and if you think is difficult to convince people what they're reading about AOC is not true, imagine the difficulty in telling-

The Honorable Toi W. Hutchinson:  
Yeah.

The Honorable Eric I. Cantor:  
Somehow what they saw is not true. We're going to get to a point, I believe, in a system of accountability. It's like-

Karl C. Rove:  
Yeah, there's a cautionary note in here about reform. In the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2001, passed in 2002, John McCain and his colleague, a democrat from Wisconsin-

The Honorable George F. Allen:  
Feingold.

Karl C. Rove:  
Enshrined in BICRA a provision that said, "If you put an ad on the internet, you're not required to, if you pay for advertising on the internet, you're not required to have a disclaimer."  
Disclaimers on the internet are entirely ... You're the committee for truth in America, you don't need to put your disclaimer on there today.

And we faced not only the deep fakes of some kid sitting in a garage in suburban Denver, but remember in 2016, one of the main drivers of news on the internet were a group of kids in, I think, it was Montenegro, who had figured out that if they made up weird websites that were either very liberal or very conservative and sort of manufactured information from public sites and gave a spin to it, they could get advertising money from putting up these websites and driving traffic to it.

So that the click bait might have only been \$22.55 a day, but by God that goes a long way in Montenegro. And we're facing an international threat from not merely the trolls at the GRU in St. Petersburg, but we're facing, in 2020, the likelihood that the Chinese, the Koreans, the North Koreans, and non-state actors are going to be trying to play in the American elections as well as Russia.

Ann Compton:  
So what-

The Honorable George F. Allen:  
Right but, yeah, so what the point is, are you going to try to restrict? All of what y'all are saying is true, but you want the government to somehow start regulating?

Ann Compton:  
Well-

Karl C. Rove:  
At minimum, I think we ought to have disclaimers required of anybody-

The Honorable George F. Allen:  
Oh, I agree.

Karl C. Rove:  
Running political ads.

The Honorable Eric I. Cantor:  
Absolutely-

Karl C. Rove:  
You buy a political ad, you got to-

The Honorable George F. Allen:  
Definitely.

Karl C. Rove:  
File it committee, and Facebook and others have to make that information public. So unlike television where if you go out and buy a bunch of TV ads, the buyers know about it, you have to fill out blah, blah. Now I want that to be public so that we can all figure out who is that committee, and where are they? Are they really registered with the Federal Election Commission, or the Virginia Department of Elections, or are they a bunch of GRU trolls, or a bunch of Chinese agents in Beijing trying to interfere with our election?

The Honorable George F. Allen:  
Agree, agree, disclosure-

Karl C. Rove:  
And second of all, we ought to have a very robust presence by our intelligence agencies to be investigating on all this kind of stuff, so that we don't just indict 33 people, Muller just doesn't indict 33 people, we indict every son of a bitch who's tried to play in the American elections in 2020, in real time, just like they did with the hacker in Capital One.

The Honorable Toi W. Hutchinson:

I do think that our laws haven't caught up with the disruptive nature of what technology does. So we're accustomed to getting information that way we get it, there's journalistic standards, and now we have this new ability to say what it is we think and send out all these opinions and stuff without any of those same standards in place.

The Honorable Eric I. Cantor:

See, but this is-

The Honorable Toi W. Hutchinson:

You don't have to verify any of those things-

The Honorable Eric I. Cantor:

Well-

The Honorable Toi W. Hutchinson:

And I don't think our libel and slander laws-

The Honorable Eric I. Cantor:

But this is not-

The Honorable Toi W. Hutchinson:

Apply to any of that.

The Honorable Eric I. Cantor:

I don't think that this is where the government is going to be able to do it, because it is going to be obsolete as soon as the government does something. I believe that we have found ways, going back to the kind of disruptive technology way back when centuries ago, that that society figured out a way to hold people to account.

And I think it's going to be more market based, I mean you've already got people out there now taking algorithms and trying to assess veracity, and I think you're going to have a system that will develop out of the market. Anytime the government gets involved, you start picking winners and losers. So I do think though-

The Honorable Toi W. Hutchinson:

I think two things can be true at the exact same time. You can have market based things that happen with guardrails, and the government ought and must do. I don't think that you can ... it has to ... All of our conversations need to be either/or.

Karl C. Rove:

Yeah, there's-

The Honorable Toi W. Hutchinson:

That is one of those things where we must act.

Karl C. Rove:  
I'm with Toi on it.

The Honorable Toi W. Hutchinson:  
Because this is the way we.

The Honorable George F. Allen:  
Government needs to require transparency.

The Honorable Toi W. Hutchinson:  
Right.

Karl C. Rove:  
I'm with Toi-

The Honorable Toi W. Hutchinson:  
Right.

Karl C. Rove:  
On this.

The Honorable George F. Allen:  
Agree.

Karl C. Rove:  
One of the largest Twitter accounts active in the 2016 presidential election was TNRep, Tennessee Republicans, which was being run out of St Petersburg, Soviet well-

The Honorable George F. Allen:  
Russia.

Karl C. Rove:  
Russia.

The Honorable George F. Allen:  
Yeah.

Karl C. Rove:  
Soviet Union.

The Honorable Toi W. Hutchinson:  
It's okay to say it.

Karl C. Rove:

Putinville. It's being run out of Putinville, and our government did not find out about it until afterwards. And the private sector, they were the ones that allowed it to set up. And when the Tennessee Republican Party kept saying to Twitter, "Hey Jack Dorsey, this is not us." They refused to do anything about it. And it is a Soviet/Russian-

The Honorable Eric I. Cantor:

It's fraud.

Karl C. Rove:

Yeah, it's fraud.

The Honorable Eric I. Cantor:

It's fraud. That's-

Karl C. Rove:

And there ought to be tools to allow private individuals but, more importantly, it ought to be a possibility for the government to sanction people by saying, "You're violating the law."

The Honorable Toi W. Hutchinson:

Yeah.

Karl C. Rove:

You're impersonating a state political party-

The Honorable George F. Allen:

That's right.

Karl C. Rove:

When you're really some guy named-

The Honorable Eric I. Cantor:

Those laws exist.

Karl C. Rove:

Yeah.

Ann Compton:

Do you have a-

The Honorable George F. Allen:

Those laws exist, yeah.

The Honorable James H. Hodges:

So the problem with all this, to me, is you begin ... If your Joe Public, you begin not to trust any information, you begin to think everything is fake news. Whether it's the New York Times-

The Honorable Toi W. Hutchinson:  
It's designed to do that.

The Honorable James H. Hodges:  
Or whether-

The Honorable James H. Hodges:  
It's the things you-

The Honorable Toi W. Hutchinson:  
Yeah.

The Honorable James H. Hodges:  
See on the internet, we got to get our arms around this, because no one believes any information that they see is real because of the things that they read about what happens on the internet. I mean this is the scary thing, is that we can't even agree on common sets of facts now, as to what problems are, because of all of the things that are going on with the internet.

Ann Compton:  
In the very few minutes we have left, could each of you come up with an idea or two of what not only governments can do to change what Bob Gates this morning called, "uncharted territory," how dangerous it has become. But come up with an idea of what not only governments might be able to do, at any level, or what the American people need to demand of the information and the leaders they put out. And I'm going to start with you, Governor Hodges.

The Honorable James H. Hodges:  
Part-time legislators. I really think that one of the things about Congress is that it has become such a full time occupation that the people in the Congress don't have a chance to really engage as much with their colleagues, with people back home as they might. And I think there is a lot to be said for a part-time Congress, where they spend more time at home dealing with people, talking to people about the problems that exist in the community, going back to the system that we had in the 1950s and before.

That's one thing that actually was pretty good then, is the time that was spent at home back in the district. So as minor as that may seem, I think trying to move to a system like state governments, where people spend a lot more time at home; and it also shortens careers too.

Ann Compton:  
If we can get rid of air conditioning, like they didn't have any in 1619. Go to Eric Cantor.

The Honorable Eric I. Cantor:  
And the question is what could the American people or government do to-?

Ann Compton:

Get past this period of dysfunction and hostility.

The Honorable Eric I. Cantor:

Certainly if you look at it from the leadership level, in terms of legislative bodies at the state level or in Congress, I always say we need to start seeing the practice of winning together again. And so at the legislative level, if you take an issue that may not be the sexiest or most consequential issue, but again establish a pattern of working together, as I was saying earlier, it could really go a long way.

But we've got to start to go about the seeds of planting those seats again. And I do think it's about re-establishing some norms or stop trying to go in and break up the norms, every single day we wake up. Because there's actually some value in some of these institutions that have developed, and they have developed based on what the subject of these several days are here in Williamsburg, celebrating Jamestown. It is those pillars of democracy, that balance of power, the notion that we don't want mob rule, which is what you've got online right now, directly impacting policymaking. So somehow there needs to be an intervention.

Ann Compton:

Karl Rove.

Karl C. Rove:

Well, I'll end where I started by agreeing with Governor Hodges on part-time legislators. You may not know this about my home state of Texas, we're the second-

Karl C. Rove:

Most populous state in the union, and our legislature meets for 140 days every two years, but alone ... And we pay them \$600 a month, and begrudge every single penny we pay them. And we, like every other state, have a balanced budget requirement.

But here's the other thing we ought to try and figure out how to do, and this will surprise you.

We do not organize, and we have not for 50 years, organized the Texas Legislature on a partisan basis. When I moved to Texas, moved from Richmond, Virginia, packed up and moved to Austin, Texas, I went to work for the senior Republican in the legislature; he was one of 13 out of 150 members of the House of Representatives, and he'd been a committee chair.

Today we have 88 Republicans and a majority of the committee chairs in the House are Democrats. When I moved there, there were three Republicans in the state Senate out of 31, and one of them was a committee chair. Today we have 21 Republican state Senators and 10 Democrats, and we have Democratic committee chairs. In fact, the longest serving chair in the Senate is a Democrat, Chairman of Criminal Justice.

So I don't know how we get there, but we just passed a state budget, 147 to 3. When every state had to cut its budgets, we had to cut ours not the future growth of state spending, we had to cut

our bi-annual budget from \$110 billion to \$100 billion from the previous biennium, cut it by \$10 billion for about 9%; it passed the House of Representatives 149 to zero. Because the members were working within a limited time constraint, 140 days, they were not organized on a partisan basis. Now we fight over redistricting and important things like the Bathroom Bill but, by and large, it operates on a nonpartisan basis.

Let me say one other quick thing. I don't think we're going to get out of this mess until we have different leadership, and it's probably not going to be until 2024 that we have both parties nominating somebody who says, "We're all in this together." The politics of the Gilded Age that I mentioned earlier, it was terrible, 20 years of divided government, two years of Republican government, two years of Democratic government.

Five Presidents are elected in a row, none of whom get 50% of the vote. Two Presidents elected with a majority in the Electoral College, but they lose the popular vote. A third President elected with majorities in the Electoral College and the popular vote, but his nationwide popular vote majority is 9,000 votes, and an ugly politics that makes today's literally look like they're singing Kum Ba Yah.

I was reading a debate in 1884 on a tariff measure, and one Democrat excoriates another member of his own party, the former Speaker, the first Democratic Speaker of the House in 18 years, by calling him a thief, and a liar, and a cad for having broken party ranks to support the protectionist position on this free trade measure.

And when finally Speaker Randall says, "I've had enough of this." And with appeals to the Chair, the Chair declared the gentleman from Georgia out of order. He turns to the former Speaker and says, "I would not blank you if you were a dog." Four letters, you can figure out what they were. But this is the tone of the times, and until along comes this mild mannered, reform minded President, whom you've never really paid any attention to, named William McKinley and breaks the deadlock and ushers in 32 years of Republican domination that's also marked by enormous periods of bipartisan cooperation. And it's because there is a change in the tone of the leadership at the top, which matters a lot.

Ann Compton:  
Toi Hutchinson.

The Honorable Toi W. Hutchinson:

So I was actually going to go to statesmanship. I was going to meet ... And it doesn't necessarily mean that we need one person, or we're going to look for a Messiah to come in and save everybody.

But I do think that our body politic does need to start to reward statesmanship. That when people think about why you go into public service in the first place ... I mean, our general conversation about the political discourse is another one of those loops: we hate government, government doesn't work, why should we pay attention, we're not going to participate, we're not ... All we're

going to do is yell and scream about it, because we hate government because government doesn't work. It's just a loop, it's an endless loop.

And I do think that that is, when you are having your own conversations at the dinner table in your families ... And everybody has that crazy uncle that says something crazy at Thanksgiving dinner; saves it up to say it at Thanksgiving dinner. And people be like, "Don't sit Uncle so-in-so at the ..." Because you know he's going to say something crazy.

Today, those kinds of things are splitting up whole families, they're changing neighborhoods, and blocks, and things. They are like, "I can't talk to you once I find out what I think you believe politically right now." And I do think that, in this day and age right now, if we don't start to, as a populace, deal with the fact that our institutions were created for a reason, they need to be protected because they are fragile, they are as fragile as democracy is.

And as long as we allow this corrosive discussion to happen amongst all of us, across the country, that government can't be a power for good, that we don't need people to come in and have ... Like this representative democracy is somehow fallible in and of itself because people are fallible; people are always fallible.

I'm not going to ... There's only one person who loves me completely, unconditionally, who I know would do anything in the world for me. That is my mother. I don't agree with her all the time; I just don't. And she knows that and I know that, and our families know that.

So looking for the person that you agree with 100% of the time, and then anybody who is of an opposing view is now the Devil, this constant de-legitimization of the opposition, that you can't have a debate with someone who... I won't acknowledge you even have a genuine premise that I can argue from.

That talk, that thing that we allow all of ourselves to do, we do it at home, we do it in our living rooms, we do it when we come from church, we do it all the time. It is then no surprise that when you show up, and it's election time, and the ad starts going, and the internet things start happening, and all that stuff starts to get seeping, that it's already in our public consciousness, that this in and of itself is an evil institution.

And so what I'm looking for, and what I hope we do, is remember that there is honor in public service, there's a reason to go into public service. For some of us it's a calling, for some of us it's a thing that we are supposed to be doing when you care about something bigger than yourself, and bigger than your own block, your own bank account, your own neighborhood, your own community, bigger than you. There is an honor to public service.

And as long as we keep behaving as though the entire political system isn't even worth saving, then none of us are going to be able to come together to solve the biggest, most complicated problems we have when nobody trusts the institutions we have that are designed to solve those problems. It's time for us to start protecting the institutions we have right now, because they're all of ours.

Ann Compton:  
Governor Allen.

The Honorable George F. Allen:

All right, cleanup. Thank you, thank you, Senator. I think any leader or anybody who cares to lead needs to lead by example on various areas that you can find common ground. Governor Hodges and I were glad to be with each other about a month ago. We both co-authored an op-ed that appeared in the Virginia and the South Carolina papers in support of the United States, Mexico, Canada Trade Agreement. It's good for America. We need to be interconnected; trade is good for jobs and our competitiveness. And so all of us, whatever our role is, whether it's state legislatures, Congress, or elsewhere need to show that sort of effort.

The other message from this week and this remembrance is trusting the people. Government closest to the people, representative democracy is created to protect our natural rights: freedom of religion, freedom of expression for men and women, private ownership of property, the rule of law, where you have fair adjudication of disputes as well as protection of our natural God-given rights. And the states are those laboratories of innovation and democracy that are closest to the people. We can learn from the states. Everyone's talking about Washington dysfunction. Everyone talking about the 49 states have a balanced budget requirement that forces-

The Honorable Toi W. Hutchinson:  
Come to the summit in Nashville.

The Honorable George F. Allen:

Come to the Summit in Nashville, and you know, Dolly sings, "9 to 5," for the Senator. And the other thing is they need, the folks who are public servants, need to be in touch with the way normal people look at things. And, honestly, if members of Congress do not get the one thing they're supposed to do done on time, withhold their pay. People will say ... And I guarantee you, they'll get it all done on time, that's the way it is in the real world.

And so we can learn from the states, we can put in those structures at the federal level, we can get a government that is reflective of what we the people want. But, ultimately, it's we the people and what we should insist on for our competitive states and our competitive country.

From the very beginning, till now, until the future if you want to be successful in your competition for jobs, and innovation, public safety, you got to be willing to change, to adapt, to innovate and improve standing; standing still will get you put behind. And so we the people need to be propelling our public servants to be willing to change, adapt, innovate, and improve, and always advancing freedom and opportunities for all.

Ann Compton:

And this is your panel's way of saying, "We all depend on you as well as public citizens, after all the power is in your hands." Please thank this remarkable panel.

## **The Global Pathfinder Summit: Young Leaders in Dialogue**

**James B. Murray, Jr., Founder, The Presidential Precinct; Managing General Partner, Court Square Ventures; Rector of the Board of Visitors, University of Virginia**

**Patience Andrew, Atlas Corps Fellow; Global Pathfinder Summit Delegate**

**Reginald L. McCoy, Jr, Deputy Chief Probation & Parole Officer, Virginia Department of Corrections; Global Pathfinder Summit Delegate**

James B. Murray, Jr.:

Good afternoon. I can't promise you, as David Rubenstein did earlier, that this will be the best panel. I can promise you it'll be the shortest and most importantly, it will be the youngest, present company excluded. As we all know, we've had a series of events for the past six months celebrating democracy, the founding of this nation. The focus of most of those events have been on the past, on the geniuses who thought of representative democracy and the founding fathers who implemented it by putting together the constitutional documents we needed to create a democracy that is now the longest lived in history.

One of the most significant of the events of the past six months was the Global Pathfinder Summit. At the summit, we shifted the focus from the past to the future. From the history to the youth. The Global Pathfinder Summit, as you just heard, brought together 135 rising young leaders from 49 different countries all over the world, and 56 delegates from here in Virginia. These are the youth that Secretary Bob Gates cited this morning as his number one reason why he's optimistic.

When we convened in May, we had chosen people with proven leadership ability. Young people between the ages of 25 and 35 who had already demonstrated in their careers that they were leaders, that they were going somewhere. They came together to talk about civic engagement, about how civic engagement can serve democracy. They engaged with each other to talk about the future of democracy. Throughout the week, they attended workshops and keynotes, collaborative discussions. They focused on civic engagement, leadership development, networking, and how these skills can contribute to a successful democracy. They participated in service projects, sponsored by the United Way. The speakers included Wael Ghonim, who was the leader of the Arab Spring in Egypt in 2015. The Honorable Ralph Gonsalves, the prime minister of St. Vincent and the Grenadines and the longest serving head of state in the Western world. We had faculty who did leadership training. We had deep design thinking, geopolitical experts, women's empowerment experts. We talked about freedom of speech. We talked about decision making. So let's watch a video about the Global Pathfinder Summit, a short video if we'll play it now.

The Honorable M. Kirkland Cox:

I've got quite an honor tonight. I get to come to the Global Pathfinder Summit and Presidential Ideas Festival where we're going to talk about some of the great themes of our fourth anniversary, democracy, diversity, and opportunity, but more important we're commemorating

the 400 years of American democracy, and it really does give us a unique opportunity to engage in that dialogue and hopefully continue this great journey to represent democracy.

James B. Murray, Jr.:

We have with us changemakers and our mission is to help those young leaders learn to build democracies and promote those issues of law and justice that make for successful democracies.

Dr. Joanne B. Freeman:

What is the experience of that person's life? Once I understand that, how can I understand that person?

The Honorable Derek J. Mitchell:

We talk about citizenship as being the most important job in democracy. That's a job. That's not just broad, general education. That's a particular type of education. When you're a doctor, you study medicine in order to become a doctor. To be a citizen, you need to learn how to be a citizen.

James E. Ryan:

Every one of you is here because you believe in the power of ideas and my hope is that you can spend time here with each other, learn from each other, and leave here with at least one idea that you think is worth spreading.

James B. Murray, Jr.:

On behalf of the Presidential Precinct, I'd like to thank the Commonwealth of Virginia and American Evolution for making the Global Pathfinder Summit possible. Two years ago, Frank Atkinson, Kirk Cox, and I got together to discuss their vision for a 400th anniversary of representative democracy. We agreed that it would be not enough to end these celebrations just having talked about the past, but that we should encourage and inspire young people to go forth and build on Virginia's 400 year history of democratic government.

We decided to convene these young leaders to engage them as advocates so that we would not limit our vision to just Virginia or just to the U.S., but to do what Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, William Short, our first diplomats did. They went to Europe and began talking about democracy and freedom before the constitution was ratified. We've been talking about it as Americans ever since. When Frank and Kirk and I decided we needed to do something for the future, we decided the thing to do was to send young people back across the world to talk about what happened here at Jamestown 400 years ago.

We decided the precinct was the ideal platform to do this. Our mission at the precinct is to deal with young leaders. We convene them to discuss, debate, and collaborate over issues of democracy. That's what the precinct does.

Some quick background, the precinct is a collaboration between the University of Virginia, the College of William & Mary, Thomas Jefferson's Monticello, James Madison's Montpelier, James Monroe's Highland, and UVA's Morven. We think of the precinct in this context. 2,400 years ago

Aristotle said, "At his best, man is the noblest of all animals. Separated from law and justice, he is the worst." The precinct's mission is to provide a forum for young, democratic idealists to create a caucus where young leaders can come study, debate, and collaborate around Aristotle's ideals of law and justice.

At the precinct, we focused on young, proven, aspiring leaders, people who are not yet part of a system. People who are trying to create new systems, trying to create better forms of government than the ones they have now. It's our mission to promote that kind of thinking, to promote people to go back to the world and think about issues of law and justice. The precinct is young. It's five and a half years old. Since we've got together our first visitors, international visitors five and a half years ago, we have now had over a thousand people from over 120 countries come here to Virginia, and they've come here to the epicenter of democracy and we send them home to build stronger democracies. The almost 200 people that visited Charlottesville in May constituted the largest and most diverse group of visitors we've ever had. The positive energy was amazing.

Imagine this, a young woman engineer from Poland debating the importance of the role of civil society with a civic advocate from Peru. Listening to that conversation is a clinical social worker from Richmond, Virginia. Or think about this. That Richmond, Virginia person, what are they thinking about? Well, how do we enforce the payment of water bills? That kind of thinking is generated by hearing folks from other parts of the world talk about what it's like to run their countries. We had a young longshoreman and journalist from Germany and we had him talking about open job markets for women with a youth program coordinator from Latvia. We had people from Malaysia, Sri Lanka, from all over the world talking about these issues for a week.

So it didn't end there. Coming out of that program, we had two unique forward thinking outcomes. The first was the Virginia Resolutions. The task of creating the Virginia Resolutions ran throughout the week. The Virginia Resolutions that were collectively crafted by all the young leaders themselves, is a statement that should give us all hope about the future of democracy. A statement of how our next generation plans to build democracies for the next 400 years.

We concluded, or they concluded, the delegates concluded that civic engagement was critical to keeping democracy alive. The delegates worked on these resolutions in a series of facilitated workshops over the course of a week. The resulting resolution we are going to post on the screen now. You should be able to see it in a minute, a list of resolutions that was developed by these nearly 200 young people that visited Charlottesville in May.

So it's not possible to bring all 200 of them back here today to talk to you. They're now dispersed back to 49 different countries, but we're fortunate to have two of May's delegates here. I'd like to introduce to you two outstanding young leaders to have a short discussion about the creation of the Virginia Resolutions and some reflections about their time in Charlottesville. Patience Andrews, a native of Nigeria, and Reginald L. McCoy, Jr., a native of Chesapeake, Virginia who's the deputy chief probation officer for the Commonwealth. Patience, please join us.

Patience Andrew:  
Hi.

James B. Murray, Jr.:

So I'd like to begin by asking each of you to give us a brief introduction. Tell us about yourselves, why you were chosen, what you thought of your time at the Global Pathfinder Summit, but I'd also like you to say a little something about what your personal goals are going from here forward. So Patience let's start with you.

Patience Andrew:

All right. Good afternoon everyone, and thank you to the American Evolution for having us here. The Global Pathfinder Summit that we had in May was an awesome experience for me due to the fact that it was diverse and really inclusive in the way that it was structured. And getting to meet all the leaders from around the world who came together to talk about the future of civic engagement and global democracy from their different countries was really mind blowing.

The highlight of that whole experience for me would be the outcome. Having the Virginia Resolutions that we have today, which is a working document and a point of reference for a lot of delegates who gathered in May for that summit.

Just a bit of background for myself. I work in the nonprofit sector and also in the creative sector in Nigeria and also a broadcast journalist serving in a local radio station in Nigeria. All of that experience for me wanted me to have an international experience within the nonprofit sector. So I applied for the Atlas Corp Fellowship, which is an exchange program for global leaders in the nonprofit sector to come to the U.S. to serve for about a year, build relationships, networks, and then go back to their home countries to develop the different community projects that they are working on.

I also got to hear about the Pathfinder Summit under the Atlas Corp program. Since it was an opportunity to learn more about civic engagement, global leadership, and interact with other global leaders from the world, I saw that as a huge opportunity to be a part of that experience. Also I found myself a challenge, being me, and the experience was phenomenal. I still muse over my experience to date.

James B. Murray, Jr.:

What are your plans for the future?

Patience Andrew:

My plans for the future is to create opportunities and create more platforms to amplify youth voice, especially in Nigeria and most parts of Africa for an equitable and just society, because that seems to be lacking a lot in Africa.

James B. Murray, Jr.:

Thank you. Reggie.

Reginald L. McCoy, Jr.:

Yes. So thanks again, as was stated, to the American Evolution for having us. So I am a deputy chief probation and parole officer with the Virginia Department of Corrections, largest state

agency, where we supervise in the community those who have been incarcerated and are now considered returning citizens. So we engage with them in order to create a more safe society.

The reason that I became involved in the Global Pathfinder Summit is that I am also a member of VGEA, the Virginia Government Employees Association. I got an email about the opportunity, and I was fortunate enough to be selected by the association to represent state employees. That was very important, to have a Virginia delegate to represent the state employees. So I put my ticket in and I got the golden ticket, got fortunate.

For me, the Global Pathfinder Summit was above and beyond anything I could have imagined. My interest was to be able to engage with leaders such as Patience from all over the globe. What I found was that the experience was so enriching, being able to learn about the different things that they're doing in their communities and the projects they're working on. So it just gave me new life and reinvigorated me, got me more energetic about being involved in the community and about how fortunate we are in our country for our democracy that we have.

James B. Murray, Jr.:

What was it like, Reggie, to meet so many people from so many different cultures, religions, ethnicities of presumably people from countries you'd never heard of?

Reginald L. McCoy, Jr.:

Yes, absolutely. Also countries that I also haven't had the privilege to be able to visit. It was amazing, but what I did notice was common threads. I noticed that at the heart of it when you're talking about humanity, we all want the same things. We all want to be successful, we want to see our communities thrive. We want to be able to provide for our families and make sure that they are growing up in safe community, safe environments where we can enjoy life and really be able to be as on. And not feel like we're fighting or anyone's rights are discriminated against.

James B. Murray, Jr.:

So Patience, let's turn to you. You spoke, you were chosen to speak at the end of the Global Pathfinder Summit. You did an amazing job, by the way.

Patience Andrew:

Thank you.

James B. Murray, Jr.:

At the end of that summary, we had a pretty good idea of what you saw the Pathfinder Summit was about. I'd like to make it a little more personal. When you think of your return to Nigeria in six months or so, what do you think is going to be difficult about implementing what you heard in May in Charlottesville?

Patience Andrew:

I'll say for me, the truth is the resolutions look really good and pretty on paper, but each time I think about the reality in Nigeria, it seems as though it is almost impossible to implement those resolutions. A key reason for these difficulty, I'll say, is the lack of people having the basic

human resources that they need. Needs such as food, shelter, water, electricity, and all of that. We've seen in the case of Nigeria, there has been a huge history of vote buying, even in the last elections we had. This is because people in the rural communities do not have access to basic amenities such as the internet or even have mobile phones. I remember during the summit when there's breakout sessions, and I was in a room full of Americans and other individuals who kept talking about the development of sophisticated technical tools to hold leaders accountable.

I knew just about then that that's going to be really difficult for a lot of rural communities back in Nigeria. So I feel like and I know that definitely that the issue around meeting the basic universal resources that people need in most local communities in Africa would definitely be an impediment to the growth of civic engagement or democracy even as a whole. Therefore, there is a need to tackle that particular issue. As we've seen also, there's an increase and rise of unemployment in Nigeria as well.

And if we're able to tackle all of these issues, then people wouldn't sell their votes, and young people wouldn't have voter apathy and not even be interested in the whole entire electoral process. Because I have friends who are similarly educated who didn't vote in the last election, because they just don't have any faith or trust in the electoral system as a whole. Basically that survival instinct is a huge problem for us.

I feel like there's a great need to address that particular issue around employment for youth to be able to objectively reason about who they would want to put in office and how those individuals can give them the dividends of democracy.

James B. Murray, Jr.:

You'll work on that when you get back.

Patience Andrew:

Yes, definitely.

James B. Murray, Jr.:

So Reggie, how did what you experienced at the summit affect you personally? Is there anything that is going to influence your personal behavior? Anything you're going to tell your family, any lessons that you want to tell your children?

Reginald L. McCoy, Jr.:

Yes, absolutely. The main thing is that I need to do more. I need to get more involved, and we have a responsibility. I consider myself to be in a privileged position. So what that means is that I have a duty and a responsibility to get out there and engage more with the community, to be able to reach out to those who are less fortunate, don't have access to education and some of the other pillars of our society that enable people to be successful and in order to be able to civically engage and be a part of the government.

James B. Murray, Jr.:

Great. So I want to make sure that we give you both one tough question. So I'm going to common question to both of you. Takes a little setting up, but Jefferson, George Washington, James Madison, Alexander Hamilton, all of them spoke frequently and passionately about the need for an educated electorate. Jeffrey Rosen from the National Constitution Center spoke about that earlier this morning. The number two goal and the final resolution of the Virginia Resolutions addressed the same point, calling for educated citizens. Today if we look across the world, we see voters who appear to be poorly informed, voting for populace who seem to be insulting their intelligence, who talk about increasing benefits without increasing taxes, who talk about crushing some religious or racial minority. In Italy and Ukraine, we have comedians have been elected president. In Hungary, we have a democratically elected president who's closed the finest university in Eastern Europe because they're afraid of educated people.

So we look at that. We look at Brexit, we look at U.S. trade policy, other things and say educated, well-informed people understand the facts, and they know that these are phony dreams. These are things that can never happen. Yet we have people getting majority of the votes who can't distinguish fact from fiction, who seem to promise things that have no basis in reality. So what would each of you do to further Jefferson and Madison's ideal of an educated electorate?

Patience Andrew:

What I would do personally, going back to what I said earlier about the issue of people having to meet the basic needs that they have to survive as individuals living in a place like Nigeria, it was surprising that something as mundane as spices, a bag of rice, could allow someone to sell their votes in most of those rural communities. Like I said earlier also, these are people mostly in the rural communities, who do not have the basic level of education that they should have. Some of them might not even understand a single word in English, right? Most of these corrupt politicians go to that target population. As we've also seen in Nigeria, people in the rural communities participate more in politics than those in the urban cities. This is because they vote more, because it's easier to get their votes, because they do not understand why they should even vote or who they should vote for in the first place.

So you see that poverty in those rural communities is a big challenge to civic educational or engagement as a whole to us as a country. That is why most politicians tend to focus in the rural communities to get more votes. Even in the recent elections we had, we had about 84 million people who are registered to vote. At the end of the day we had about 28 million people eventually cast their votes. It just goes on to show you that that's really low in terms of turnouts, considering the fact that we have an estimated population of what, 200 million people and just have that very small amount.

Very few people go out to vote. Just shows that there's a lot of voter apathy affecting us as a country and there is a need for us to educate people. So going back home, I co-founded a nonprofit that is engaged in civic engagement and also helping to amplify youth voice. It's to really go into those communities to get high risk individuals to engage them and educate them about civic engagement and the need for democracy and the basic tenants of democracy as a whole and have those youth on the other hand get to educate their peers about the need for civic engagement and democracy, but not just getting those youth.

We need to also solve the basic needs that they have such as shelter, food, and all that. So my intention going back home to do that work is to get high risk, young individuals in those communities, educate them, and have them serve as agents of change among their peers in their communities. But at the same time, most importantly, to pay them for doing that job, because I feel like that would be a huge incentive to get more people interested in politics as a whole.

James B. Murray, Jr.:

Reggie, we'll give you a minute. How do you see this issue of an educated electorate?

Reginald L. McCoy, Jr.:

Well, what I'd say is that we need to have open and honest conversations in which people can be able to understand that in order for things to happen, like infrastructure, things that we need, you have to have taxes. There's no way that you can reduce taxes or eliminate taxes and still be able to get the things that we need. I think also people need to be open and honest with themselves. To be able to realize, "Hey look, if I want for things to move forward and be able to process, then we need to be able to work together." Okay. Now, when you're talking about education, that involves to me collaboration. Collaborating with community agencies, and so, if we can do that and I think we can make people more educated, then they can have a better understanding about what they're doing civically.

James B. Murray, Jr.:

Thank you. So I'd like to wrap up. I said a few minutes ago that there were two long lasting things that came out of the Global Pathfinders Summit. We've just been talking about one of them, the resolutions, but there's another, and that is that the way the precinct operates is that we have a global, a digital platform, a virtual platform where everybody who's ever participated in any of our programs stays connected online permanently as long as they wish. So we have a Presidential Precinct network. It now has 7,000 young leaders around the world talking to each other about these issues, and the folks that were here in May are still talking to each other.

Patience told me a story at lunch about a young woman from El Salvador who was here in May, has returned to El Salvador, and has been online talking to her fellow delegates from other countries about the challenges they're facing in El Salvador, getting people civilly engaged and dealing with a president who is using the internet as a weapon to crush his opponents.

Now, I have no idea what advice these young folks are giving each other, but I feel confident that the fact that that's happening and will continue to happen has got to be good for democracy around the world. So out of what happened at Jamestown 400 years ago, we come full circle to these young folks building a digital platform to make sure that democracy survives. So with that, thank you for your time. Reggie, Patience thank you both for coming.

Patience Andrew:

Thank you.

Reginald L. McCoy, Jr.:

Thank you for having us.

### **Special Recognition**

**Dr. Larry J. Sabato, Founder and Director of the University of Virginia Center for Politics  
The Honorable John W. Warner, United States Senator from Virginia (1979–2009);  
Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee (1999–2001) and (2003–2007)**

Dr. Larry J. Sabato:

Well, good afternoon. It's not often I get a musical introduction, so I appreciate that very much. I think we'll have some fun with our panel when they come up, but as I think you know, I believe this is in the program. We're going to have a special guest first and a little intimate conversation between the special guest and me. And I feel very privileged to be able to chat with him, an old and dear friend, Senator John Warner. And Senator John Warner is oh, I don't know, he's approaching old age. I'm not going to say he's there, he's approaching old age. But you'd never know it.

We've been sitting in the back and talking about old times and this race and that race and all kinds of things. And I was thinking about his career and it's absolutely incredible because you can go back as far as World War II and Korea. He was in both of those wars and you didn't have to, you didn't have to. You didn't have to do the second one if you'd been in the first one, but he always was willing to jump in, to participate.

He did lots of things in between, but let's start with Secretary of the Navy in the early 1970s. Then he became head of the Bicentennial Commission. Those of you old enough as I am to remember that the tall ships and the wonderful celebration of the bicentennial of the US which I think helped to bring the country together. We could kind of use something like that these days. And then from there he went to a place many of you have never heard of, the United States Senate. He was elected in 1978. He was elected very narrowly. It was 5,000 or so votes very, very narrowly.

Well, that was pretty much the end of his contests. Occasionally he'd have one that was within a few percentage points, but mainly he was unopposed, and he served in the US Senate from early 1979 all the way until 2009 when he yielded the seat to another Warner who was completely unrelated to him but the voters thought that he was, and that's what enabled him to win that massive landslide, Mark Warner.

Just on a personal note, I've got to tell you this because it describes his life in a way. In 1978, when he ran for the Senate, I was already a pundit back then, because I basically had a life as a kind of a hobo, no real employment that mattered, doing all kinds of things that made no difference. And so I was a pundit already back then, and I wrote a really nasty piece about John Warren and I'm embarrassed to admit that now. Talk about being wrong, but I wrote a nasty piece about him.

Most politicians that I've known would have never spoken to me again. Instead, he called me and said, "I want you to get to know me. Maybe you'll still criticize me, but boy, I could tell from that piece, you don't know what you're talking about." We got together, and sure enough, our friendship has endured. It grew even though I had a role and he had a role, but this man has served not just Virginia, but the nation. He was a national Senator in a way that we don't have many of anymore. He served the national interest, not his party's interests, and we need more of those in both parties. So I'm extremely pleased and proud to have the honor of introducing Senator John Warner. Right there. A standing ovation.

The Honorable John W. Warner:  
Not bad, old boy.

Dr. Larry J. Sabato:  
Well I appreciate that. Appreciate that. Standing ovation. That tells you something right there.

The Honorable John W. Warner:  
They needed a stretch. Come on.

Dr. Larry J. Sabato:  
Oh no, they didn't. Nobody told them to do it either. They did it spontaneously. The best kind of standing ovation. Senator, just getting right into it, because you and I have been talking on the phone a good deal, and we were talking backstage here just a few minutes ago and we've talked about what's wrong with our system today. Because clearly this extreme polarization has hurt us in lots of different ways, and it's here in Virginia as it is nationally. And we're having a hard time, and I hear this from both parties, having a hard time recruiting people for public office. They don't want to run any more, or at least a lot of the good ones.

Of course, the ones who are in this room are all exceptions. Every single one, okay? Because you know, UVA is a public institution, so you're all exceptions, but a lot of your colleagues who aren't here right now don't fall into that category.

Senator, you were there for so many years. You took the arrows for controversial things you did, not just from Democrats, but also Republicans and pundits. They're the ones I really hate. Those pundits are worthless. And they were all attacking you for the things you did, but you stayed there. You toughed it out. What can we do today to attract people who want to serve the national interest and not just their party's interest?

The Honorable John W. Warner:  
Okay. Before we get too serious, let's lighten it up a little bit. First I want to introduce my wife, Jeanne. Jeanne, stand up please. She's the one that has to go through all the daily... And the reason that I do it, it ties into the theme of what I want to talk about, and it's public service. But any public service starts with your family and the commitment of particularly your wife and but secondarily your children because so much time is taken away by events that you must attend everywhere. And you owe it to them to make sure that they're solidly with you and you give them an ear. And so I wanted you to meet my half when I'm on the road all the time.

And there sits George Allen. George and I had about as much fun together as two clowns in the Senate circus. We had it going and coming. We were slightly different in strengths. His voice is stronger than mine. He's overpowering, six foot two inches, which will hit you going down the hall. You got to be careful, and there's his lovely wife right next to him, but... The others are in here. Where's is Bobby Scott, Bobby, you still here?

Dr. Larry J. Sabato:  
He's in the back.

The Honorable John W. Warner:  
He's in the-

Dr. Larry J. Sabato:  
He's coming out shortly.

The Honorable John W. Warner:  
He's coming up I think. Oh, Bobby and I put together- He was talking about the first African American on the bench. I remember going and seeing Bobby, and I said, "Bobby, Virginia has never had in its 200 year plus history an African American on a bench. Or a woman on the federal bench." And I said, "I want you to help me select that individual to go on the bench." And we did. It was Jim Spencer. And our guest earlier today, of course, was on the circuit court, and Jim came up from a district court.

So I've had wonderful experiences with all these great pals of mine to serve together. But boy, every one of us are facing a challenge today. But I go back again and reflect a moment for the basis of my thoughts on 30 years of traveling for the Senate. I'm always laughing at Congressman. They're got to get home to their district. They've got to rush out to get home to their district. Well, the district's a driving distance for most of them in Virginia, easy enough. And then it's only a short circle group of people.

Senators go from the tip of the state, George, all the way up to Northern Virginia, to the Atlantic Ocean, all the way to the valley of Virginia. And so senators have a lot more to cover than the members of the House. But I want to thank those of you, and I'll bet there's a few here that might've voted for me one time or not. Is there a hand going up? Yeah, there's a hand going up.

Dr. Larry J. Sabato:  
Secret ballot.

The Honorable John W. Warner:  
May I thank you? Because I enjoyed it and enjoyed every minute of it and did come up to the end. And this shows you how politics in Virginia has worked in those days. In the end, I just said, "You're 80 years old or give or take 81 whatever, and you've had a good roll of the dice. Nobody's tried to send you to jail. I think it's time to move over and let someone step forward." And I did do that, even though the Democrats offered not to run anybody against me in turn for

commitment from me to give them one year to decide who should run. Fair enough. So I took the option, and here I am today having the pleasure of being with you.

But we're here to talk about what we can do. And I'm remiss in this sense, in all those 30 years talking to so many young people in all types of forum, they've often closed, "Oh, we admire you." Well, I appreciate that very much. "But how do you get into politics?" A very fundamental question. How do you get into politics? So I did not spend the time of trying to answer their questions.

So here I'm in the twilight of a career, and I'm going to dedicate my efforts very clearly working with my buddy over here. By the way, he's all smiles now. I ran with the old opposition. If you can't beat them, join them, so that's what I did. Join you rascal. But he has established himself not only in the University of Virginia, not only in Virginia, but nationwide as an authority on politics, a bipartisan.... I mean, he's not picking one or the other, it's just on the system of politics.

And together we're going to try and come up with a concept and sell it to our state. And we'll help finance it, but sell the concept to the state of having an all-day work session and run an ad all across Virginia, saying, "You're interested in possibly serving in public office someday. Sign up. We'll feed you lunch, but you're on your own." You get here and you leave with tight schedule, but we're going to introduce you to politicians and other public figures all over the state, through cameras and so forth, and tell you what it's like in hopes that you can make up your mind. We're not tailored to sell you to do it, but you better know it before you get in it.

And believe me, getting into it today is very important for reasons that were not present when I came into politics. And that is the severity of the technology that has, in the 30 years of my Senate time now, 40s, that's 10 years.

All the things that have been developed from the internet, to social media, to unmanned spacecraft and all kinds of things. So today's political figures have got to be persons that have a basis to learn and learn quickly, because the spectrum of problems that they're going to be confronted with is just unlimited. So let me just stumble through one little last personal story to make a point clear. Picture my campaign was over a year and two months, and I ran against a former governor, Linwood Holton, Dick Oberhausen and Nathan Miller, a distinguished state legislator. And for one year the four of us travel with our dog and pony show all over the Commonwealth, sat on boxes and picnics and had a friendly debate. And then we came down to, now we got to decide which of the four, so they came up with the idea, let's have a convention. Well, that sounded sensible.

1,100 people, one thousand one hundred people showed up at the Virginia Colosseum for that convention. I'll never forget it. And it went on into late at night. And I remember one of my campaign manager said, "You want to win this race? You're on the fifth ballot." And I'd won on all of them. And I was tied with Obenshain for the sixth ballot coming up. He said, "Get out there and start a parade, and don't let the parade end until after midnight." I said, "Well, what do you mean? What's that got to do with it?" He said, "At the stroke of 12, there's about one fourth

of this audience, evangelical in their beliefs. They have to quit politics. It's a Sabbath Sunday morning, and they're going home. You're going to lose." And I said, "I got to think about this. It seems to me fraudulent. It's distrustful." He just shook his head. "It's up to you. You want to be a Senator? Get out on that parade. If you don't, pay me off, and I'm gone."

Well I didn't, and I lost and Dick won. And then we had the tragedy of his coming in in an airplane one night late in Richmond, and the plane hit the top of a tree, and he lost his life. And I was given 90 days. Got that? 90 days. I didn't have a stick of furniture. I didn't have an employee. I didn't have anything to put together a campaign and seek that election. And so I got into it again; I'll never forget. I won the nomination.

And by the way, the old city council of fathers of the Republican Party were a tough gang in those days and they didn't really want, "You're not conservative enough. You're not conservative enough. You've got to commit to do this."

"I don't make any commitments." Well, blah, blah, blah. And the door opened, and this is something I'll never forget, and in walked a woman very quietly and simply said to those guys, "My husband lost his life, Dick Obenshain. He would be here tonight telling you to give the nomination to Warner." And it was dead silence. I took her by the hand, walked out, next morning they announced I had to pick a ... So to show you the power of individuals.

This could go long. I'll rush up to the last story, and then we'll open up the case. I think it's fun to hear about people who had all their achievements in life, and all the little things in life that made a difference.

It is the last week of the campaign. My opponent was a very able Democrat named Andrew Miller. His family, Francis Pickens Miller, had been a part of the famous Byrd Machine for a while. Then they broke off. But he was well known, and he was an attorney general and a very able campaigner and a good guy.

So picture the last debate, cleverly put in Old Town Alexandria where I now live, with a very strong Democrat stronghold. So the odds were kind of against me to begin with. And we went through the debate, and then the moderator said, "Each of you have two minutes to stand before this crowd and in very simple language, tell them one reason why you should be the next Senator." Well, Andy Miller, being Attorney General, senior to me in the hierarchy. He got up, walked up, looked them in the eye. He didn't say anything, and he stood there. And my watch is clicking. I'm saying, "Wait a minute, this guy is burning up his time. He's not saying a thing."

And then he looked them in the eye and he said, "Elect me. I was born a Virginian." And there was dead silence. He turned around and walked off. The silence was still in that room. And that was the longest walk in my life from my seat up to where I was going to speak. I said, "Dear God, give me the strength to figure out what to do now. I've been 18 months trying to do this. It hangs in the abeyance for the three minutes I've got. What do I do?"

Well, I said, "Go for it, boy." And I got up, and I go into the rostrum, and I said, "I'm very impressed with what my opponent said tonight, and you should take it into consideration because it's important."

I call it the Virginia Way. We know in Virginia how things have to be done, and often we don't put them down in writing, but we instinctively, as my father used to say.... I used to say, "Daddy, what does that mean?" "It's the Virginia Way, son. Don't try and worry about it."

So I got up, and there's my mother, 86 years old, in the front seat right down front of me. I said, "Mom, you heard my opponent talk about his birth." And we have great pride in it. Our family had come from down in Amherst, Virginia. And Mom got up and said, 'I heard him too. I heard him too, but I want him to know that if I and Dr. John...' My father was an old time surgeon. "If I and Dr. John ever thought that our little boy wanted to be a United States Senator, I'd have crossed the Potomac River and had him under the magnolia trees in the state of Virginia."

Folks, that broke that audience up. Next day, banner headlines, "Mother speaks for son." I won that election 48 hours later by one half of 1% of the vote. So this whole, you didn't know that story.

Dr. Larry J. Sabato:  
No, I did not know that story.

The Honorable John W. Warner:  
You got one for the book.

Dr. Larry J. Sabato:  
Mothers are wonderful.

The Honorable John W. Warner:  
It shows you the importance of what you're doing here today and have done. That's been a common theme throughout today's speeches and yesterday about the need to get only the best and the brightest to come into our political system. But we've got to sit down and devise and I hope we're initiating a work session to help those who want to know more about the fundamentals of politics to step up and come forward.

But the importance of family is so at number one, and unless that family is with you, don't bother. But we're not here to convince you, we're here to all day answer your questions with a series of other expert people. And I'd like to put our great state on the map as holding a real, honest to God, old time forum of what it is to be a politician, what's going to be expected of you. And hopefully some more of you will come and step up to the challenge, not take it.

Dr. Larry J. Sabato:  
There you go. That was wonderful. That was the easiest interview I've ever done. Frank, no pay. You don't have to do it, okay? Just strike it.

The Honorable John W. Warner:

Old Frank. Frank has done a wonderful job pulling this together. Can we have another standing ovation for you? Get up, get that standing ovation. Oh, come on. Get up, lazy bones. There he is.

Dr. Larry J. Sabato:

Did you know Frank was one of my first students? He was.

The Honorable John W. Warner:

Well you did a damn good job.

Dr. Larry J. Sabato:

Thank you very much. Yeah, I take full credit, Frank. Look, Senator, I want to ask Jeanne up. Senator Warner wanted to come up and say hello.

The Honorable John W. Warner:

Now wait a minute. Hold everything.

Dr. Larry J. Sabato:

We want you to come up and say hello. No, she wants to come up and say hello.

The Honorable John W. Warner:

That was not part of the deal.

Dr. Larry J. Sabato:

Well, I'm doing it. I didn't get to do anything else.

The Honorable John W. Warner:

I get nervous.

Dr. Larry J. Sabato:

I'm going to do that. Come on up here, Jeanne, and the truth is she's going to take your small token. We're presenting you, I think Frank is, with this special Virginia's Heritage 1619 to 2019 wine commissioned by the American Revolution in honor of this commemoration year. Now you have a designated driver, right?

The Honorable John W. Warner:

Right here.

Dr. Larry J. Sabato:

Okay, well, I just wanted to make sure there wasn't going to be any drinking in the car on the way back.

The Honorable John W. Warner:

No. No drinking tonight.

Dr. Larry J. Sabato:

We have had a wonderful time. I know our panelists want to come out and shake your hand before you leave the stage. We're proud to have known you. We look forward to other adventures with you. You're still full of good ideas. You gave us one, and we also loved the history lesson. Thank you very much.

The Honorable John W. Warner:  
All right.

Dr. Larry J. Sabato:

Thank you, Jeanne. Thank you so much. That was fun. We had a great time.

### **Civic Education and the Culture of Citizenship**

**Dr. Larry J. Sabato, founder and director of the University of Virginia's Center for Politics**

**David M. Rubenstein, co-founder and co-executive chairman of the Carlyle Group**

**The Honorable M. Kirkland Cox, Speaker of the House of Delegates of Virginia**

**The Honorable Robert C. Scott, United States Representative from Virginia**

Dr. Larry J. Sabato:

Okay. Look, we're I hope going to have a good panel on civic engagement and civility. There aren't many examples we can cite at least from the current day, but we're going to have a good conversation about what we can do to strengthen civic engagement and to strengthen civility. Now, we have a fantastic group of people to discuss this.

I do want to tell Frank something. This is just between us, if you could all not listen?

Frank, you wrote a wonderful script and suggestions for the panel. I loved it. These three panelists have insisted on rewriting the whole thing. I do not want you blaming me for the subjects they're going to bring up, are we all agreed on that? Thank you so much. Okay. Just wanted him to know that, because it's not all going to be sweetness and light. There's going to be some controversial topics discussed.

So, not necessarily with our first speaker here, because he's somebody that I think we all know. We certainly know his work and the great things that he has done for Virginia. And I'll introduce him in just a second.

The second speaker is Bobby Scott, the Representative from the 3rd Congressional District of Virginia. I've known him since the 1970s. We met of course in politics. No other place we would have. But he's our senior, he's our dean, our congressional dean now, both houses of Congress and Virginia.

And then we have Kirk Cox, the Speaker of the Virginia House of Delegates. I think you've seen some of him during this conference. I haven't seen much of him, but I've certainly seen a lot of his son Cameron, who's been in our classes and working with the UVA Center for Politics and doing a terrific job. My staff loves him. I criticize him heavily anytime he gets an answer wrong,

because he should know everything with the Speaker of the House as a father. And that's just my view of it. Yes. And you know that's true. You gave me permission.

The Honorable M. Kirkland Cox:  
Sorry, I let you down.

Dr. Larry J. Sabato:

Yeah, no, no, no. He knows most things, but not everything. We'll get to that in a second. But I want to start out by introducing a man that I hadn't had the opportunity to meet before now. But who is the philanthropists' philanthropist. He has done more for historical preservation and institutions, including Monticello near me, than anybody that I've ever come across. And he does it quietly and effectively.

To think of the history that we would not have preserved or the history we wouldn't have discovered had it not been for you. So I want to take this opportunity to thank you on behalf of everyone for what you have done, and I'd like to see, having focused on history, what you can tell us about the ideas of civility and a civic engagement from that perspective, David.

David M. Rubenstein:

Let me say, what I'm trying to do is to remind people a little bit about our country's history on the theory that, not a novel theory, that if you remember the past, you might not make the mistakes that we've made in the past. And maybe we'll do better in the future. That's not a novel concept, but the theory behind studying history is that we might learn something from it and do better in the future.

One of the problems we have now is that because of a concern about STEM education, among other things, history is not being taught, particularly American history, in our school systems as much as it used to be when many of you were in school. We don't teach civics anymore very much. We don't teach American history very much. You can graduate from virtually any college in this country without having to take an American history course.

You can graduate from 80% of the colleges in this country as a history major without having taken an American history course. So what do we get as a result of this? Think about this. In a recent survey that was done by the Annenberg Foundation, three quarters of Americans could not name the three branches of government. And one quarter of Americans could not name one branch of government. 30% of Americans think that George Washington crossed the Rhine River during the Revolutionary War, which was not the case.

More high school sophomores can name the first three names of the Three Stooges than the first few names of any founding fathers. And amazingly, 10% of American college graduates now believe that Judge Judy is a member of the United States Supreme Court, which is not yet the case, I would add.

So think about this, recently, now if anybody here is a citizen who was a naturalized citizen, any naturalized citizens here? All right. If you are a naturalized citizen, you have to reside in this

country for five years and then take a citizenship test. It's a hundred questions. You need to get 60 of them right, and you're a citizen after being sworn in. 91% of the people that take that test, presumably after studying, passing it. That's pretty good, 91% pass. A survey was done by the Woodrow Wilson Foundation recently and discovered that if you give the same test to people who are native born Americans, only the citizens in one state were able to pass it. Vermont.

In 49 out of the other 50 States, the average citizens, presumably without studying, could not pass that basic citizenship test. So, there's no one way to solve all this problem. What I'm trying to do in a modest way is this, I'm trying to buy some historic documents, the Magna Carta, the Declaration of Independence, the Emancipation Proclamation, Bill of Rights, Constitution, and put them in places where people can see them.

Now, why is it so important to see the historic documents? You can put a facsimile or you can look on a computer screen and see what the Constitution says. The human brain has not yet evolved to the point where it treats a computer screen document the same as it does an historic document. So if you go see the original Magna Carta, which I bought and now put on permanent display at the National Archives, you're more likely before you go there, or after you go there to read about the Magna Carter, why it's important and what its significance is to our country.

The same thing is true in historic buildings. When the Washington monument had earthquake damage. I said, "All right, I'll put up the money because it might take too long to otherwise get it done. Monticello, I thought needed some work. Montpelier needed some work. Arlington House needed some work. Iwo Jima Memorial needed some work. Lincoln Memorial needed some work. So, I said, "Let me fix these up. I'll pay for it and maybe more Americans will visit these places and if they visit maybe they will learn more about our history."

Now, that's not going to solve all our problems. I have decided also to try to help our members of Congress learn about American history and we talked about this earlier, so I started a program five years ago to educate members of Congress a little bit more about American history. And what I do is once a month, I have a program where I bring a great American historian, Doris Kearns Goodwin, David Michael, and so forth.

And I interview them in front of members of Congress. We get typically 200+ members of Congress or so. And I ask them to sit with people from the opposite party, because they often don't do that. And also from people on the opposite house, they often don't do that either. And I won't say peace has broken out in Washington, DC as a result of it. But I do think members of Congress have learned more about our history, and also maybe there's a little bit better comradery.

So to summarize what I'm trying to do to help with civic engagement a bit is to get people to think more about our history, the good and the bad. And when I say the bad... Thomas Jefferson was an extraordinary man. He wrote the Declaration of Independence among other great things he did, but he was a slave owner. And when I put up money to help Monticello get restored a bit, I said I'd like the slave quarters be built out, because people should know that Thomas Jefferson, for all of his strengths, was a slave owner among other things. And the same is true with

Montpelier. I wanted the slave quarters built out there as well. So that people can see the good and the bad, and so we can learn the good and bad about our history.

And my theory is that if people learn more about our history, we'll have more informed citizens. The theory of democracy is that you have an informed citizenry and they can make intelligent decisions, but if you don't have an informed citizenry, democracy won't work as well. That's my basic premise.

Dr. Larry J. Sabato:

Well, it's a tremendous premise. It's a tremendous premise. But you are leaving an unbelievable legacy, and you've caught some of these things just in time, because deterioration occurs. And what I really was impressed with was your ability to look at it in a balanced way at historical figures. They weren't perfect, unlike us. We're incredibly perfect; I think everybody here would agree to that. But some of them actually had faults.

You mentioned Mr. Jefferson, the founder of my university. I happened to consider that a big plus and the Declaration of Independence and the Statute of Virginia for Religious Freedom and the Louisiana Purchase. And we could go on and on.

Now, it was horrible that he was a slave owner and he knew better. He knew better. But, you have to balance the accomplishments and achievements with the less attractive side for anybody. Don't we all want that? Maybe in our obituary, if not years later? Don't we want a balanced view of the life we led? So, I would love to see that view of history and historical figures become standard.

David M. Rubenstein:

When we all were in grade school, we might've read how great George Washington was and he was great. Without him, we wouldn't have had the Constitutional Convention succeed. We wouldn't have probably won the Revolutionary War, and the presidency wouldn't have gotten off to a good start. But he was a slave owner as well. But the only founding father who freed his slaves upon his death. And so, we have had many faults with our Founding Fathers and so forth, as we have faults with lots of people. Nobody's perfect. But I do think...

And when you mentioned obituary, I'd like you to think about this. There was a man who was sitting down in Stockholm in 1888, and he was reading the newspaper, and he read his own obituary. How can that be? Well, Alfred Nobel, who was the inventor of dynamite, was sitting at his breakfast table in Stockholm, and he read Alfred Nobel has died. Thank God, the merchant of death, inventor of dynamite has gone.

And actually the newspaper had made a mistake. It was his younger brother who had died, Ludvig. But he had the advantage of looking at his own obituary and what people thought about him. So I ask people all the time, "Think about this. Suppose you were going to read your own obituary tomorrow in the newspaper. Would you be happy with what you read?" Well, if the answer is "Not yet," well, you have some more time to do something about it.

So I tried to tell people all the time to think about this. Well, the earth is 5 billion years old. Humans, as we are, *homo sapiens* are roughly 400,000 years old. We're modest in terms of the grand span of earth. And our average life expectancy for each of us is 80, 90, 100 years if you're lucky or unlucky, depending on your point of view of getting to 100.

So, what you can do in your lifetime is relatively finite, but we're all on the face of the earth for such a short time in relative terms that we should try to take advantage of it and do something so that you can leave a mark and you can say, "Yes, I can justify my existence in the face of the earth. This is what I have done to make myself proud of what I've done. My parents proud, my children proud, my grandchildren proud."

And so, I ask all of you to think about what you can do. And I've coined a phrase for one thing that I've tried to do, which is called patriotic philanthropy, which is to say, to give back to our country. Now, all philanthropy is patriotic and honest. But when you're doing things to remind people our history and heritage, which I'm trying to do to some extent, I think you do contribute to our country.

Now all of you may say, well, you're already doing good things, and if you are, great. If you're not yet doing good things to help our country, think about this. I am convinced that those people that give back to their country will live a longer life. Now, all of you want to live a long life, right? Now, why do I say that? Well I say that because people that give back to our country are happy, happy people live longer. Grumpy people don't live as long. So if you're going to be happy by giving back to your country, try to do that now.

And also, I'm convinced there's a special place in heaven reserved for people that give back to their country. Now you might laugh about that, but why would you want to take a chance that I'm wrong?

Dr. Larry J. Sabato:

That's great. I love that. And I agree with you. If you're a betting person, you would certainly take that bet and do the good things. And you have, that's for sure. You set the standard for everybody else. We will come back to that.

I want to go to a Congressman, excuse me, Mr. Chairman. He is chairman of the Education and Labor Committee. Used to make me call him Congressman. Now he makes me call him Mr. Chairman. I don't know what's next. I knew him when he was a delegate. I knew him when he was a state senator, and he was more informal than, but you know what power does to people.

But I love him. I always have. He's a terrific guy, chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee. He has long been a supporter of public education in general and civic education in particular.

People aren't born with those things in their genes. At least most people aren't. But I think Chairman Scott is an exception, because his mother was a science teacher. His father was the first African American to serve on the Newport News School Board-

The Honorable Robert C. Scott:  
In about a century.

Dr. Larry J. Sabato:  
In a century?

The Honorable Robert C. Scott:  
In about a century. That was 100 years ago.

Dr. Larry J. Sabato:  
Well, we don't count that it's a long time ago. It's history. We've already established that we want to take care of that another way. So, he's got education in his blood. And I want to ask Bobby first about the role of education in cultivating good citizenship and also about civility. You're in an institution, Congress, generally both houses where civility is in short supply. And the same is true with the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. How do you deal with this today and is there any coming back?

The Honorable Robert C. Scott:  
Well, I mentioned before, the Virginia delegation gets along better than any other delegation, and you can credit your recent guest, John Warner, for really making that a priority. If you want to know. I mean you have a role model of stability. Most delegations don't have that, but we certainly did. And we have John Warner to thank for that. If there is any dignity within the Virginia delegation, and I think it's probably one of the best delegations in terms of cooperation and civility in the nation, that's because of... He was dean of the delegation for many years. Give to give John Warner another hand for all of hard work.

One of the problems, as you have suggested, education is extremely important. And you have people trying to debate issues when one side doesn't believe in science. How are you going to debate somebody who doesn't believe in science?

And if you look at the budgets we've produced, a lot of them don't believe in arithmetic. You have tax cuts and suggest that it's not going to affect the budget. Well, obviously that's absurd.

So you're trying to have civil debates with people you can't debate. One of the things that's frequently said is public sentiment is so important. I mean, these people didn't fall out of the sky. They were elected. And if they're acting in an uncivil way, their constituents have to respond.

But education is an extremely important aspect of this, and we need to focus on making sure education is available to all and increase the level of education for people across the country. In 1954, in the *Brown* decision, the Supreme Court said that it is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if denied the opportunity of an education. Such an opportunity is a right which must be made available to all on equal terms.

Okay. Then we start funding education with the real estate tax, which virtually guarantees it's not going to be equal, because wealthy areas had more assets than others. So we wanted a Title One to put money into low income areas, so that low income areas would have a fighting chance.

We passed No Child Left Behind, which pointed out that even if the money is straight, you want to make sure the achievement is right. And if there are achievement gaps, you've got to deal with it. The response to achievement gaps were so convoluted that everybody hated No Child Left Behind.

So, a couple of years ago, we passed the Every Student Succeeds Act, which gives the states more power to do something, but it doesn't give them any flexibility on the requirement that you assess all of the students to ascertain achievement gaps and then have incredible response to those achievement gaps. If we can succeed in that, I think it would be going a long way in having an electorate that is knowledgeable and can deal with all of the complexities of legislation.

Without that, there's no civil way to have a discourse. I mean, if you're not using evidence and research.... And you've seen this in crime policy more than anywhere else. I mean, I was on the Judiciary Committee before for the whole time I was in Congress up until the time I became a lead Democrat on the Education Committee.

And crime policy is really just a matter of choice. Are you trying to reduce crime and save money, or are you codifying a bunch of simple-minded slogans and soundbites? Unfortunately, over the years, it's slogans and soundbites. Whatever sounds tough on crime or sounds like you're doing something, you pass it. Some of the initiatives have actually been studied and researched and had been shown to increase the crime rate. Trying to get people, I think we're gradually getting to an evidence and research based approach where we can have more intelligent crime policy.

Texas went through this process, about four or five years ago, maybe six years ago. Their appropriations committee was told that they needed \$2 billion for the Department of Corrections to deal with the increasing prison population. Two billion, one state. Somebody suggested, "Well, if we try a little prevention, early intervention, and rehabilitation, spend about 10% of that money on that, we might not have to build all the prisons."

Okay, so they did. They said instead of two billion, 200 million. And they looked up, and it reduced crime so much that they not only didn't have to build any new prisons, they closed some they had. Interestingly, that creates a nice coalition, because a more humane, evidence-based approach and saving money covers the entire political spectrum. And I think that's where people are now looking at criminal justice reform as something that's doable.

But you have to have people who are willing to have an educated approach to policy. And that is, in recent history, very difficult.

Dr. Larry J. Sabato:

Let me ask you one follow up. Of course, education is primarily a state and local function, granted. But you're Chairman of the Education Committee. Are there any ways that the federal government can encourage in the elementary and secondary schools more civics education and maybe something called civility education?

The Honorable Robert C. Scott:

Well, members of Congress are hardly the role models with moral authority to talk about civility. We can attach... And there's significant federal money in the way we deal with the achievement gap and try to equalize funding, try to deal with individuals with disabilities, English as a second language to make sure those are taught, is by having strings with federal money. The absence of civics, I think, is one thing that we need to start looking at.

Because people, as David just mentioned, are growing up without any basic knowledge of civics or civility. I don't know how you can teach civility, but you ought to... If you have civics, and the discourse is more intelligent and less acrimonious, I think by example you can have more civility. But we have a situation now where people are reelecting and supporting and not criticizing people who are not being civil.

Dr. Larry J. Sabato:

Well, you heard David's description of the average American's knowledge of civics. It's almost a crisis, because in the end, it's average citizens and their knowledge or lack of it about government and politics and the candidates and the elections that determine the type of government that we have.

The Honorable Robert C. Scott:

Well, the legislators didn't fall out of the sky. They ran campaigns and got elected. And when they have served a little time, they have to be reelected. And when they have behaved the way some are behaving and get reelected anyway, we have a problem.

David M. Rubenstein:

With respect to civic engagement, I should have mentioned as well that one of the greatest tasks or responsibilities or obligations of a citizen to be engaged is to vote. Yet, even in presidential elections, we have roughly 50% of eligible voters voting. In off year elections, we have, well, less than 50%. So of the eligible voters in a typical congressional election, in an off year, you might have 25% or 30% of eligible voters voting.

In a primary, you might have 10%, and therefore, some people who have the right to vote don't choose to exercise it. When you think about the people who have given their lives in our many wars to preserve our right to have the right to vote, and people don't choose it, it's a sad commentary on the current state of civic engagement.

Dr. Larry J. Sabato:

Although there is a little positive good news. Last year in the midterm elections, it was only a 50% turnout only, but it was the largest midterm turnout since the first midterm of Woodrow Wilson's administration, which I remember well, and that was very exciting at the time.

And I do think in 2020, you're going to see a turnout through the roof. And you can guess the reasons why. I think there'll be turnout through the roof.

David M. Rubenstein:

But it's turn out by our normal standards. In some countries, maybe they force people to vote to some extent, but you might have 80% or 90% of eligible voters voting. We'll be lucky to ever get 60% of eligible voters. I'm not talking about registered voters, eligible voters to vote. And if we can get 60% or 70%, it'd be better, because the government itself will obviously have more authority and more of an imprimatur of authority once you actually have more people voting for it.

Dr. Larry J. Sabato:

Let me turn now to Speaker Kirk Cox. And he has a perspective on this, not just formed by his many years of public service and his current high position, but also for 30 years, he was a civics teacher in Virginia. And by the way, I just want people to know, don't even bother to look for corruption connected to Kirk Cox, because the man's been a school teacher and then a member of the Virginia General Assembly. And if you want to get rich, those are not the two ways to do it. So, thanks. You look good, Kirk.

But seriously, I have had a number of his students come to the University of Virginia. They love him. He was a great civics teacher. He would often bring them up to the university and show them around and get some of us to chat with them about it. Obviously you have a strong political philosophy and party, but they pointed out to me, the Democratic students at least pointed out to me that you never insisted that they agree with you. And maybe you even gave them a little extra credit for having the guts to disagree. That's the way it should be. Mr. Speaker, what's your view of civic education and civility?

The Honorable M. Kirkland Cox:

Well, I would say, first of all, some great points have been made. I think David said very aptly, we don't teach enough civics and history. But the key to all of it is the teacher in the classroom.

And it's interesting, when you teach high school, you have two kinds of kids. You get the kind of kid who loves government, about 15% of them, but they're very emotional, they're very passionate. They don't really know why they love certain figures, but they think they do. And then frankly, you have 80% of the kids that really... It doesn't affect their life and they just don't see the utility of it.

So your challenge as a teacher, which I think is very important... And we have so many education fads. So your challenge as a teacher is to make sure that you give them the critical thinking skills, but don't... They've got to know the documents, they've got to know the Federalist Papers, they've got to know the Declaration. So how do you do that?

So I've got to give you an example. So, my first day of school, I tell all young teachers, don't pass out materials for the entire class. You've already lost them. You've got insurance forms, you've been through this and everything in the world. I said engage them quickly.

So here's what I used to do, and this will sound terrible. I used to shoot the president. Let me explain how I shot the president. What I would do is I'd have a simulation, and no matter who was president, I was bi-partisan, I would have a little exercise by which I give the kids a two-page scenario. And most presidents travel in the summer. And so I'd give all the background, and then I would say, "The president is boarding Air Force One. He has just been shot, and he's in a coma." And I go, "You're the vice president. You have 15 minutes to figure out what to do, stand up in front of the class, and then explain what you're going to do."

So you can imagine they're panicking, it's the first day of school. And so I have two kinds of kids. Remember the one kid that knows all the answers. So he's holding up his hand to volunteer, and everyone else is scared to death. And I tell them, stop looking at your feet because I'm going to call on you if you're looking at your feet, because I'm going to call somebody that doesn't want me... The one don't want to be called on.

So I call on the two types of kids. I put them outside the room after they think about it for 15 minutes, and I tell the rest of the class, "You're the press corps. So you have to stand up and ask questions, et cetera. And we're going to see how this person does." So I call the first kid in, who's the passionate kid. And so all the kids stand up, and they start clapping for him. I go, "That's terrible, because free press, they don't clap for the president. You've already totally blown this exercise."

So then the kid walks in. He expresses no sympathy to anyone. He's nervous, but he's passionate. And I give him certain little nuggets within my two-page explanation. And one is they were Russia-made weapons. Well, you all know that in the Cold War, there were so many Russia-made weapons obviously on the black market. So the kid immediately accuses the Russians of shooting the president, and he starts World War III. And I go, "Well, that's really bad, because you've just started World War III."

So then I start asking the kids questions, and I let the other kids ask questions. But then I asked the key one, I go, "So, Mr. Vice President, how does the 25th Amendment affect this situation?" Kid's looking at me like I'm crazy, and he goes, "The 25th amendment," he goes, "I have no idea."

And I go, "Well sit down. You're totally through. You've trained to be Vice President for 30 years. There's only 27 of them, and you don't know the one that of course deals with obviously disability of a president. And so your whole career is over." And I said, "But here's what's really important is, in the United States of America, we cherish our representative democracy. You train to really do good things, and now frankly your career is over." And I say, "That's very, very important."

And then I keep the simulation going, but two days later, I do things like the stock market's dropped 2000 points. And I asked a new vice-president, "So what are you going to do about monetary policy?" And he goes, "Well, I'm going to raise taxes." I go, "Well, the Fed does that. You've totally got this totally wrong. You don't know what you're talking about."

And I guess what I'm trying to do through all this... I stop after about two days, and I go, "Here's the problem. You're very passionate, and I love your passion, but you basically don't know the facts, and you made a lot of bad decisions. I'm going to do a similar simulation at the end of the year. You'll get every one of those facts right, and that passion in what you believe in, you will turn into really good public policy."

And I know this is a little bit of a long story. So then we proceed to teach the Constitution, and I make them memorize the amendments, teach the Federalist papers, and when they start getting bored, I say, "Remember that simulation I did? You need to really understand these fundamental principles."

And I actually had my kids debate the Federalist Papers, and let me tell you... When I was teaching it, they grouped a lot of kids into X, Y, Z. Every one of those kids can do that if you have confidence they can do that. And we debated separation of powers and checks and balances, six categories, Federalists and Anti-Federalists. And we heard a lot of great discussion about Madison's belief on the Bill of Rights. We debated the Bill of Rights, et cetera, and those kids did great.

And even when elections came along, I was trying to think, so how can it be creative and get kids to basically know what the candidates truly stand for? And so, I would have them write "Who are you for?" And they would be very passionate. They would write who they were for, and they're feeling real good about themselves.

"So, well, flip over the page." And I will list six major policy areas. So for example, for President Obama, the ACA. "Well, explain it to me, what's his position?" And it was really funny. They would flip it over, look at it, and I would just look at them. And literally a minute went by, and all their pencils are down, I mean, they don't know. And then I'd actually wait for about 10 minutes. Everyone's feeling horribly uncomfortable.

And once again, I made the point, we're going to talk now about these campaigns and the platforms of these various candidates. And once again, I love your passion. You have no idea what this candidate stands for. So by the end of this particular lesson, you will know that. Then you can make an informed choice. And I know I'm going on and on about this, but I think it's very, very important that we engage our students, and we make sure that they develop that factual basis and they also develop those critical thinking skills.

And finally I do a mock General Assembly. Let's talk a little about civility. I teach them parliamentary procedure before we can do anything. And I make them come through the speaker, which is what we have to do. I make sure they conduct themselves in committee the right way.

And there are small things you can teach students about how to conduct themselves. But I think those kinds of exercises are very, very, very valuable. And so that's one example.

But this is a great forum today that we learn so much about that. When I became Speaker, my promise to myself was, and this is difficult, because I'm a conservative Republican. So Bobby and I would disagree on a lot of issues. But I'm Speaker for the entire House.

And when I gave my speech, I basically said, and you got to remember, it was very controversial. We were 50/50 for a long time. Basically, the election was decided by drawing a black film canister out of a Virginia museum bowl, okay? Because there was a tie election between Republican and Democrat, and we of course won that drawing. And I said, "It feels like we're five miles apart with all the rancor. But really there's only five feet difference between the Democrat and Republican side. It's our obligation for the citizens to work together." And we try to do that, we're not perfect, but I think we really do try to do that. So that's sort of been the way I've approached it.

And I'll end with this. Everybody says, "Where do you think you've had the most influence?" And I will always tell you, I think as a teacher. I've loved being in the General Assembly, and you've been a tremendous teacher, [Larry]. So many of my students come back and say that. But I really do think I've had a lot more influence as an educator and teacher than I ever had in the General Assembly, because I think that's where it all starts.

David M. Rubenstein:

Well, I would just add that we're here to celebrate the 400th anniversary of Virginia's founding. So once we have nice discussions and so forth, we go about our business. What have we accomplished by doing this? Well, I think one of the things that we all might consider is what can Virginia do to improve civic engagement in this state? And what can Virginia do to improve voting participation in this state?

Virginia has a special obligation, I would argue, because it was a Virginian who drafted the Declaration of Independence. It was a Virginian who was the father of the Constitution. It was a Virginian who presided over the Constitutional Convention. It was a Virginian who was the person who was most upset about the Constitution because it didn't have a Bill of Rights. It was a Virginian who drafted the Bill of Rights.

So Virginia has been involved from a long time for civic engagement and in doing the things that are now the governing principles and governing structures for our country. So you would think that Virginia, as a mark of its 400th anniversary, should say, "We want to make sure that going forward, people in this state do a better job than any other state in knowing what the Constitution is, knowing what the Declaration of Independence is, knowing what our history is, and being engaged by voting in a higher percentage, making certain the citizens who take the citizenship test do a better job than in any other state."

So when you think about what you want to do going forward after this celebration's over, I hope that people who are involved will say, "We should leave a legacy for those people who are coming in

the future." And the legacy should be that we are the most civically engaged state, we're the most informed state, and we're honoring the great Virginians who came before us because of what they've done.

Dr. Larry J. Sabato:

Let's hope so. Let's hope so. Yes. We're running out of time. But I want to ask one other question. Because we've talked about civic education, and it's easy to talk about and difficult to do.

But an even more difficult subject is the dramatic and disturbing decline in civility, not just between elected officials, but in our system, generally. Citizens to public officials. You can throw the news media in. I actually think that social media is the cause of a great deal of it, not the actual news media. And you can't put all these genies back in the bottle. We're stuck with it. And relatively few people are going to jump off Twitter.

And most days I'd like to, but you can't, you're engaged with people. You need them and they need you and all the rest of it. What can we do practically? Two of you are our senior people, very senior people in elective bodies, where we all can agree civility has declined. And yes, I know of the president's role, and that's certainly a big piece of it too, but it was declining before he was ever elected. What practically can we do? Learning history helps, being taught well helps, but there are other things that we've got to do. It's almost a crisis, you know, the lack of civility. What can we do?

David M. Rubenstein:

That's an easy question. So I'll let the congressman take it.

Dr. Larry J. Sabato:

And do it in two minutes like last night with the debate, and I'll say, "Thank you, Mr. Speaker," just like they did.

The Honorable Robert C. Scott:

I'll be brief. You have to call it out. You cannot allow some of the things that are being said to become normalized. Statement after statement. And you can't defend them. A couple of days ago there was a press conference held by legislative leaders, and the subscript under it was GOP leaders defend racist comments. Well, you should be calling it out. You can't defend it, because then it just encourages more of the same. If we don't call it out, it's going to continue. And the voters have to participate. When people conduct themselves in that kind of way, there have to be adverse consequences of the election.

The Honorable M. Kirkland Cox:

I think you have to find some common ground. Okay. So let's be candid. When you go to issues which are very important to me, like life, that's hard. Because that's such a fundamental principle. But having said that, higher education, K-12, you know, when I came in as Speaker, one of the things I tried to do with the talent pipeline, a lot of the stuff we're doing in K-12, was to go to Governor Northam to say, "This is a set of issues we can work on."

I think you find that with anything else, once you try to start working on a set of issues and you have a few successes, obviously you have to work with those people, and then you get to know them a little bit better. And then I think you can build on those successes. So at first, we can be practical. I mean, don't go to an issue that is so polarizing. You're not going to get a start there. And so in Virginia, and I do think we've had some really good things happen, if you look at our colleges and universities, what we've done in that space. So, that's really what we've tried to do the last few years.

And then sure, you've got to try to tackle the tough issues too. And the tough issues for us obviously would be Virginia Beach and the mix of gun control, mental health issues. But I really do feel like if you can have some success, and you start working on those, and you know who the players are, then I think that really evolves much easier when you try to work on some more difficult issues. That's my more practical solution.

The Honorable Robert C. Scott:  
Larry, I think-

Dr. Larry J. Sabato:  
Go ahead.

The Honorable Robert C. Scott:  
I went and visited an Education Committee retreat in Charlottesville. The House Education had a bipartisan retreat about two years ago, right after we had passed the Every Student Succeeds Act. And I was just stunned with the serious, cooperative, evidence-based approach the committee was taking. And coming out of Washington where it's basically slogan-based. But a really deliberate process. And when you can agree that you're going to follow the evidence and research, that knocks out a lot of the confusion right there.

I mean, if you're doing crime policy, if you can get people to start off who are going to follow evidence and research, it'll eliminate 99% of the debate. Because the research tells you exactly what to do, and a lot of stupid stuff that's codified, the research is clear, it doesn't work. And so I just want to compliment the House Education Committee for taking that kind of evidence-based, constructive approach.

David M. Rubenstein:  
Two points. One, some of you may remember that in the early 1960s, Adolf Eichmann was captured in Argentina and taken back to Israel. And the trial was held in Israel. And he was sentenced to death, and he was executed. A book was written about that. There were two articles actually in the *New Yorker* by Hannah Arendt, and she entitled it the *Banality of Evil*. And what she meant was evil had become so common-place that killing people in concentration camps was accepted as the norm.

And in the same sense, while it's not killing people, when you accept as the norm outrageous statements or a conduct that is not becoming of a civilized society, that society will ultimately

not survive. So we have to speak up against these things, and we have to do things that might take some profiles in courage. *Profiles in Courage* was a book written by John Kennedy about senators. There haven't been as many books written about profiles in courage in recent years. But maybe we should encourage more people to speak up and be courageous.

And speaking of John Kennedy, remember what he said in his famous inaugural address? "Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country." So everybody here and anybody who might be listening: say, what can you do for your country? One of the things you can do for your country is speak up when there are outrageous things being said. So that our civic conversation is not allowed to go off track. And so we don't have a banality of evil, a banality of just accepting these outrageous things that people say.

And the final thing that John Kennedy said in that address, some of you may have remembered it. I remember it quite vividly, I was in the sixth grade, but I remember that speech. He said, "With a good conscience our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His help, but knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own."

So we can't depend on God to solve these problems for us. I think it requires each of us to get engaged and to give a little bit more of ourselves than maybe we've given before in order to make certain that we don't have a banality of evil kind of concept, where we accept what anybody says that might be outrageous, and we allow people to do things that do not further civic discourse.

Dr. Larry J. Sabato:

That's a perfect note on which to end. It's actually kind of upbeat. I've studied *Profiles in Courage* by the way, the original version. I've talked to Ted Sorensen about it, who was the real author of at least part of it. And we agreed that even then, the book was a very slim volume. So maybe we can all work to expand the next edition of *Profiles in Courage*. We all need to do it to make our society more civil and to help civic education. I enjoyed being with you. Thank you, David. Thank you, Bobby. Thank you, Kirk. They did a terrific job. Please join me in a round of applause.

**Democracy Under Duress: A Conversation About Global Challenges**

**Andrea Mitchell, NBC News' Chief Foreign Affairs Correspondent**

**The Honorable Robert M. Gates, Chancellor of William & Mary; United States Secretary of Defense (2006–2011)**

**Robin B. Wright, journalist and author; Joint Fellow at the United States Institute of Peace and the Woodrow Wilson International Center**

Andrea Mitchell:

Thank you all so much. It is wonderful to be back in Williamsburg. I was here thankfully for a dozen years at the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation as a trustee. Let me tell you how proud and happy I am though to be here today commemorating this important anniversary and also with

these panelists. I want you to welcome, please, the former United States Secretary of Defense in both the Bush and Obama administrations, the Chancellor of William and Mary, Robert Gates. Bob Gates.

Also, distinguished journalist, my colleague, my friend, author, Joint Fellow at the U.S. Institute of Peace and the Woodrow Wilson International Center, Robin Wright.

I just want to say, first of all, how pleased I am to be here today with both of you and how important this conversation is, to be part of the discussion of the challenges to democracy globally.

I do have my iPhone with me. It is turned off, but I have it for a reason. The last time that I went on stage at a foreign policy panel without my phone, it was a year ago at the Aspen Security Conference, and without my phone, my producer had to crawl underneath and crawl up onstage and hand me a note to let me know that the White House had invited Vladimir Putin to the White House. I was interviewing the head of National Intelligence, the Director of National Intelligence of course, Dan Coats.

This note just said, "The White House just invited Putin." This was three days after the Helsinki Summit. I asked the question, and the rest is still playing out as we see. So I carry my phone in case of breaking news.

The Honorable Robert M. Gates:  
I think he said, "Isn't that special?"

Andrea Mitchell:  
Isn't that special?

The Honorable Robert M. Gates:  
It was probably the beginning of the end.

Andrea Mitchell:  
As spoken by the former CIA director and twice Defense Secretary and former national security official.

We are here at a fascinating and troubling time, I should say, around the world for global democracies. First of all, we face the rise of populism. We see this around the world, political pressures from refugee migrations and the growing effects of climate change, of globalization, of populations, working communities, feeling the pressure and feeling alienated from the international elites from multinational organizations, not only, I should say, since the economic crash globally in 2008.

But what is now being felt in the UK with Brexit, and as you've heard today tangentially in Eastern Europe as well and Hungary, and the political disruptors - Hungary, Poland, Pakistan, Italy, Spain, Venezuela, Brazil - to say nothing of what we're experiencing here in the United

States. Is this the inevitable result of the post-World War institutions being challenged, the end of the post-World War II order? Are the multilateral institutions created in the late 40s and 1950s at Bretton Woods, with the United Nations, NATO, the other economic and military alliances that followed World War II, are they now outdated? Are they in fact contributing to the sense of alienation that we're seeing in populations around the world? Resentments against the ruling order by younger populations too young to remember the cataclysmic events of the first half of the 20th century.

I think these are all questions that we should be examining today. I cannot think of two better people to be addressing them, of course, than the former Secretary of Defense and CIA director and my colleague and friend, Robin Wright, who is the author of not only many books but has worked in conflict zones for decades, has analyzed and examined all of these issues most recently in some extraordinary writing for The New Yorker, and is one of the great foreign policy journalists of her generation. Welcome, both.

Mr. Secretary, if I may first to you, let's talk about your thoughts on democracy around the world, and what's leading to these challenges.

The Honorable Robert M. Gates:

Well, I think we had a remarkable surge of democratization after the collapse of the Soviet Union. There for a period of time, you had almost 300 million people who had lived in Eastern Europe and Russia who were under dictatorships, under communist dictatorships, all of a sudden, experiencing the fresh air of freedom and democracy. To a certain extent, that has been sustained in most of Eastern Europe. It clearly has not been sustained in Russia, and we can talk about that.

But I would say that there is this phenomenon that really extends from... You've mentioned all of the different countries where we're seeing this, from Pakistan to Eastern Europe, to Italy, to France, obviously to Britain, and even here in the United States. I think one common thread is discussed on the part of a lot of people with the political establishment with the political parties and elites that have been in power one party or another for decades.

In the view of a growing number of people, an elite that has failed to take their interests into account, that has failed in the wake of new technologies, in the wake of all these different new problems in terms of globalization and so on, has not responded in terms of how do you take care of the ordinary citizen under these circumstances. My favorite example actually in the first example of this was Venezuela because 40 years of corrupt political leadership across the political spectrum led to such disgust in Venezuela that they elected Hugo Chavez, and we all know what's happened since then.

But it really was discussed with the political establishment that started... I think one element of this is discussed with the political establishment for not being responsive to the needs of average citizens and a feeling on the part of a lot of these average citizens that the political elites were taking care of themselves and their friends and not worrying about the average Joe or Jane.

The second, I think, feeding into this was the economic crisis in 2008, 2009. The elites not only can't make things happen politically. They really screwed up the global economy. They really screwed up the American economy. Now, come the recovery, the elites did just fine, but a lot of people who were hurt by the worst economic crisis since the depression either took a long time to recover or have never recovered at all. Even in those circumstances, the disparity between what they are earning and what they see the elites earning today is so great that they believe again that the so-called elites are taking care of themselves but not paying much attention to anybody else.

I think a third factor in a lot of these countries is the whole immigration refugee crisis. Europe felt it in dramatic ways as a result of the civil war in Syria and the ISIS successes in Iraq and in Syria, a million immigrants allowed into Germany and people seeing a threat to their culture and to their way of life by these immigration flows that seemed uncontrollable. Where are all these people going to go and how will they affect the life in my village and in my town? And so on.

Then, the fourth factor that I would mention- And these are not exclusive, but I think that they get most of it. The fourth factor, quite frankly, is the effort on the part of Russia to the greatest extent and, to a lesser extent, China and probably others to actually exacerbate all these problems. It's happening on two levels. The first is to actually have an impact on elections through hacking into databases, affecting the outcome of elections through the technology of the voting process, through voting rolls and so on, putting up false ads and trolling candidates and so on and so forth.

But the second is exacerbating our social divisions and trying to turn ethnic and social conflicts and racial conflicts in every one of these countries to make those worse and to divide us and furthermore, at least as far as NATO members are concerned, trying to turn NATO members against each other and weaken the alliance.

This is a pervasive problem, and it is affecting us on several levels. It's not just the technical, how do we mess around with the election? It's how do we make life hard for these countries? I think, for me, this populist movement, if you will, is deeply rooted in a resentment of above all political, but also the economic elites that a lot of people believe have forgotten the interests of average people. I'll just give you one simple example.

When Macron increased the price of diesel fuel in France, all these yellow vests turned out in demonstrations in Paris. If you lived in Paris or a big city, it wasn't that big a deal because you had access to metro and so on, but if you live in a rural area of France or you're a farmer in France, that increase in the price of diesel may make the difference between whether you can survive or not. It's as though the elites in Paris completely forgot about the potential problems this one move would make, in the interest by the way of a cleaner climate, but the effect it would have in a rural area.

Andrea Mitchell:

The exacerbated political conflicts have been exaggerated even further through social media. Robin, when you and I were first covering foreign conflicts and domestic politics, we didn't have

the instantaneous ability of the Russian trolls and bots of the Internet Research Agency in St. Petersburg and other actors as well now to try to influence elections, whether it's Brexit or trying, through Le Pen, to influence the French election. They're trying again, we are told authoritatively from our intelligence community, to influence the 2018 midterms. This is an ongoing thing.

Robin B. Wright:

Absolutely. I mean the access to technology and literacy that comes with it, particularly in parts of the world where you see for the first time the majority of the young are literate, can communicate. They may not have high school degrees, but they have access to technology. They have a broader sense of the world. We see that both as a force for good and something that threatens.

I want to talk more broadly in a minute, but I'll give you one very telling example. Tunisia, the one country in the Arab world that went through and led the way in the Arab Spring in 2011, it was ignited by social media. It was a young rapper who put out a song on his Facebook at a time that 20% of Tunisians were on Facebook, and the song talked about Tunisians living off garbage and going through school and never learning to read or write.

It resonated. The young were galvanized. A young fruit vendor, when pressed for a bribe by a police inspector, just trying to sell fruit on the streets in a remote Tunisian city, stood up and said, "I won't pay it." The police inspector took the fruit vendor's produce. He went to protest because he supported his ailing mother, his five siblings, and his uncle. He went from government office to government office to demand he get his produce back, so he could support his family.

When he couldn't, he had no recourse. He was turned back at every post. He went to the governor's office, covered paint thinner over his body, and set himself on fire. At that moment, the song from the young rapper and literally the spark by this young fruit vendor came together and had mobilized Tunisians. This is in 2011, and it ousted a man who'd been in power for a quarter century.

Now, what is important to understand: I went back to the remote town in Sidi Bouzid where this happened a year later. I asked the young, "How are you doing?" on the same street corner where he sold his fruit. They said, "We have far more freedoms and far fewer jobs. Two years later, I went back and was an international monitor at Tunisia's first democratic presidential election, and the lowest turnout in the freest election ever held in the Arab world, 22 countries, the lowest turnout was among the young, and the lowest turnout in any city was in Sidi Bouzid.

Two years later, in 2016, as ISIS is appealing to people around the world, Tunisia provides the single largest number of fighters. Tunisia is one of the smallest countries in the Arab world. It's smaller than Florida. 11 million people. Over 3,000 joined ISIS. Another 9,000 tried to leave the country and were turned back by security forces. ISIS, having reached out on social media. So you can see, with this extraordinary wave of democracy that we celebrate at the moment, how it

can be manipulated so quickly in the one country where we saw such hope and turned into such evil.

Now, if I can just for a moment look at the broader trend and add to one thing Bob said. We are all contemporaries. I feel very fortunate to call both of them friends. But in the first half of our lives, the majority of failed democracies were as a result of coups or insurgencies. Between 1946 and 1999, 64 democracies failed because of coups or insurgencies. It was like a light switch. You'd turn the light switch on and off. We turned it off, and democracy after coup, the light stayed out for decades.

What's interesting about the second half of our professional lives is that, today, the greatest threat to democracy... most democracies fail because we elect autocrats. It's stunning between 2000 and 2010, 40% of democracies face threats from populism. I've seen the transition play out in my life.

In the Philippines, I was a pool reporter with John Paul II's plane in 1980 when he went out and he told Ferdinand Marcos, the dictator, "The gig's up." He supported people power that brought in a democratically elected government, but in 2016, the Filipinos elected Rodrigo Duterte, who is one of the biggest thugs on the global stage today, challenging all the basic tenets of democracy.

In Russia, I covered the end of the Soviet Union in 1991. I was back in Russia in the run-up to the election last year electing Vladimir Putin, who's now been in power either as prime minister or president for 20 years.

The last example is South Africa. I was in Soweto, the black township outside Johannesburg in 1976, when a group of schoolchildren led the first black mass uprising to protest government decision to change the language of education from African languages to Afrikaans, the language of Dutch settlers. That gave birth to the mass uprising that, 15 years later, led to Nelson Mandela's freedom. I went back to watch him walk to freedom. Today, the average black in South Africa is far worse off in terms of the way he lives than he was under apartheid.

We celebrate the great birth, the latest wave of democratization, but there are an extraordinary number of threats. One of them is the manipulation by social media and how states use the social media to subvert other countries and then coming together with this threat of populism.

Andrea Mitchell:

Well, in some ways, what we see evolving also is single-party governance, something that Lenin first created in 1917. Bob Gates, in government, you saw these trends. We see frankly right now in America, our administration embracing some of these totalitarian leaders, whether it be Erdoğan, Putin, Duterte, around the world, taking action in Venezuela which has not worked yet to unseat Maduro.

But to what extent do the American principles of Jamestown and Williamsburg and our founders have to drive or show as an example and a broad interest in human rights and in press freedoms?

The Honorable Robert M. Gates:

Now, I think that there has been really, since 1945, only one clear strong voice in the world for democracy and for liberty. That has been the United States. Now, I believe that you can't impose democracy on another country. But I will never forget talking to people like Václav Havel in Czechoslovakia and Lech Wałęsa in Poland and the refuseniks in the Soviet Union after the fall of the Soviets, and how important it was to them, not that we intervened militarily which we never did, but to know we were out there, that we cared, and that we were a voice for the principle of democracy and liberty.

Now, we helped them a lot clandestinely. The Poles had the advantage. They had three different streams of covert assistance, one from CIA, one from the AFL-CIO, and by far the most important, from the Catholic Church and Pope John Paul II, but hearing our voice, knowing we were there, we were a beacon for them, something they could look to.

I think if we lose that feeling on the part of the rest of the world, that despite all of our flaws... And believe me, the rest of the world knows our flaws. We're not exactly keeping them a secret. But if the rest of the world knows... has always known that we, at least what we stand for and what we aspire to be, that voice is really important. It's important for the Turks to hear who are voting in Istanbul against Erdoğan. It's important for the opposition in Venezuela to know. It's important for the people in a lot of these countries that we're talking about.

I think we have to be very hard-headed. Look, I'm as much of a realist as anybody. The reality is the United States has done business with some of history's greatest monsters. But Franklin D. Roosevelt never pretended to be in love with Joseph Stalin.

In the real world, we have to deal with these people, but we don't have to embrace them. We can treat with the leaders of authoritarian states. We can do business with them, but we don't need to embrace them in the same way that we embrace the leaders of democratically elected governments. I think, Andrea, to your point, I think if we lose our willingness to be that city on the hill, to be that beacon, I think we lose a lot of what makes us unique in the world.

I think we lose a piece of our national soul. I think we can be very hard-headed about how we do business. I think we can and should drive harder bargains with a lot of people including the Chinese, but I don't think we ever forget who we are and where our roots are in places like Jamestown.

Andrea Mitchell:

The obvious question is Kim Jong-un, and some of the language that's been used about love and embracing. What have we gotten for it? There were missile strikes just yesterday. It's a careful balancing act. I understand the pragmatism. I understand all the arguments about the Saudis being a political and military ally, but then there is Jamal Khashoggi.

But I do remember, you mentioned the city on the hill, which calls to mind when I traveled to Moscow with Ronald Reagan to meet with Mikhail Gorbachev after the first couple of summits.

After the 1985 summit. Then there was the Moscow summit. He went to Spaso House, the ambassador's residence, and met with dissidents. He gave a speech to the Russian people, the then-Soviet people. Ronald Reagan did not mince his words. That did not prevent him from reaching landmark arms control and nuclear reduction treaties with Gorbachev.

There's a balancing act. I think values have to, in some fundamental way, be central to who we are as a country, despite being pragmatic, perhaps not as pragmatic as some people in government have to be, but I recognize those facts. Is that a fair analogy?

The Honorable Robert M. Gates:

Oh, absolutely. I've done this most of my professional life. Sitting across the table in Moscow from the head of the KGB, I would say he and I probably didn't share very many values, particularly as we were having our dinner in a safe house that had once been owned by Beria, the head of Stalin's Secret Service. That was a little eerie, but yeah. Again, I guess I'm repeating myself, but I think you can blend sustaining your belief in values and promoting those values with a very hard-headed pragmatic view of how to deal with the world.

I think that, I mean from my personal experience of the presidents that I've worked for, I think most of those presidents did that. Certainly, Ronald Reagan did it. I think both Bushes did it. Obama did it. Jimmy Carter did it. I would say the interesting thing in the balance is I would say Jimmy Carter tilted too far the other direction and was not tough-minded or hard-headed enough while promoting democracy and human rights.

The problem with Jimmy Carter's policy toward human rights was that we took a very tough line on it, but the only people we could punish were our friends. We would impose sanctions or other actions against South Korea and others, where we couldn't do anything with respect to Iran or the Soviet Union or China in terms of far greater and far worse abuses.

Andrea Mitchell:  
Robert-

The Honorable Robert M. Gates:  
It is a balancing act.

Andrea Mitchell:

Well, you're an expert on Iran among many other things. How do you balance our expectations for Iran to prevent some of the more egregious behaviors of the IRGC and at the same time not excessively punish the population then hope for some sort of free elections at some point?

Robin B. Wright:

I think one of the great problems is that even as we deal with the tough guys and try to negotiate arms deals with them, in the past, there's been more consistency. Yes, there have been deviations, one a little bit more than the other, but there's been a sense that America always stood for certain things. I think the problem now is we're seeing such fluctuations that we went from one policy that was designed to recognize and to sanction the Iranians for their bad behavior, to

sanction the Revolutionary Guards for their intervention in the Middle East. There were the missile tests, but we're still trying to deal with the most consistent danger, which was Iran's nuclear program or the potential for a nuclear program.

Now, we've reversed course, walked away from one of the most important arms deal. Whether you like it or not, it was the most significant arms deal, major arms deal in a quarter century. It stopped in its tracks what could have been not just Iranian nuclear weapons, but also the proliferation of nuclear weapons in the wider Middle East. The question becomes if Iran is the model, does it mean that anytime that any country does a deal with the United States, is the next president, if he doesn't agree with all its terms, going to walk away from it? What is it that America stands for? What are the parameters of engagement with it? I think that's where our credibility comes into question.

As I said, it doesn't matter whether you like a deal or not. It's the principle of, can you do as Reagan did? Can you talk to dissidents and give a lecture, whether it's at the Berlin Wall or on Moscow television at the same time as you're talking to the leader of the most powerful communist state at the time? That's where I think we get time and again into problems that...

And I think we face that issue when it comes to Saudi Arabia. Something that I feel very deeply about. I think Andrea knew Jamal Khashoggi as well. He was a friend of mine for 30 years. This is a man who was dismembered in a consulate and his body hidden, and we commemorate the anniversary in October. We still don't know where his body is. Yet, Saudi Arabia is the first country that President Trump went to and has made it the foundation of the broader policy in the Middle East.

This again sends mixed signals. What is it? We condemn, not very vociferously. We're continuing to sell arms. The president vetoed congressional pressure not to walk away from rearming the Saudis because of its war in Yemen. Again, democracy, to be sustained, has to represent certain values and a certain kind of consistency.

I think one of the problems we're seeing and one of the many reasons for the rise of populism is that: what is it that is going to bring us stability, give consistency, give us a sense of prosperity and efficiency and productivity in creating and getting us through this awkward transition the whole world is going through on globalization? That's where, I think, we haven't had from either party. I live in Washington. For me, a pox on all their houses.

I think this is where we haven't quite seen the leadership emerge that gives us or defines the post-Cold War values and gives us that sense of leadership how we're going to get there. We, by default, go to the kinds of identities that put us in competition among ourselves and with others around the world.

The Honorable Robert M. Gates:

I would go back to something I said in my remarks this morning about the consequences of wave elections that return one party to another after another to office and to power... feeling

empowered to pursue their own agenda and with a certain self-righteousness that they've got it all figured out.

Part of the reason for this instability, are these wave elections. Part of the problem, and just to take the Iran agreement as an example, if you're not willing to work with the other side of the aisle and get an agreement like that ratified by the Senate, just then, as you executed the agreement with a signature, the next president can un-execute it with a signature because it's just an executive agreement.

That's much more difficult to do if you go through the process of submitting an agreement for ratification, because then, you actually have to reach out to the other party as you're negotiating. I remember when President Reagan was negotiating the INF treaty, we were negotiating the INF treaty, we actually had a consultative group with senators from both parties consulting with us as we did it.

The result was it was actually fairly easily ratified. When you have these agreements where you have buy-in from both parties, it provides a stability and a predictability not only for ourselves, but for other countries in the world that we don't have when these things are done by a single party. The same thing is true when a piece of legislation is passed with the support of only one party.

The next time the other guys are in power, they're going to get rid of it. This has increased the instability. And, frankly, to draw the thread back, this paralysis in Washington feeds this populism that our government doesn't work, because the politicians who are running it have no interest in making it work. They just want to keep themselves in power.

Andrea Mitchell:

In fact, that's true of domestic issues as well, of healthcare...

The Honorable Robert M. Gates:

Yeah. Oh, absolutely.

Andrea Mitchell:

Other issues that are decided on single party votes. The tribalism that we see in Washington now reflects both what's happening out in the country and the feedback to it as well.

How important is a free press to the survival of democracy, Secretary Gates?

The Honorable Robert M. Gates:

Well, I personally think it's critical. Jefferson once said that, in essence, given a choice between a free legislature and a free press, he'd take a free press any day as a better guarantee of liberty. My own experience in government, and I've been through a lot of crises in government, I joined CIA in the middle of the Vietnam War, and the Johnson administration lied pretty consistently to the American people about what was going on. It was the press that basically revealed the reality.

When I was Secretary of Defense, it was the press that alerted me to the mistreatment of outpatient wounded warriors at Walter Reed Hospitals. Washington Post turned out the story. It was absolutely right. I ended up firing the hospital commander, surgeon general of the army, and the secretary of the army. We got it fixed.

It was the press that alerted me to the Marines using a handful of armored vehicles in Anbar province in Iraq that had V-shaped holes that were dispersing the blasts from IEDs, and we looked into it. Ultimately, we bought 27,000 of those vehicles for \$40 billion. They saved a lot of lives, but I wouldn't have known about it if it hadn't been for the press.

I tell CEOs the same thing I told the generals. When you read a story in the press, don't automatically curl up in a fetal defensive position. You may have just been told about a problem in your organization you didn't know you had. Go find out the truth. Go find out the facts. If you find out the story is correct, then fix it and acknowledge that you found out about it through the press. That's how you learn how to fix it.

If it's not true, then you've got the facts to push back and say, "The story's not true." I went out to the press. I did a weekly press briefing. Every single week I was in Washington as Secretary of Defense over four and a half years, went in front of the cameras. Half the time, I didn't even have anything I wanted to say, but I wanted to be available to take questions, because in my head, that was the way a Secretary of Defense in the middle of two wars, that was the way I communicated not only with the American people about what we were trying to do, it was the way I communicated with two million young men and women in uniform.

When I first got the job, I said, "I'd like to set up an email account like I had at Texas A&M where there, the students could email me directly, and I could deal with their problems. I want to do the same thing with the military." My chief of staff said, "Sir, there are two million of them." I said, "Okay. Well, that was a really bad idea." But I feel very strongly about this. I think that, in fact, one of my biggest worries for this country domestically is there's so many newspapers in medium and small towns that are closing.

Well, who's going to keep an eye on the mayor or the town council or the people that are doing the contracting for the town? Who's going to keep an eye on them? I think you clearly hit a hot button for me, but my experience in government... Let's just say I have not led two of the most press friendly organizations in the world, the Central Intelligence Agency and the Defense Department, but I feel very strongly that more than anything else other than perhaps an independent judiciary, free press is critical to preserving our freedom.

Andrea Mitchell:

There have been restrictions lately on, well, in the last two years in both the Pentagon and the State Department, not at the White House, but on press coverage that had been pretty dramatic. I just want to say that Secretaries of State, whom I've covered full time since 1994 and the White House before that and the Hill.... Secretaries of State always made it a point, Democrats and Republicans, when they went to a totalitarian government, if the host country did not have a press briefing on their visit with the foreign minister, they would have one unilaterally. Whether

it was Moscow or Beijing, wherever they went, Ankara. The Secretaries would do that to show that in America, when the press is traveling with the Secretary of State, we have access.

I remember one dramatic moment in my experience in Khartoum when I was at a photo opportunity with Condoleezza Rice and the dictator there, and I asked him about terrorism and then got manhandled by his security people and dragged out. Secretary Rice would not leave Sudan without getting a formal apology to her because it happened in front of her and to her traveling press corps who she said were part of her delegation. That was a similar, not as dramatic, but similar statements were made.

It was noteworthy that Stephanie Grisham, the new White House press secretary, on her first trip on the job, at the DMZ, threw herself in front of the security people from North Korea. I can't stress how difficult that must have been. And she showed her stuff to get the press corps in. I experienced it in Cairo when this wonderful former advance person for Vice President Pence, with whom I was traveling to the Middle East, absolutely faced down, I swear to you, a six-foot five-inch if he was an inch, she was about this tall, bodyguard demanding that the vice president's press pool get in for a photo op with the Egyptian leader who is no friend of the press corps. There is an American tradition. It is not always followed, but I think Bob Gates certainly signified the best of the best in terms of cabinet leadership in that regard.

Robin, we've seen the importance also, of the decades in ancient times when I was a young reporter, it was Radio Free Europe, that information is such a potent form of democratic empowerment. You refer to the AFL-CIO in Poland. I think it was my late friend, Lane Kirkland, who was a very strong leader in that regard. As well as, you point out, whatever you were doing covertly and the support of other democratic institutions.

No one knows this more profoundly than Madeleine Albright, given her history in Czechoslovakia and her parents' history. The problem we face now is with these Russian trolls and others, Iran and China and others are in the game, Russia most notably. How do we get facts to people? One of the problems we have in America is that everybody is in their little tribal niches, and nobody, as Pat Moynihan used to say, is entitled to their own facts. The problem has become one that we in America don't share the same facts, and certainly people around the world are getting misinformation.

Robin B. Wright:

Well, I wanted to pick up from something Bob said, and that is... Today, it's stunning to me the way that 20 years ago, 25 years ago, CNN really defined international news. It was the one that set the priorities and that people around the world watched. Today, you have RT, which is Russia Today. You have the Chinese CCTV, which are prevalent on cable networks around the world and have studios in Washington and are probably available on your local cable network. That when it comes to having a megaphone to broadcast your ideas and win followers, converts, whatever, other nations have learned from our example. And they are filling this void that, whether it's the local newspaper, particularly as people increasingly get their news from the visual media rather than the print media.

Andrea Mitchell:

On social media, they're under false flags. They're not even labeled-

Robin B. Wright:

That's right.

Andrea Mitchell:

... as Russian television.

Robin B. Wright:

Absolutely. There is kind of an alternative world of data that reinforces each other. Whether it's on Twitter, on television, we find this has permeated our own society in a way that CNN once did with the rest of the world. It's flip-flopped.

I think one of the thing that we don't talk about enough is the economic component of it that. For a long time, liberal democracies, Western democracies created the model for the rest of the world what people aspired to in terms of getting again prosperity, efficiency, productivities, stability and so forth.

Today, what's really striking is the idea of authoritarian capitalism which is providing those goals, productivity and prosperity and stability that increasingly are seen as an alternative to liberal democracy. It may create more stable environments. You look at the turmoil we're seeing in the West and Western societies, and that it all comes together in a way that we may be at a turning point.

The 18th century gave us the birth of democracy. The 19th century gave us the routing of democracy. The 20th century gave us the global embrace of democracy, and the 21st century is giving us the challenge to democracy.

There was a study at Harvard done recently that suggested that Western democracies may no longer be able to regain the position they once had as the model. That's something we kind of take for granted, "Oh, this may be a moment that we're struggling or we're seeing populist movements." Democracy's challenged in important countries like Turkey, which has been in free fall since 2014, which is the second largest contributor to NATO. Poland, the first country to challenge the Soviet domination of Eastern Europe that you look around the world. Every continent except Australia and Antarctica have these challenges to them.

You may remember the Frank Fukuyama's famous book, *The End of History*, assuming that democracy was the wave of the future. It may be that democracy is really only the interlude. If there isn't more work done to sustain the system, coming up with a sense of common good and human goodwill, that we jeopardize the future of what has been the most dynamic, hopeful political system in the world, in world history.

The Honorable Robert M. Gates:

I think actually we can do a lot more to defend ourselves. I think we've allowed ourselves to be pushed around too much. We're finally waking up to the disadvantages we have been operating with in terms of our economic relationship with China and are now pushing back on some fundamentals, not just the trade balance which, frankly, I think is of secondary importance, but rather on reciprocity when it comes to intellectual property protections, when it comes to joint ventures, when it comes to investment, and so on.

Basically, I mean my view is that our policy ought to be very simple. We believe in total reciprocity. What our companies can do in China, your companies can do in the US. What we can't do, you can't do, period. End of sentence.

When it comes to some of these television networks, it's pretty one-sided. RT, which they referred to, is operating freely in the United States, has studios in the United States. The Chinese networks have studios in the United States. How many studios do you think American networks have in China? Zip.

Here are the rules. What RT is allowed to do in the United States, the United States is allowed to do in Russia, and vice versa. Same thing with China. There's no reason to allow these countries to basically run roughshod over us using our own freedoms. Now, is that an impingement on our First Amendment? Maybe, but I think allowing some other country to broadcast propaganda into your country when you can't broadcast it into theirs freely is simple diplomacy.

I think we actually can be much tougher about these things. I think we can be much tougher in using our own methodologies to send some messages back to their countries about what's going on inside their countries, about the corruption, about environmental issues, and about a host of other things. They like to try and divide us. Well, two can play that game.

I think actually and, now, this is kind of the old CIA, DOD guy coming out, but my attitude is maybe we ought to start playing hardball with some of these guys in a way we haven't been doing in a while and show that democracy, by God, will defend itself. There's a price to be paid for trying to interfere with us. I think at a minimum, we ought to make them identify themselves.

The Chinese are buying up all kinds of communications capabilities in this country and a lot in Africa and in Asia, elsewhere, to the point where they will dominate the mass media in a lot of these countries. We're not doing anything. I think that there are some counter-offensive things that we can undertake.

And to just tie it back in to where we started, it also shows that we can get some things done. We will defend ourselves. We do believe in our institutions. We do believe in freedom. We also believe in reciprocity, in a fair playing field. We're just strong enough and tough enough to make sure that happens.

Andrea Mitchell:

How important is it for American leaders to have good relationships with our allies in NATO, in other defense accords?

The Honorable Robert M. Gates:

Well, I mean it's important, but the truth is those relationships have varied with every president. I will tell you the hardest thing I ever had to do with successive American presidents was to get him to meet with the President of the EU. They just hated it. Who's the EU, and why do I have to meet with them? Why do I have to waste my time with these guys?

Let's just say the relationship between President Bush 43 and Jacques Chirac and Gerhard Schröder was not exactly warm and fuzzy. The truth is that they couldn't stand each other. I think, actually, the leaders themselves sometimes place too much importance on these personal relationships. Leaders do what they do because it's in the interests of their government, of their country, or their own political interest, not because they love the American president. The more American presidents came to grips with that reality, the less time they'd waste schmoozing some of these guys who aren't worth schmoozing.

Andrea Mitchell:

Well, we certainly are seeing that result now in the UK. Do you have any projections as to what Brexit will mean? Let's say it's a no-deal Brexit on October 21st.

The Honorable Robert M. Gates:

What do I know, but I would say one word. Disaster. Now, this goes probably to the dinner panel, but I think it'll have some profound effects in terms of our relationship with Britain and Britain's role in the world.

Andrea Mitchell:

Putting on your old hat again, how does any of this, if at all, affect our relationships with the Five Eyes, our key intelligence partners? Do they get nervous when, let's say, someone who is very partisan becomes in charge of all of our intelligence agencies, which is maybe not the case, and maybe everyone changes when they take a job? But do they begin to hold back? Does it make us less safe?

The Honorable Robert M. Gates:

I don't really think so. They deal with us because it's in their interest and because we have a lot to offer. The truth is that a lot of intelligence services including several in the Five Eyes arrangement are held by political appointees, by people who were cabinet members or political officials and not intelligence professionals. A minority, a distinct minority of heads of US intelligence have been intelligence professionals. Some good, some not so good.

I think it actually won't make that big a different. I remember the big argument when we made the switch in the mid-70s to really serious congressional oversight of CIA and the other intelligence agencies. Everybody was saying, "Oh, nobody will ever talk to us again. Nobody will share their sources or anything else." It all ended up being bunkum. Nothing changed at all.

Andrea Mitchell:

Robin, when we talk about the media and the pressure on us right now as well, not only from our sources and from officials who are very skeptical, if not hostile to what we're doing here and abroad, how challenging is it in this era of social media to fact check, to make sure we don't get swept away by false rumors? Just how different is the climate right now? As I hear from my colleagues covering the White House, it's very, very hard given a president on Twitter and other officials reacting.

Robin B. Wright:

Well, I think one of the problems in covering the environment generally today is the lack of briefings. You don't have the Secretary of Defense coming out every week, or even the White House as you know as well, doing daily briefings. So the old days, of the sense of we have an obligation to the taxpayer, to the citizen to tell them what's going on. Now, it's like a game in how much is held back.

I would disagree with Bob on one thing. That is I've heard from a number of European countries, key European countries, that they have withheld intelligence because they were afraid that if it got to certain places in government, that it would end up... whether it's with the Russians or with others... that they didn't want that information shared.

I think there is some reticence, some concern about how respectful the intelligence relationships are today. I don't think they were what they once were or have been in the past. I think that's a problem. It's the general sense of collegiality.

One thing you mentioned on the Iran deal was that we didn't get it ratified. Well, fair enough, but the fact is, you had six countries that negotiated the deal with Iran, and this was not something that was a bilateral deal. It was an effort to literally get the world community to speak with one common voice, countries that we had profound disagreements with, including Russia and China, but we came together.

You can argue in both ways, but it's just, in this era where we really need to figure out some way to think bigger than we are, whether it's among ourselves or globally, it's harder and harder to do that because we feel so siloed here that we're adversaries. There's always that adversarial role that we're the check on the balance on government.

It's always true that the majority of government officials don't want to tell the press the majority of things, but they have to fess up, whether it's in announcing where their budget priorities are or addressing different crises. There's just a sense now that everything is so partisan.

Just one example, there's a poll done recently and two issues, Russia and climate change are now totally polarized. I found one poll and it's a riveting, hang on, the breakdown among different Republicans and Democrats. On Russia, 65% of Democrats believe Russia is a threat and only 35% of Republicans think it's a threat. When it comes to climate change, 84% of Democrats and independents think climate change is a danger to the human species, only 27% of Republicans. The fact that issues like that have become polarized, it just reflects the divisions within and how

hard it is for us to come up with a common policy ourselves, much less take on these bigger issues globally.

Andrea Mitchell:

Well, finally, Secretary Gates, with that kind of polarization on issues that used to be sort of common threads among politicians of different stripes, here and abroad, how do we get past it? My own solution would be more fact-based reporting, more education, more involvement by young people, college students, as you are demonstrating with your commitment to higher education, in learning more about our history and our foreign policies.

The Honorable Robert M. Gates:

Well, I see we're out of time, so, I'll be very brief. I think in some ways it goes back in this country to the previous panel. I just couldn't agree more with the issues relating to the teaching of American history, particularly in high school and the absence of teaching of civics and the broad ignorance around the country of how government actually works, much less greater specifics.

I think that returning to that agenda that David Rubenstein and others were talking about is really critically important. It's one of the reasons why I think organizations like the Boy Scouts and the Girl Scouts are so important because they teach this stuff that they don't learn in school anymore, and obviously, our universities, but I think in terms of here at home, the critical thing is teaching people to think for themselves.

I remember I was at a dinner 25 years ago, and I'll close with this because I think it really gets to the heart of what you're talking about. I was at a dinner for 450 of the smartest high school students in the country. I was there as head of CIA. Colin Powell was there. The head of the FBI was there, a lot of very successful business people were at the dinner. I was seated between Bill Gates and Barry Diller. Well, we all got a chance to say a few words to these high school kids. One of the people who spoke before me was Oliver Stone.

This was the same year that the movie *JFK* came out basically accusing CIA of assassinating JFK. When it came my turn, I stood up. I told these high school seniors. I said, "Look, you're too old and you're too smart to be spoon-fed American history by anybody, whether it's the government or it's Oliver Stone. If you care about these issues," this was 25 years ago, "go to the library. Research it. Figure it out for yourself."

I think one way to get at this whole fake news and all the rest and multiple sources of information is, both in high school and in college, teaching critical thinking and teaching people that, if they care about something, to go find out the facts for themselves and where they can go that are reliable sources of information.

Universities and schools can teach how to differentiate sources. They've been doing it forever. We did it when I was a student. "There are some sources that are really good. There are some that are really terrible. Here's how you tell the difference." That's a long-term solution to the problem. If I may, I would just say in closing, part of it would be helped if the media could do a

better job of disguising some of its biases, and if people had more confidence that critical sources of information of what's going on in the country in the world were more reliable in themselves in terms of being even-handed.

Andrea Mitchell:

Well, thank you so much, Robert Gates, Robin Wright. Thanks to all of you for your commitment to these issues. Thank you.

The Honorable Robert M. Gates:

Thank you.

## **Reflections**

**Bryan Austin (as Thomas Jefferson)**

**Kurt Smith (as James Madison)**

James Madison:

Good evening to you, ladies, gentlemen.

Thomas Jefferson:

What great exuberance.

James Madison:

I will confess, my dear Thomas, I am notorious for being the most soft spoken statesman in all of America, but I will confess my greeting was entirely operatic compared to the whole assemblage.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, our time together is brief. At this present moment, this crowd is excessive, the music oppressive, your choice of speakers, bad. Upon those grounds, we have but a brief period of time to address you before you enjoy the various libations and festivities. And if this is the greeting we have to begin upon, this the footing by which this contract of conversation will start, I will say, Mr. Jefferson, we will never get through it alive. Upon those grounds, shortly, ladies and gentlemen, we may conjure some greater degree of exuberance that which might lubricate the wheels of enlightened conversation. Once more, I say, good evening.

Audience:

Good evening.

James Madison:

We will improve upon it, I have no doubt. Ladies and gentlemen, it is our privilege upon this occasion to have this opportunity to address you. Moreover, to celebrate this event which happens so very rarely over the course of the wheel of human events, that, of course, celebrate Virginia's role in this experiment of self-government. I thank you.

Thomas Jefferson:

Thank you, the one Virginian.

James Madison:

Mr. Jefferson, we have a Continental Congress in miniature. Upon those grounds, though we have walked with this nation for the better part of some 40 years in public service, still, it haven't been some time since we have trespassed across these streets of Williamsburg where the both of us began. Upon political fields, I hope you will allow the opportunity for introduction. Friends, for myself, I have held the opportunity and honor to sit as legislature, magistrate, counselor, architect of the various political scriptures we hold dear, but happily upon this occasion, speak to you from the title we all share, that of citizens. My name, ladies and gentlemen, is James Madison at your service.

Thomas Jefferson:

And I, dear friends, for better, for worse, born and raised just west of here, five days ride west of Williamsburg. Shadwell Plantation was my family's plantation, and yet, we find ourselves now not of individualizing ourselves by county, but rather individually and ourselves by the rather industrious nation upon which we found ourselves. That is, I call myself a citizen, friends, just as you. My name, for better or worse, friends, is Thomas Jefferson of Albemarle County. A pleasure.

I'm not known for my skills at extemporaneous speech. It's said of me that I cannot string three sentences together, it's said of me that I have a bit of a stutter, but I say the Federalists will say anything, will they not? Do not believe everything you hear out of Patrick Henry's mouth, friends. There are great orators upon our age, great orators upon us, but we must utilize our individual education to sift fact from fiction. May our newspapers always remain with fact in them. A newspaper with only facts in them, as I say, will have no subscribers.

James Madison:

But moreover, ladies and gentlemen, when it was requested of both of us that we should exit the tomb and, upon this occasion, address you, it fell to both myself and President Jefferson whereby we uttered the remarks, "Truly? You wished myself and Mr. Jefferson to address this aghast occasion?" And all the same, we would shrink from this opportunity were it not for the purposes that bring us to this point.

You see, ladies and gentlemen, many years ago, born forth from this city of Williamsburg and echoed over the course of the entirety of this world, an experiment was reared. Many years ago, we resolved unanimously for an independency from Great Britain, and from that, reared a new system, one not derived from the usurped power of kings, but rather instead the legitimate power of the people. You can clap for that if you wish. Very patriotic, President Jefferson.

Thomas Jefferson:

I thank you, sir.

James Madison:

And yet, still upon that in every instance when we examine this future, this wilderness without a single footstep to guide us, there is one singular panacea, one singular cure by which we are

people confused, tired, fatigued, may navigate this road together, that, of course, being the examination of history. But that is all why we are here, yes? The examination of history, and a particular history by which Virginia deals itself great honor in rendering. That is, of course, that which took place in 1619 in this fatiguing summer season of the year. That, of course, of representative government, democracy.

Many years ago, ladies and gentlemen, we had the opportunity to choose for ourselves whatever system of government was most conducive to our liberty, and our happiness, and our safety. We chose the most volatile, detrimental, and turbulent system imaginable. We chose a republican form of government, a republican form of government utilizing that electric power of democracy. Throughout the annals of time, if you examine it, democracy fails. It's the source of turbulence contention. It is as short in its life as it is volatile in its death.

And yet, from our very beginnings in 1619 through the most confusing and bare wilderness, Virginia has endeavored to prove history wrong. That is why upon this occasion, we have rendered the opportunity to address you. Myself and my dear friend, Mr. Jefferson, have had an odd alliance upon the course of this experiment. Have we not, my dear friend?

Thomas Jefferson:

We have indeed, but we have allied ourselves upon the fact, we have allied ourselves upon facts of history. Friends, I say to you, and perhaps you know the answer to this question, what is the most important subject that man may study?

I'm glad that the Virginian knows this answer. History, friends. History is the most important subject that mankind may study. And I ask you why. I know you're stuffing kale upon your mouths, but yes, I understand that you perhaps might know the answer. Our creator gifted us with reason, did he not? We are sapient beings. We're sapient humans. We are homo sapiens. Our creator gifted us with reason, certainly, he expects us to use it. You brought your minds with you this afternoon. Did you not? So, let us use it then, friends. Why is history the most important subject that man may study?

So you can learn from it. And this is coming from the mouth of a woman. History may indeed be... Take less. Are you stepping back, James? Are you just... You wish to push me into the fray of this fire? Well, I shall step into then, friends. History is a manual, you understand. History is a manual for mankind to be better. We may utilize the understanding made generations prior, we may understand their mistakes so as to ensure that we need not make the same mistakes made generations prior. Yes?

Audience:

Yes.

Thomas Jefferson:

And thus, history might be a manual for mankind to be better, yes?

Audience:

Yes.

Thomas Jefferson:

So, no doubt that you in your time, you are not repeating the same mistakes made generations prior.

Audience:

Of course not.

Thomas Jefferson:

Why do you laugh? I'm not known for my skills at hilaritas.

Yeah, I'm a slow learner? I'm a slow learner?

You are a slow learner. Well, thank you for placing that precedent upon your shoulders and not yoking that thing of around mine. These are the jokes, friends. If you find yourself repeating the same mistakes made generations prior, friends, this means one of two things. One of two things. Either man is not reading history, or more dangerously, man is reading history, and then choosing willfully to remain ignorant of the lessons contained therein. You might as well not even open up a book in the first place.

History is a manual... Thank you, Virginians... for mankind to be better. So, we might adhere to history. We might understand the mistakes made from 1619 onto the present, and we might understand that these mistakes might be a manual for us to adjust our current situation so as do need not repeat the same mistakes made generations prior, that we might complete acts and servitude amongst our people in a representative form of government. You know, we have turned the entire government over to we, the-

You've read this? Yes? What a beautiful, stupid idea. And yet, it's the best one that man has created. It is the best one. Even though we understand as Mr. Madison, my dear friend, has given it to be known today, that pure democracies fail for the very reason that make them powerful. That every man is given a what? A what?

Audience:

A voice.

Thomas Jefferson:

Absolutely. A voice. And yet we might achieve tyranny of the majority. We must guard against this tyranny of the majority with indeed perhaps ideas and systems of republic, and ideas and systems that uneducated people in general receive a relinquishing of the chains of bondage to which man willingly binds themselves. They fade like mist in the morning with a general system of education. This is why education is important. I'm an ardent advocate of education.

James Madison:

We're here to celebrate 1619, not lobby for education, Thomas Jefferson.

Thomas Jefferson:

I'm lobbying as far as I can. I'm given a platform, and I shall lobby publicly funded education in Virginia. For men, and yes, gasp, I'm a radical. It's a right, you know? It is a right. John Locke says so. Anyway, I'm not lobbying, sir. If you wish to so cede the floor, I shall cede the floor to you. And what is it that you wish to discuss about 1619?

James Madison:

You are very generous. I'm very pleased that you asked, Thomas. Upon that front, ladies and gentlemen, our time wanes. In truth, we have come to examine history. And not solely to address those various events from those various 20 settlements, from those various Englishmen elected by other Englishmen, but rather instead of precedent. It has been rendered by the English constitution that it should be the greatest constitution under the sun, burdened, as Blackstone says, by a people terribly ignorant of it, the English people. Thank you.

America's precedent is a very different one. One that is imperfect. One that can be more perfect. What we examine here, ladies and gentlemen, is a very different precedent, a precedent whereby from our very generous genesis, through the tumult and strife, through the various contests and tribulations, we have endeavored to set a precedent to be different than that which has come before.

To that end, what advice might be rendered from two gentlemen, who, from the very beginnings in public life, have wished to grow old in a free country? What advice might be rendered to an America fractured by party, lost to an army of partisans, frustrated and tired from the various scars and wounds which might be derived from a difficult system of self-government? It should be, my beloved countrymen, to hearken not to the unnatural voice which tells you the people of America, knit together as they are by so many cords of affection, cannot be members of the same family, cannot be the mutual guardians of their mutual happiness, cannot be children of one flourishing empire.

Hearken not to the voice which tells you this system is a novelty in the political world. It has no place in the wildest of projectors or the rashest of intents. For make no mistake, ladies and gentlemen, in 1619, there were plenty who said we could not, and yet, still somehow, we did. That is what it means to be an American even before such a term was ever crafted. Upon that, Mr. Jefferson, I must wonder if you might give us some words of conclusion or given your love for viticulture, I'm certain you have a litany, nay even a militia of toast you could burden these people with.

Thomas Jefferson:

So long as the glasses are full, then yes, we shall supply. My dear friend, James, my dear friend, we out of many. As in 1666 what that discovery rather rediscovery that... You can lower your hand. It's going to be a minute... that indeed out of that rainbow of colors, we were all united before, before it was discovered perhaps by Newton or rediscovered that a delineation might be upon us. There was a Jefferson listed on the first council of state ever at Jamestown, John Jefferson, my father's father's father's father's father.

Sometimes I look back on 1776 and wonder what would he think? John Jefferson, my great, great, great, great grandfather. Would he look upon me Thomas and say, "I thank you. I thank you for tearing down the entire country that I lived in." An apt question. Would he look at my face, look me in the eyes when I enter into heaven, and would he say thank you. Thank you for extending to all Americans these gracious rights, which should be extended to all. And yet is this not the obligation of this new country to stand up and say nay? To have the bravery. Let us not forget that this entire country was founded upon men who stood up and said, "Nay." As my dear friend James Madison, says... And if I can put words into your mouth, I will.

James Madison:

You've done it for our career.

Thomas Jefferson:

He says that people get the government they deserve. We will always get the government that we deserve. Always. Man creates this government for mankind. I know of no higher toast to raise an honor to than the forms and systems of government that we create for ourselves. May they always be honorable. May they always be just. May they be right, down upon the citizens and subjects upon which whom they exist. We create this thing for each other. It is our object to ensure that they extend the gracious rights of mankind down onto the very people under whom they sit. So, I say to you, dear sir, James Madison, let us hope these people in 244 years do not dash our ship of state upon the rocks of apathy and ignorance. This country is yours, dear friends, do with it what you will. We're dead.

**Remarks about the National Endowment for Democracy and Chatham House  
The Honorable Andrew H. Card, Jr., Chairman of the National Endowment for  
Democracy; United States Secretary of Transportation (1992–1993); White House Chief of  
Staff (2001–2006)  
Dr. Robin C. H. Niblett CMG, Director of Chatham House, the Royal Institute of  
International Affairs**

Voiceover:

Ladies and gentlemen, please welcome 2019 Commemoration co-chair and Speaker of the Virginia House of Delegates Kirk Cox.

The Honorable M. Kirkland Cox:

Well, good evening. It's hard to follow two presidents, but I guess I'll have to try. Let me begin by thanking the very convincing and knowledgeable representatives of President Jefferson and President Madison, Kurt Smith and Brian Austin, for their encouraging remarks. It's been a very engaging and thought-provoking day, and I know you've enjoyed it.

We have more for this evening with some important remarks before dinner about efforts to spread democracy and a timely discussion about collaboration among free nations after dinner.

Before we proceed with the program, however, I want to recognize a few folks. We recognized the commemoration's executive committee and executive director this morning. For those of you who were not here, let me mention them again and ask them to stand so we can show our appreciation for all they have done to make this program possible.

First, Paul Koonce. Paul has so ably led our development efforts. Next, George Martin. Thank you, George. Jeanne Zeidler, Jeanne. Now I have to point out, Jeanne was instrumental in 2007, so she's done yeoman's duty for a long time. Senator Ryan McDougle. Thank you, Senator McDougle. And of course I think the two stars of today are Ben Dendy and Frank Atkinson, who together have led this planning for this forum. So, a big round of applause for Ben and Frank. And 2019 executive director, Kathy Spangler. Kathy. And my good friend, JYF executive director, Phil Emerson. Phil.

As Senator Norment said yesterday at the opening reception for this form, we have been blessed to have a very large group of volunteers helping with this commemoration. We also had an exceedingly capable professional staff, the 2019 Commemoration led by Kathy Spangler. We've had great team of consultants at Jack Morton Worldwide and other excellent commemoration partners. They made all of us look good. They have made this excellent week of activities possible. I hope you will join me in saluting all the members of our extended team.

Earlier today, we recognized some outstanding Virginia leaders who've joined us for this program. There are several others I want to mention at this time. First of all, Dr. Warren Billings, who wrote the very famous book, *A Little Parliament*, which is really the authoritative history of the first general assembly. Dr. Billings. Someone who I greatly admire, George Allen. Governor Allen in 1997 really kicked a lot of this off in the State of the Commonwealth Address. He started the 10-year countdown to 2007, and then charged us with continuing this through 2019. He's been instrumental in the planning group, and so let's give a good shout out and Virginia welcome to George Allen. Governor Allen.

The work of democracy takes many forms. We are fortunate that there are organizations, nonprofit organizations whose mission it is to communicate the values and the methods and also the benefits of the democratic form of government. Sometimes we tend to think of this work like we think of missionary work, that it is all about taking the gospel to a far off land. Much of the important work to be done is here at home in the United States and in the UK and in other places where democracy tends to be taken for granted and where civic engagement has waned.

We have an opportunity to hear this evening about two leading organizations, one here in the US and one in the UK, that are working to renew and reinvigorate democracy at home and advance and expand it abroad. One is the National Endowment for Democracy, which is chaired by former Transportation Secretary, White House Chief of Staff, Andy Card, who we had the privilege of hearing from today.

The other is Chatham House, the Royal Institute of International Affairs, which is led by Dr. Robin Niblett, who just arrived from London this afternoon. I think with that, that deserves a round of applause. We will hear more from Secretary Card and Dr. Niblett after dinner when

they'll be joined by Secretary Gates for a discussion collaboration about the US, the UK, and other allies. We've asked them to take some time before dinner to tell you about the work of these key organizations.

Before they begin, we will hear first from Secretary Card. Once again, I want to especially thank Dr. Niblett for coming all the way across the pond and doing some yeoman duty and coming to this major organizational meeting today. We admire your stamina, and we also are delighted to have you with us. Now, let me call forward Secretary Andrew Card for his remarks. Secretary Card.

The Honorable Andrew H. Card, Jr.:

I come from Boston, so I park the car in Harvard yard every once in a while, and you won't know what I'm saying. I am passionate about democracy. It's such a privilege to be here. I thank the speaker for his hospitality, Speaker Cox. And Senator Norment, I don't where you're sitting, but thank you for your leadership. President Rowe, thank you for hosting us and taking care of us while we're here. Thank all of the people that are involved in putting this together, especially Frank Atkinson who dragooned me.

I am the chairman of the National Endowment for Democracy, and I bet most of you have never heard of it. The National Endowment for Democracy was the vision of Ronald Reagan. When he was president of the United States, on June 8th, 1982, just after remembering what had happened on June 6th, he went to Westminster in London, and he gave a major address, a truly historic address in the march of democracy.

He celebrated the democracy of England and Great Britain. He celebrated the democracy that was brought to the new world by Great Britain. And he celebrated the democracy that America formed with the constitution that begins with one small word, "we". He reminded everyone as he addressed the British Parliament that we have an inalienable right to be able to govern. We have the right to form a government, and we're so blessed that we do.

Clearly, what happened 400 years ago in Jamestown never could have been imagined by people who are in Jamestown with what has happened. We the people have made a difference. President Reagan gave a remarkable speech where he said, "We, who understand democracy, who live in democracy, who participate in democracy, who argue in democracy, who complain in democracy, celebrate democracy and we want to bring it to every people all around the world".

He called for the United States and Great Britain and other democracies to recognize how important it is that we plant seeds of democracy all the time around the world to bring more people to recognize the opportunities that come from self-governance. He cautioned us that it would not be easy. He reminded us that democracy itself was not easy, that it's fragile, and it takes work. It takes understanding, it takes compassion, it takes civil dialogue, it takes compromise to make things happen.

He had a great ally in Margaret Thatcher who recognized the call. When President Reagan came back to the United States, he challenged Congress, that was controlled by members of the other

party, to recognize how important it was that the United States not only be a shining beacon of self-governance and democracy to the world, but actually be contagious with our democracy, and plant seeds of democracy around the world, and bring hope to people.

With a lot of work, a bill was passed with bipartisan support in the House and Senate, and it became law 34 years ago, and the National Endowment for Democracy was created. It's not an arm of the government. It is not a government entity. It's a 501 (c) (3) uniquely created by Congress. We get audited by the State Department, yet we're not a division of government. Our board of directors is bipartisan, very eclectic. It includes two senators, one Republican, one Democrat. Two members of the House of Representatives, one Republican, one Democrat. The chairman of the organization, just by tradition, has always been of the same party as the occupant of the Oval Office.

It's a board that meets quite regularly. In fact, the law says that we must meet regularly and approve every single grant that is given. It's not delegated to the staff. It's not delegated to the bureaucracy of the National Endowment for Democracy. There's a vote by the board on every grant that is given. We give no grants to the United States. We give grants to people who are fighting for democracy and helping to spread it around the world.

Go to Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, they know the National Endowment for Democracy. They celebrate it because it helped create a climate where they could have a democracy. It's humbling to travel the world and see how people celebrate democracy and give thanks because of the National Endowment for Democracy and President Ronald Reagan's vision.

Just within the last two years, you probably missed the stories of democracy flourishing in Armenia. For the first time, a revolution took place without a shot being fired, but votes being cast. They have a democracy. In Tunisia, the seeds of democracy are taking root and people are being elected to their parliament, including some who are funded by NED, to create a climate for democracy in Tunisia. In Ethiopia, one of the most diverse countries in the world with tremendous challenges, they are having elections. They're honest elections, they're open elections. The leader of that election effort, trained by people, funded by the National Endowment for Democracy.

In Ukraine, in Georgia - not the state, the country - in places all around the world, Malaysia, progress is being made to a democracy. The National Endowment for Democracy distributes some 170 million dollars. Some of it we can talk about, some we don't. We support institutions that are bringing freedom to people, inviting the press to have a standing, speech to be welcomed, compromise to be invited, and transitions to be reality. It's not easy work. It doesn't always produce the results that we want, but when it does, places like Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Poland, and Hungary, and the Czech Republic say thank you. It makes a difference.

This is a remarkable celebration that you're having here in Williamsburg and Jamestown, but it really was also an effort of the National Endowment for Democracy that was spreading democracy to all of us. There are other places that need to have democracy. You've all seen

what's been happening in Hong Kong. We know the abuses in China. We see what's happening in the Middle East, yet democracy is finding some traction.

Sure, the Arab Spring planted some weeds not flowers, but it did give rise to democracy opportunities, even in the Middle East. So, there's good work to be done, and it's critically important that it be done with the United States being that shining beacon on the hill. Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan had the courage to stand up and shout for democracy, and they motivated a lot of other people to get to work to build democracy around the world. It's critically important that the United States of America and its great ally, Great Britain, continue to lead the charge.

Dr. Robin Niblett has been doing that in Great Britain. He also did it under the tutelage of the United States, CSIS. He is at the Royal Institute for the International Affairs, the Chatham House. It's a privilege for him to be a partner in the effort to spread democracy around the world. I'm so glad that he is here to describe what the Chatham House does. You should know that they have rules in the Chatham House. I love their rules. The Chatham House rules say, "You can say anything you want, and you will not be quoted." It makes for a very free conversation. So now, I'm inviting Dr. Niblett to come up here and tell us about the Chatham House rules for spreading democracy, because it needs to be done.

Dr. Robin C. H. Niblett CMG:

Mr. Card, Andy, if I can say that, thank you very much for those warm words of welcome. I brought a bit of a script up here. I'm told that when Brits speak, sometimes we get a little more leeway because somehow the way we say it sometimes sounds better than actually what we're saying. I've had to follow Madison and Jefferson. I don't have anything on these autocues, I don't know if Andy did and others did or not. So, don't let jet lag take over at the wrong moment. I'll stick a little bit to time. I want to make sure that I say what I want to say.

What I want to say, first of all, is, it's a privilege to be here. When I heard that this meeting was being undertaken, 400th anniversary of hosting in Jamestown, the first assembly, representative legislative assembly in what was then known as the new world, struck me as the kind of meeting I really wanted to make an effort to be at. I'm thrilled that I did so. It's a great privilege to be on this forum on the future of representative democracy, and with such a great lineup, including obviously Chancellor Gates, other speakers I heard earlier today, David Rubenstein.

I definitely want to say a big shout out for Senator Norment and also for Speaker Cox for inviting me to be here today. Look, 1619 was a moment when the United Kingdom and America were very much part of the same political entity. I did walk past several etchings of British soldiers handing over arms, I think it was to General Washington, on the way to this long walk into the dinner. So, I'm very aware that this assembly also sowed the seeds of our separation. But in sowing those seeds of our separation, it put right into the roots of this country a belief in democracy, which has made it quite rightly a beacon around the world.

None more important, because you came back to our aid and to the aid of your allies in Europe, from whom so many Americans were descended, twice in the 20th century to help us protect our

democracy. There was a kind of poetic circularity to that set of relationships. We became closest allies in that process. I look forward to seeing some more about, I suppose, what the US, the UK are doing as countries in promoting democracy in the conversation we'll have after dinner, as you say. Luckily, after dinner means after the main course. You've already had a first course; otherwise, I'd be speaking very fast.

But I have been asked to say a few words about Chatham House. I don't want just want to make this some sort of pitch for the institute I've been privileged to lead for nearly 12 years now. But I do want to connect it a bit to the democracy agenda that is the absolute focus of this event today.

I should note right at the beginning, we are looking forward to our centennial year. Next year in 2020, we will celebrate our hundredth anniversary in 2020. It's important for those of you who don't know, this was always a transatlantic idea. It was specifically on the margins of the Versailles Peace Treaty negotiations in Paris at a dinner in the Hotel Majestic in May 30th, 1919. The members of the British and, in those days, dominion delegations and their American counterparts got together for dinner. The delegations being many of the academics, some of the diplomats. As you know, that negotiation went on for pretty much six months, a year ultimately. The complexity of the negotiation required a lot of experts to be there, not just diplomats.

Their view was quite simple. You can't leave diplomacy just to diplomats. Look what happened. I don't say that flippantly coming out of the horrors of the First World War. But the idea that you would benefit in the future from having groups of individuals who brought expertise, who brought fact-based analysis, as Congressman Scott referenced earlier today, evidence-based approaches to thinking about international affairs. International affairs would actually become an area of academic study. It didn't exist in 1920 as an area of academic study alongside science and economics. Importantly, as Andy Card just mentioned a minute ago, there was a need to create a safe space in which government officials could talk about these complexities with experts and discuss those developments.

You noted the Chatham House Rule. I will say one thing because people always call it rules, but there's one Chatham House Rule. I'm very happy to say Chatham House rules, but then it's a verb. If we keep it to the noun, the Chatham House Rule was founded in 1927 as a way of trying to give that element of confidence to diplomats to feel they could speak frankly. But most importantly, the Chatham House Rule is not a rule of secrecy. It's a rule of openness. It's the idea that you must get that information out, share it with people. Otherwise, in a way, you will not have the informed citizenry upon which democracies, as we've heard throughout today, are based.

I said originally it was an idea of an Anglo-American institution reflecting our close bonds and the imminent handover of world leadership from the British Empire to the rising American power. It was a lovely idea. Things got in the way. We were in different paths of... we had the pond between us. I suspect funding had something to do with it as well, but we won't go into the funding bit. But it certainly led to the foundation of Chatham House in 1920, and the Council on Foreign Relations, our sister institute, was founded in 1921. David Rubenstein will be leading that celebration next year.

Now, this is all about the founding, and that's fine, but to what purpose? And I've been asking my colleagues at Chatham House, centennials are a moment to think about purpose. And I would say very quickly... I'm keeping an eye on time here... that our sense of purpose, actually, has not been one. It has evolved. Democracy has moved in and out of that sense of purpose. I do not think you could claim that, in the 1920s, the founders of Chatham House were thinking much specifically about democracy. They were British imperialists as the Americans were patriotic internationalists, maybe Wilsonian internationalists. Ours were Imperial internationalists. They realized that British national interests were better protected and Anglo-American leadership might be better protected in a rules-based order with open markets.

That rules-based word, or that phrase, it's become a little clunky now, was absolutely the root value of the founding of Chatham House. Lionel Curtis, the British academic who helped found it, said that our goal must be to replace the rule of force with the rule of law, a powerful statement which he repeated in 1939. Therefore, we, CFR, some of the others were involved in designing the League of Nations. That didn't work out. We returned to the drawing board in the 1940s to work with diplomats and others to design the UN system, which did work.

That took us to the second phase. This is where democracy did come in, because in the second phase, the democracies that had survived the Second World War had to band together to protect themselves against the communist threat. Studies on nuclear deterrence, the alliance, Soviet studies, regional energy all built up. That success, which led to the end of the Cold War, and we thought the victory of democracy, led to the third phase of the purpose of a place like Chatham House, which was really to focus on the benefits of globalization. Having won the Cold War, democracy was almost taken as a given, taken for granted.

We looked more at issues of how you regulate relationships between states that are integrating, the future of the European Union, financial regulation, how to deal with the spillovers of globalization, the impacts of climate change, of the spread of pandemics, global organized crime. Great. But where are we today? I will do a mea culpa, I think, on behalf of all think tanks. We did not focus enough on the risks to democracy, and to the way that globalization in aggregate may have been a positive force and is a positive force. But if you don't look at the disaggregated effects amongst different communities, you can lose the license to be able to pursue it.

Today, we're dealing with the backlash, the backlash against globalization, much of the West, the changing geopolitical dynamics driven by the spread of wealth, power, and technology. I'd say today, therefore, our role is to help build a sustainably secure, prosperous, and just world. Sustainable growth is not just about the environment, as important that is. It's about being politically sustainable. Security, sustainable security cannot be built on the back of other people's insecurity.

A world that returns to might is right is one whose governance systems I do not believe will be able to survive. For Chatham House, therefore, we've got to think what is the connection between international stability and domestic stability? I would say that, today, those systems of government that treat citizens as the people who lead them, and where citizens are not the

servants of governments or servants of the state, are likely to be the most survivable and the most powerful over time.

In the near term, as we're seeing with authoritarian governments, there is the capacity for them to do well economically. Over time, I think our history over 100 years is that you're building up instability, which can later on either explode or affect us all in any particular way. We are proud to be committed in our analysis, in our recommendations, in our debate, on the effective separation of powers, on the primacy of the rule of law, on having independent, effective civil societies, including the media. And the protection of the rights of individuals and minorities.

None of our systems is perfect. We're having to work on ours right now. And as you know, we're going through a bit of a workout in the UK. In particular, you've got your own workout going on in the United States, I would say. Madeline Albright said at Chatham House back in 2013, "Democracy is not an event, it's a process." We certainly look forward to being part of the process of working with all of you to make sure that the United Kingdom and the U.S., who were born really out of the same impetus, which is democracy, we've each helped each other protect. We've got to make sure that that relationship is not torn apart in this period of instability, but that we're in a position to work together for the next phase of this democratic experiment.

So, thank you very much. I look forward to being able to engage in conversation about the challenges that we'll face on the U.S., UK side after dinner. But thanks again for the invitation. I look forward to participating further. Thank you.

**A Conversation on Collaboration: The Role of the United States and United Kingdom in Promoting Democracy**  
**The Honorable Andrew H. Card, Jr., Chairman of the National Endowment for Democracy; United States Secretary of Transportation (1992–1993); White House Chief of Staff (2001–2006)**  
**The Honorable Robert M. Gates, Chancellor of William & Mary; United States Secretary of Defense (2006–2011)**  
**Dr. Robin C. H. Niblett CMG, Director of Chatham House, the Royal Institute of International Affairs**

The Honorable M. Kirkland Cox:

For the past two days, we've been focusing on the beginning of representative government in America 400 years ago and on the prognosis for democracy's future. It cannot have escaped anyone's notice that this seminal event came about because of the imagination and creativity of our friends across the pond, who had the wisdom to introduce the democratic ideals of the mother country into the fledgling colony here in Virginia for four centuries. Since then, the United Kingdom and the United States have been collaborating on representative democracy, spreading it, improving it, extending it as promised to everyone, and defending it from threats at home and abroad.

As Her Majesty the Queen said when she addressed the General Assembly in 2007, it has been one of the most successful and significant international collaborations in human history. Here to discuss that collaboration between the US, the UK, and the other free nations that are our allies are three people about whom it is no exaggeration to say they devoted their entire lives to defending, preserving, and advancing our democratic ideals.

Of course, they have already been ably introduced today, but let me present them again. Former Secretary of Defense and current Chancellor of William & Mary, Robert Gates. From the United Kingdom, the Director of Chatham House, the Royal Institute of International Affairs, Dr. Robin Niblett. And former Secretary and current National Endowment for Democracy chair, Andrew Card.

Dr. Robin C. H. Niblett CMG:  
I'll sit here.

The Honorable M. Kirkland Cox:  
So, gentlemen, the floor is yours.

The Honorable Andrew H. Card, Jr.:  
I've been asked to try to get this group talking, and the truth is, they have some wonderful things to say. My goal is to make them say as much as they can. I'm going to start with-

The Honorable Robert M. Gates:  
I've told Andy, if we can do this in 30 minutes, everybody in the audience will appreciate us.

Dr. Robin C. H. Niblett CMG:  
They'll desire to leave.

The Honorable Andrew H. Card, Jr.:  
The truth about democracy is it's not easy to get, it's hard to maintain, and there's never an end. So, it's a journey. Democracy is always a journey. I'm going to start with Bob Gates, who had a remarkable, remarkable career of witnessing what our democracy was doing to challenge the exact opposite of a democracy during the Cold War. And watched the culmination of our efforts to plant seeds in places that were praying for democracy and how that realized. So, Bob, just run through a quick litany of your career and what you saw.

Dr. Robin C. H. Niblett CMG:  
In 30 minutes.

The Honorable Robert M. Gates:  
I was telling Andy, I joined CIA in 1966 out of graduate school, the Russian East European Institute at Indiana University, to do my bit against the Soviet Union. I never dreamed that in my lifetime we would see the end of that Cold War and the collapse of the Soviet Union.

I often get asked, "So, who was your favorite president to work for?" And I say, "Well, it's pretty easy because it was the first president, Bush." Because it had amazing closure for me in that, having joined CIA in '66, to be in the White House and spending several hours a day with the president as we managed the liberation of Eastern Europe, the reunification of Germany, the collapse of the Soviet Union, victory in the Cold War. I became Director of Central Intelligence six weeks before the collapse of the Soviet Union. Now, talk about closure.

But it was amazing to see in 1991, '92, all of a sudden, 300 million people, as I mentioned earlier, coming into freedom, having the opportunity to have freedom and democracy. I think the only other thing I would say to Andy's point is, there was a lot of hubris at the end of the Cold War, and we all know about the book, the *End of History*, and the victory of liberal democracy and so on. The truth is, a realist, which I am, would always say no, it's never done. The struggle against- the forces of authoritarianism are far older and far deeper in human history than the forces of democracy.

So, the struggle for democracy, everywhere, including here, is always going to be a struggle. And only if we recognize that it's always going to be a fight to preserve liberty, and human dignity, and democracy are we fully prepared to defend it. I'm afraid that in the 1990s, we became incredibly complacent thinking one and done. Soviet Union's gone, the Nazis are gone, we have won this thing. But that's not the way the world actually works.

And so, I think if there's one lesson from the last two days for me, it is that the struggle for liberty and democracy, representative democracy, founded in Jamestown 400 years ago, will always be a continuing struggle. And the second we let down our guard, the forces of authoritarianism will surge.

The Honorable Andrew H. Card, Jr.:

Well, you were also the Secretary of Defense at a time when we were trying to help build democracies in pretty tough places because we had disrupted governments. What lessons did you learn as we were trying to help build a democracy in Afghanistan or in Iraq?

The Honorable Robert M. Gates:

Well, in all honesty, Andy, I would say that I think we overreached. I think that we did not sufficiently appreciate that real democracy, that enduring democracy depends on institutions, and those institutions have to grow up inside of a country. And the people of that country have to be willing to sign on to it. I think that actually at the end of the day, we have ended up with a democracy, however flawed, in Iraq. The price has been incredibly high. We don't know how long it will last, but the truth is, in all of the Middle East today, Iraq is the only democracy, however flawed. That's something.

The question is, what price are you prepared to pay? My view is that you can't impose democracy at the point of a gun. One of my favorite quotes is... In 1944 and late 1944, Winston Churchill was being pressured to impose a democratic government in Greece, and get rid of the authoritarian government that was actually an ally. And Churchill's comment was that democracy is not a trollop to be picked up in the street at the point of a Tommy gun. And so, I

think we need to understand that we can help people build a democracy. We can help people create a representative democracy, but at the end of the day, they've got to want it for themselves, and they've got to be willing to pay the sacrifice to get it, like we did in this country.

So, I think that... It's like I said in one panel today, I can't... I'm losing track. But we have to encourage and support, in every way we can, people seeking liberty and democracy. But we also have to recognize that it can't be imposed by force, but we still have to be seen as their friend and their supporter, their ally. Like I say, at a very high cost, Iraq has a flawed democracy, but it beats the hell out of almost any other government in the Middle East at this point. So, everything's relative in that sense.

We'll see what happens in Afghanistan. I'm very worried that we'll do a deal that gets us out but that sacrifices the actual gains that have actually been made. Afghanistan is terribly flawed. It's hard to say Afghanistan is a democracy. But the truth is, today in Afghanistan, there's a relatively free press. They have an elected government, women are in government, millions of girls are going to school. I would hate like hell to see a peace agreement that sends them all back under the tent.

The Honorable Andrew H. Card, Jr.:  
Robin, that's a good segue to the role of NGOs because-

The Honorable Robert M. Gates:  
One thing I got to tell you, because I'm working on this book, National Endowment for Democracy, you are Vladimir Putin's worst enemy.

The Honorable Andrew H. Card, Jr.:  
Right.

Dr. Robin C. H. Niblett CMG:  
Badge of honor.

The Honorable Robert M. Gates:  
We know that. Putin believes that the Color Revolutions in 2004, 2005 in Ukraine, Georgia, and Kyrgyzstan were all the work of NED and like-minded organizations from the West, all of whom are, of course, bought and paid for by CIA, in his view. Not true. But these authoritarians see the National Endowment for Democracy and other NGOs as their terrible enemy, and they think they're a function of the US government. What they can't wrap their heads around is that they're simply enabling the people of their own countries.

The Honorable Andrew H. Card, Jr.:  
Well, President Xi in China, just in the last 24 hours, the Chinese government with that went after the National Endowment for Democracy, claiming that we were manipulating what has been happening in Hong Kong for the last several weeks. So, the target is a little bit bigger today than it was yesterday. Robin, part of your work, like NED's work, is to encourage, foster, invite,

support, and motivate NGOs to reach beyond the boundary of your country to help spread democracy.

Dr. Robin C. H. Niblett CMG:

It's difficult these days. I think we've got to be honest, as I think Secretary Gates was just now, that it is a much more difficult environment in which to have that conversation. Even in the time I've been director of Chatham House, the kinds of conversations I'm able to have with counterparts in China, in other think tanks, the kind of conversation one might have on a panel, even the conversation one might have in a restaurant with somebody, if there's two rather than one person, has changed. Whether it's in the Gulf or in Russia, quite a few NGOs that drift onto the political side, some of the survey organizations like Gallup, some of the quasi political think tanks, like the Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung of Germany, have found themselves heavily in the crosshairs of governments, the Russian government amongst others, who feel that they can bring pressure to bear.

And what they're doing, in a way, is developing parallel institutions almost to ours that dress themselves up as think tanks or dress themselves up as institutions but are not based on the same sets of values. So, I think we need to recognize that the space has been so difficult for governments to step forward and make that change, even in the NGO space. Governments have learned the lesson, authoritarian governments, those that are autocratic, those who want to keep the spoils to themselves.

And as you were saying, that is the system that we've been ruled under for thousands and thousands of years. It has been, in essence, government by mafia. It's people who extort the population and offer them protection. That is almost a natural way of things. So, to go the other way is complex. What I would say is you need partnerships. NGOs can only go so far. How you team up between NGOs, government agencies... I think in the UK, the way the Department for International Development, DFID, teams up with NGOs in parts of Africa to drive administrative change rather than political change.

Back to the point of institutions, if you don't have a certain level of economic opportunity, the scope for democracy to take real root or to emerge organically from inside the country is incredibly difficult. I was saying to somebody before this dinner, how can you have democratic government if you're not paying tax? If you're not paying tax, who are you voting for? You're voting for your tribe. You're voting for the person who put a dollar in your pocket or whatever the currency might be. You're doing it because you've been threatened. Without a certain level of economic development, it's incredible to get through. Now, a certain level of economic development does not guarantee democracy, obviously, but you need to be able to have that first level.

So, I think, thinking about how we can act as this bridge to support elements of economic development, elements of administrative efficiency... Corruption is the tool of autocrats. This is the danger, of course, with sanctioning autocrats is they're the best at using sanctions to their own advantage as we've seen many, many times in the past.

So, the role for think tanks, I almost feel we are protesting more from the outside today than we were before. It's harder to be inside. I'd say one of our most important roles right now is to defend what we've got. You were mentioning Hungary, you were mentioning Poland, some of the dialogue that takes place even in the UK, in our own countries.

I used the phrase earlier that even this institute now, we have to say what we believe, what we stand for.

If I were to say that as a director of Chatham House 10 years ago, oh, no. Chatham House doesn't take positions. You analyze, you describe, you help others make decisions. Now, we as an institute are having to say we're standing on the side of certain principles, like I described my remarks earlier. That is a very different world from before.

I'd just say two other things. I think that the corruption angle is a really important one to take. You know when you expose corruption in today's world of social media... Remember the Chinese officials with the photographs of the big watches, and those watches were shown? Suddenly, they disappeared, and it caused real problems for the Xi government, though he's turned it to his advantage.

There's an institution called Transparency International, UK-based, doing incredible work exposing some of the corruption taking place in countries around the world. I think our main role is to defend what we've got, shine the light of transparency if we can, each in our own way, into these countries, give the populations there the tools to be able to create their own democracy. As Bob said, you cannot impose this through the barrel of a gun, not even at the end of a pen.

The Honorable Andrew H. Card, Jr.:

Well, the National Endowment for Democracy, we are not boots on the ground. We are not boots on the ground. We identify people within institutions around the world. Many of them are experts that help to find ways to reinforce an effort to have an independent press, to understand that engagement of people makes a difference, having the courage to show up, even to show up for a meeting. So, the boots on the ground that NED uses in a more formal way, or the International Republican Institute, the National Democratic Institute, those are parties to our official parties.

The International Republican Institute is very closely aligned with the Republican Party. The National Democratic Institute is very closely aligned with the Democratic Party. They help with boots on the ground, especially creating a climate for elections, monitoring elections, and establishing a process by which parties can grow in other countries.

The same thing goes with labor unions, the National Endowment for Democracy has a core relationship with solidarity, the AFL-CIO in the United States, in a solidarity movement. They participate with us, and President Reagan put them in the NED organization. As does the Chamber of Commerce, which has an organization that helps to create a climate for private entrepreneurship around the world because economic freedom frequently leads to democracy and political freedom. So, there are many boots on the ground, and most of them we hope are

indigenous to the places where we're going because that's the way for democracy to spread. How do you identify needs and marry them with solutions?

Dr. Robin C. H. Niblett CMG:

I think that you have to take the need somewhat as it's given to you rather than creating it, if I can say that. I remember giving a talk recently... I did a trip to Moscow, don't often go. Not very welcome. This was post-Skripal, I might add as well that I went. The trip had been planned before. But I did end up speaking at a think tank, and I talked a lot about China to them as a kind of parallel conversation, if you see what I'm saying, about... And maybe this is something we might want to talk about at some point because I...

I'm sorry, I'll step back for a second. One of the things that worries me most about our capacity to do our job and to promote democracy, good governance, accountable, representative government around the world is the fear that there may be a division between Europe and America and that we may get divided in our objectives over this process.

If we're not standing together in our own democracies or promoting them, that is a deep concern. When I talked to them about China... And I'll say this point now, it might bring Bob out on it. The point I made is, to me, I feel there's a difference between China and Russia. At the moment, I find... Even on the way over here, and I was reading a bit on the way here and even listening to the news when I'm here, we can put China and Russia in the same basket. But I'll stick myself out here. There's no point having a dinner conversation without getting a little crunchy, as they call it.

My sense is that Russia is... most clearly as a European, we see them interfering, trying to undermine democracy across Europe, not only in central Eastern Europe, but in the UK, in France, in Italy. Take your pick. They would like to bring down our system of government. No shadow of a doubt. China is different from a European perspective. I'm not talking about what they're doing back in China. A spade is a spade, you've got concentration camps, you've got Uyghurs being brutally treated. We can go through the list. We know exact... they're ruthless, ruthless inside their own country. So, when we're trying to identify partners, I'm still trying to think, are there partners in China for Chatham House or not?

The Honorable Andrew H. Card, Jr.:

I have no idea.

Dr. Robin C. H. Niblett CMG:

In Russia, we don't bother. To put it frankly, we don't bother because they can't... there's no point going there. You can have a conversation about climate change and about resource management with Chinese counterparts that's responding to a need, to your question, that they have that is a common interest with us where, and I'll use the phrase, there could be a win-win outcome on climate. That is probably worth pursuing.

And China is systemic enough in its impact that if China does something different in this resource management, it has a global impact that will make a difference. Russia is all about

lose-lose. They don't mind losing as long as others are losing as well, and preferably a bit more. China, of course, is big enough to think it can win and win twice, if you see what I'm saying. So, when you see about the need, I'm wondering, is there still a need in China that we can play with, or do we have to abandon it?

When I come to America, I find myself asking this question, where are we compared to our American counterparts? Can we still have that same conversation? Because if we get divided on this, it's going to be a complicated world.

The Honorable Andrew H. Card, Jr.:

One of the challenges as you help to spread democracy is not to try not to carry the bias of your own democracy. That's something that the United States decided we were going to have our own version of democracy, very different than the democracy in the UK. The UK adjusted to what we had to the point that we probably have the best relationships with the UK, but our democracies are very different. We have to recognize as we help to spread democracy that other entities may choose to have systems that are a little bit different. But there are core responsibilities in a democracy. I think they all come from our Bill of Rights.

Obviously, we have to make sure that there is a media that can be a check to what is happening in government and expose corruption and report the truth. The people have to be empowered to be able to select their leaders, and know that they have selected leaders, and the leaders should be responsible to the people. The money is not to be stolen. They're supposed to comply with the rules. That's something that we try to teach around the world and empower government to do.

Bob, you watched as the Soviet Union was trying to spread its form of government. They are not as focused on spreading their form of government now as they are undermining other governments, democracies. But the Chinese, I think, are looking to spread a system. How do you compare that to what you saw during the Cold War?

The Honorable Robert M. Gates:

I think that the Soviet Union probably had its greatest appeal in the West in the 1930s during the Depression when it appeared that the capitalist system had completely collapsed. There was a certain appeal when they were our allies in World War II. In the total devastation of Western Europe after the end of World War II, that was their moment of maximum opportunity in places like Italy and France. And that was beat back.

Then, their next opportunity was really in the developing world as colonial countries became independent, and the Soviet Union was the champion of anti-colonialism. As most of those countries moved from colonial status to dictatorship. Those dictators loved the Soviet Union because the Soviet Union enabled them. It didn't matter whether it was Nasser in Egypt or a variety of people in Africa and various other places. But I think by the late '70s, the ideological appeal of the Soviet Union was dying. Once Ronald Reagan came into office, and once Soviet leaders kept dying one after another, the appeal of the Soviet Union really collapsed entirely. So, the Soviet Union, by the time it collapsed, really had no appeal anywhere.

What Xi's China offers, and he's now offering it as a model for other countries, is effectively as it been described elsewhere today, authoritarian capitalism. And he can point to bringing hundreds of millions of people out of poverty and into the middle-class. He can point to China's extraordinary infrastructure and all the achievements that they have had.

So, it's not so much an ideology as an alternative to liberal democracy, of saying, this market capitalism within a framework of liberal democracy actually doesn't work. The entire Western economy nearly collapsed in 2008. Western governments can't get anything done. They're completely self-destructive. They're paralyzed. When they're not paralyzed, they're destroying themselves, a.k.a. Brexit. And here's a way for developing countries, in particular, but also other countries to say, "Here's a way you can develop your economy, have political stability and move forward." But it's still the same old paradigm. It's the people working on behalf of the state rather than the state working on behalf of the people.

Listening up here tonight, the only thing that just gets under my skin is the inadequacy of our fighting back against this paradigm. Of going back... It kind of goes back to the last panel... of going back at these systems and saying they are based on lies. They are based on corruption. They are based on the elite governing everything. So, my concern is that...

And again, I go back to what I was saying this afternoon. We have President Xi pushing a very aggressive alternative to liberal democratic regulated market economies. We're not defending ourselves. We're basically just saying, "Well, whatever. We don't stand for anything. We just want a better deal. We'll have a better trade deal, or a better this, or a better that." But we're not pushing back in terms of saying, "Actually, in terms of your people, what we're doing actually works best. We have our lapses, and we've had some lapses, but at the end of the day, we can do this better."

So, I think, Andy, the answer to your question is that there is this alternative model that's being put forward. It has a great deal more appeal, particularly in the developing world, but I would also say in places like Eastern Europe, than Soviet Communism ever had. It's a more dangerous threat to democracy than the Soviet Union ever was because the Chinese are a hell of a lot smarter. They're hell of a lot richer. And if we don't figure out a way to counter that theme that they're portraying around the world...

I was talking earlier about how they're buying up communication systems and media in Africa, and the Middle East, and elsewhere to propagate this notion, including in this country with Confucius Institutes and things like that. We need to get our act together. These guys are serious, and they're a hell of a lot bigger threat, in my view, ideologically, than the Soviet Union ever was. And we're still wandering around in the wilderness.

The Honorable Andrew H. Card, Jr.:

That is a clarion call. But Bob Gates also did follow through on his promise. He said the word Brexit. So, tell us what's going to happen and when.

Dr. Robin C. H. Niblett CMG:

What's going to happen? Oh, my Lord. No one knows what's going to happen. Boris Johnson, our new prime minister, doesn't know what's going to happen. He definitely doesn't know what's going to happen.

The Honorable Andrew H. Card, Jr.:

He says he does.

Dr. Robin C. H. Niblett CMG:

He knows that he's going to wait, he says, for the EU to come back to him.

The Honorable Robert M. Gates:

A long wait.

Dr. Robin C. H. Niblett CMG:

Exactly. The EU 27 don't like populism because they feel if they give in to one populist, they'll have to give in to other populists. And they see in Boris Johnson an opportunist populist, which is worse than a real populist, if you see what I mean. Nigel Farage is a real populist. But it could be argued that Boris Johnson has used the populism to get himself successfully into the prime minister seat. We'll see what he does with it. He might do good stuff with it, who knows?

But in terms of Brexit itself, the UK is in a countdown to the 31st of October. I was saying to our table a minute ago, if no one does anything, the UK leaves. It's not that somehow something has to get passed. The UK would have to ask for an extension of what's called the Article 50 process in order to extend it beyond October 31st. Otherwise, the UK is out. Unless Parliament goes, "Hold on a minute, hold on a minute. We don't agree with this." Boris Johnson has got a two-seat majority with the [Northern] Irish on his side. There will be a by-election this Thursday, which will probably be lost. It'll be down to a one-seat majority.

That's a pretty precarious thing to try to push such a radical change for the UK through the door with a divided country and a divided party. So, I think he is girding his loins, and that's a Boris Johnson phrase, for a general election. And he may try to bring that in early and say, "EU 27 wouldn't give me what I want; Parliament is going to try and block it. I need a mandate. I'd like a no-deal Brexit." He's brought in this guy called Dominic Cummings, the master of the dark arts that Benedict Cumberbatch played the role of on a British TV show called *The Uncivil War*. There's no dark arts masters in this room, I know, not even in any direction here. But in any case, he has got this guy, Dominic Cummings, backing him.

He reckons he can take on Nigel Farage, and maybe take him out. I think that's a slightly optimistic take. You could end up with a hung Parliament. The long and the short of it is, we don't know where it's going to go. Literally we're going to be hogging the space of Britain's capacity. And if I can just be serious for a second, background, not that Brexit isn't serious. But the capacity for the UK to have a credible foreign policy on anything right now is so difficult because we are so obsessed with the psychodrama that is Brexit. Some ways you've got quiet parts of government getting on with things and doing good business, hopefully not within the sight lines of government.

But Brexit is... Britain was a reluctant country going in. It went into the EU almost by accident in 1973 with a firm referendum in '75. And it has now found itself presented with a question. As somebody from France said to me, "I can't believe you got 48% of vote to remain." Britain's always felt itself an unnatural member in the EU. So, being able to bet on where we'll come out of this latest thing is almost impossible. I'm not going to get into too much detail. I wrote a thing about it on the Chatham House website. You can see my answer on there if you want to see where I think he's going to go in the next few months.

The Honorable Robert M. Gates:

So, let me just say, first of all, I think from the standpoint of the United States, I think it's really important for Britain to remain in the EU because of the special relationship between the US and the UK. It exercises an influence in terms of the policymaking decisions of the EU, with respect to foreign policy issues of importance to the United States. But that said... And I referred to the difficulty earlier this afternoon of getting presidents to meet with the head of the EU Commission and so on.

And the truth is, and it goes back to the discussion that we had about populism, the truth is, the EU is essentially an elitist operation in Europe. A lot of Europeans resent the EU, including in France. And where the EU has been brought... or some aspect of the EU has been brought to a vote in places like Denmark and others, it has lost. It is a project of the elites, and the EU bureaucracy in Brussels is so intrusive and so affects every part of European life that there is an enormous amount of resentment toward it. It's one of the reasons that very few governments in Europe, including the French, are willing to bring the EU to a popular vote because they're scared to death of what the outcome would be.

So, this is one of these examples that I was trying to cite this afternoon, in terms of talking about populism, of elitist projects that have ignored the consequences for people further down the food chain economically and that has created enormous resentment. It boiled over in the UK, but it's near the boiling point in a lot of places in Europe, in Greece, and in Spain, and Italy, and even in France. And the EU, in my humble opinion, would be well-advised to have a therapy session and figure out how the hell do we actually get the people of Europe to embrace this? And what form would it take to get them to embrace this broader union of European states?

It was a reaction against the nationalism that brought about World War II. It started with reconciliation between France and Germany, and that was all to the good. But the European Union, in many ways, is the worst of both worlds. It's an economic union without a political union. Brexit is really the most dramatic manifestation of it right now. But I will tell you, in my opinion, and we're out of time, but I think under the surface, there's a lot of resentment in Europe. It's on the mainland about the EU. And these guys ought to be paying attention.

Dr. Robin C. H. Niblett CMG:

I'll let Bob have a last word, but just two comments quickly. My anger about where we are in Europe is directed principally at the governments and all of the... The EU, like the UN, in many ways, is a tool of the governments. And what most European governments have done is they've

been unwilling to take the tough choices that they had to take in their countries to fix their countries through this process of globalization. Fixing schools, nothing to do with the EU. Fixing major infrastructure, not really to do with the EU. R&D spending, not to do with the EU.

What they've done is then focused all of their frustrations, used the EU almost as a proxy, enabled... government after government, including the British governments, conservative and labor have not... The EU is an enabler of capacity rather than an answer. It controls 1% of EU GDP to 45% roughly of GDP controlled by national governments, pensions, labor laws. I could go on.

And so, what makes me angry about the situation is that, including for the UK, a tool that could have been a multiplier has ended up being part of the problem of this loss of institutions. My one other comment just about Brexit, to finish on this point... Because, Bob, you said it'd be better for the UK to remain in the EU, and I share 100% your rational. It'd be better for the UK, better for the transatlantic relationship, better for the EU, better for the West in the time of democracy. But to get it right now, you'd probably have to have Jeremy Corbyn as prime minister. And I'm not sure that would be too good for the UK-US relationship. He's not that keen on the EU either, for that matter.

I'll throw out maybe a Panglossian, a sort of overly optimistic note, which would be to say that if either Boris Johnson or whomever is able to navigate a way for the UK out that does entail an agreement with the EU, in terms of British democracy, those British politicians will no longer be able to hide from their responsibility for their decisions. And what I think the British public have felt is this loss in a democracy, that somehow their politicians have stopped being responsible. They will have to reacquire a sense of agency and a sense of purpose, which will then make Britain, even if it's a bit poorer, feel and be a bit more democratic. And in the end, our relationship with the EU may be better outside than it was inside. That'd be my optimistic note.

The Honorable Robert M. Gates:  
I'm an intelligence officer, I can't end on an optimistic note.

Dr. Robin C. H. Niblett CMG:  
I tried. I tried to do my best.

The Honorable Robert M. Gates:  
But a hard Brexit-

Dr. Robin C. H. Niblett CMG:  
Oh, yeah, that's what I said.

The Honorable Robert M. Gates:  
... may also mean no Great Britain.

Dr. Robin C. H. Niblett CMG:  
Yeah. I said, if we had a deal. I agree, hard Brexit, Boris Johnson might be the last one.

The Honorable Robert M. Gates:  
Scotland, Northern Ireland.

Dr. Robin C. H. Niblett CMG:  
Yeah, exactly. We'd have England back to England.

The Honorable Robert M. Gates:  
The good old days.

The Honorable Andrew H. Card, Jr.:  
Democracy is hard work, and we're seeing what hard work means. It's messy. It doesn't always go the way you plan, but governments closest to the people govern best, and the EU has been removed from the people. But I think it's critically important for us to celebrate our democracy, which brought us together today, by polishing it. Because the world is watching the United States of America in particular, and we should be careful how we participate in our democracy, so that we will be an invitation for others to participate in their democracy. With that, I say thank you very much. Thank you, Bob. Thank you, Robin.

Dr. Robin C. H. Niblett CMG:  
Thank you.

The Honorable Andrew H. Card, Jr.:  
Thanks, all of you.

**The Most Powerful Perch: A View from the White House**  
**Ann Compton, ABC News' White House Correspondent, (1973–2014)**  
**Melody C. Barnes, Director of the White House Domestic Policy Council (2009–2012)**  
**Karl C. Rove, Senior Advisor to President George W. Bush (2000–2007); Deputy Chief of Staff to President George W. Bush (2004–2007)**

Ann Compton:  
Good morning.

Group:  
Good morning.

Ann Compton:  
I want to introduce to you Melody Barnes whom I covered during the Obama administration, head of domestic policy there and is now at the University of Virginia setting up a remarkable democracy initiative. And she is also a professor of practice.

And Karl Rove, who I have covered for 20, 30 years. And he's not only Bush's brain and the White House former Deputy Chief of Staff and Senior Advisor to the President. But he's an

accomplished historian as well and has just published a biography of William McKinley and how pivotal that moment in history was.

And I'm Ann Compton. I covered seven presidents. Did any of you ever watch that popular TV show called *West Wing*? Okay. I loved it. Watched it all the time. Do you know how wrong it was? I'd watch it in absolute amazement. There is the president Jeff Bartlett. And there are these dynamic young people working for him. And they would carry heavy conversations through these busy bustling hallways of the West Wing. And they would argue and they... it's nothing like that in the West Wing. It is quiet. It's almost a sanctuary with pale walls and organic curtains and a hushed kind of reverence as you walk through the halls. And the one thing that *West Wing* got absolutely right, is that every president and every presidential staff, every day has five or six important issues, balls in the air.

And this is the White House, you can't let any of them hit the ground. You can't go home at six o'clock say, "I'll deal with that tomorrow." And that sense of always being on your toes and dealing with major, sometimes conflicting issues, *West Wing* got absolutely right.

We're going to talk about democracy this morning. And I want to start by asking each of these panelists how democracy looks from inside that sanctuary of democracy. We, the last couple of days, had panels talking about the legislative, about the more raucous moments in our history. But there's a very special point of view that these two can bring to us. Let me start. Actually, I guess I will start with Karl talking about his experience inside the West Wing, where the president that you arrived with had been a governor with a Democratic legislature. And George Bush came, at least for the first nine months of the administration, trying to deal with a Congress which was not always friendly. Karl.

Karl C. Rove:

Well, first of all, thanks for having me. And thanks, Ann for superintending this. I was listening to the music that was playing as we were all eating. And I get Martina McBride's "Independence Day": "Let freedom ring. Let the white dove sing. Let the whole world know that today is a day of reckoning. Let the weak be strong. Let the right be wrong. Roll the stone away. Let the guilty pay. It's independence day." I get it. It's sort of related to what we're talking about. But would somebody please explain to me Antebellum, "It's a quarter after one. I'm a little drunk and I need you now. Said I wouldn't call but I lost all control and I need you now."

Melody C. Barnes:

Oh Karl. I didn't know.

Karl C. Rove:

Well, I don't drink. I'm sorry, that wasn't me. Must have been you. What does democracy look like from inside the White House? Way too much of it. There's so much that comes flowing over the transom that it really is difficult for any president. I mean, the volume of things that a president is forced to either decide or decide not to decide and let somebody else make the decision, the volume is enormous, which is why every one of these people ages when they're in office.

I was at the White House for seven years, Melanie was there for four. We were longer than most, the average tenure of a senior White House aide is about 18 months. And we at least get to leave, they don't get to. And so every president ages. When I went there, I had hair, and it wasn't gray. We came to the White House after a little bit of a tumultuous period in Florida and with a little acrimony. But Bush was used to dealing with, as you say, a Democrat legislature in Texas.

And he understood the personal relationships mattered a lot. It was something that he'd known before he became governor of Texas, but that really was driven home. We have a very powerful lieutenant governor. The lieutenant governor of Texas is constitutionally more powerful than the governor. No bill can be brought up in the floor of the Senate without the personal agreement of the lieutenant governor. He appoints all the committees, all the committee chairs. He controls the calendar. And we had a rather rambunctious, historic figure named Bob Bullock as Lieutenant Governor. And we had a Democratic Speaker of the House, a cotton farmer from Plainview, Texas, who had been there for about 20 years as a Member and had been Speaker for about eight.

So in comes Bush, and Bob Bullock and Pete Laney don't know what to make him. Particularly Bullock, he's a little concerned he's got a country club Republican. So Bush asked all three of them to meet for breakfast every week. We have a 140 days legislative session every two years. So we've got a lot to get done in a very short period of time.

So they had a meeting, and Bush said, "Why don't you come to the Governor's Mansion, and we'll have breakfast." And they had breakfast, and the first decision of this group of three was that Bullock and Laney said, "The food is too healthy here. You're going to come to our apartment in the capital." Each one of them has an apartment in our capital. "And we're going to eat there because your cook is too healthy. Too goddamn healthy," as Bullock said. So they began to then meet every week at either the Speaker or the Lieutenant Governor's apartment. And Bush is rather a very healthy guy, so he would walk every day from the Governor's office at the Capitol to the Governor's Mansion a block away.

And the press figured this out so they ambushed him. They'd stand outside the Governor's office, outside the Capitol on his pathway and just ambush him. So, there's an issue being discussed among the three men, they come to an agreement about how to resolve it. The word got out that they had resolved this issue, and so the press bushwhacked Bush and said, "What'd you guys decide?" Bush said, "We've agreed to do X."

Well, Bullock was furious. He said to himself, "Am I dealing with another press hungry governor? Am I dealing with somebody who's interested in the headline?" And he let it be known that he was going to blank Bush on an important piece of legislation that Bush was pushing, regarding medical liability caps. Rather than having a \$500,000 cap on paid and separated, it would be like a million and a half. And Bush heard about it. And Bullock was a rather pungent individual, so you can imagine how he expressed what he was going to do to Bush on this issue.

So the next time they met in the Lieutenant Governor's apartment, Bush walked in, walked over to Bullock, and kissed him full on the lips. "What the hell you're doing?" Bush said, "Well, if you're going to blank me at least you got to kiss me first." And then he apologized. He said, "I understand I offended you. I didn't mean to. I get it. You don't want us talking about what we're doing here. Lesson learned. I won't do it again." And Bullock, highly partisan Democrat, that was the moment he began to fall in love.

Melody C. Barnes:  
The kisser.

Karl C. Rove:

Yeah. More than just a kiss. When Bush ran for re-election four years later, Bob Bullock, lifelong Democrat, endorsed Bush for re-election despite the fact that his opponent's son was Bob Bullock's grandson, godson excuse me. And when Bullock was dying in 1999, he summoned his wife and said to her shortly before he passed, "I want you to promise me that you will go to the Republican National Convention, and in my name endorse George Bush." Which she did. So Bush came with an expectation of being able to work across party lines. And it was hard, particularly after Florida, but Bush's attitude was, "We've got to do it." First person he called, some of you who may have heard it yesterday. First member of Congress he called was George Miller, ranking Democrat on Education and Labor, because he wanted to make No Child Left Behind his number one legislative priority. First member of the Senate that he called was Ted Kennedy. Pissed Trent Lott off mightily, but Bush said, "I need to send a signal that I'm going to operate in a bipartisan way."

And we attempted to do that, real hard when a war intervenes, but Bush was really emphatic about it. After 9/11, we went out to Chicago, when they were going to start flying again. American and United were coming back into the air. We went out there, and it was as you can imagine, a pretty emotional day because everybody, that community of people who've worked for the airlines, knows everybody. And everybody in that crowd knew somebody on one of those four flights that went down. So really emotional. And Bush heard that Gephardt was coming to the event. So he said, "Invite the Leader, Democratic House Leader to ride back to Washington on the plane with me." Remember, the Democrats are in the minority, Republicans are in the majority. Democrats now have control, because of the defection of Jim Jeffords, they have control of the Senate. But it's a Republican majority in the House.

On the way back, we're sitting in the front cabin, and the President says, "Dick, we got a problem. Our economy is in free fall. We're losing a million jobs. We lost 1 million jobs in 90 days after 9/11." But he said, "We've got to do something to stimulate the economy." Gephardt said, "I agree." Bush said, "Here's what I want to propose." And laid out four steps. Number one was a cut in the corporate tax rate. And Gephardt said, "Mr. President, I can agree with three of what you got on there, but I can't get the votes among Democrats for the corporate tax cut. And why don't you try expensing and depreciation instead."

So when we got back to the White House, Bush called up Larry Lindsey, the head of the National Economic Council, and said, "I want you to swap out number one, the corporate tax

rate, and put in what the Democrats are talking about on expensing the depreciation." Lindsay was totally against it and said, "Mr. President, this is the best thing we can do. Everybody understands exactly what happens when you cut the corporate tax rate. Corporations immediately know what's going to follow. The bottom line, it's going to have much bigger economic bang, than expensing and depreciation, accelerated expensing and depreciation." Bush said, "I get that, but I want you to do that."

So we put forward a package. Passes in Congress. I'm watching the vote. We get the votes obviously in the House because we got a bunch of Republicans supporting us and a handful of Democrats, but among them is not Dick Gephardt. So I'm a little pissed off. So I walk in the Oval, the president says, "How's the vote?" I said, "Here's what we won. But God dammit," I didn't swear in the Oval. I said, "Dick Gephardt voted no." And I was a little irritated.

And Bush laughed at me said, "Are you so naive, as to think he was ever going to vote for it?" I said, "Yeah. Yeah. I mean, in the cabin on Air Force One, you did exactly what he wanted you to do." He said, "He was never going to vote for it. But he knows we paid attention to him." And it was a great lesson to me. Because I was used to the transactional politics of Texas, where the Democrats said, "We're at the table," and the partisanship is lower. And as a result, "When we're at the table, and we write it, we can vote for it." But in Washington, the reality is, partisanship is much higher. And a president has to be willing to build a patient relationship based upon, "I'm going to listen to you. We're going to do some of what you want us to do. You're going to have a seat at the table. And at the end of the day, I'm not going to get irritated if you don't go along with what you told me to do." Because at the end of the day, a president is there for four years or eight years, and those moments will come and go.

Ann Compton:

Democracy for you. Now Melody, when you arrived eight years later, there was also a crisis. The economy had jetted off the edge of the cliff. And Barack Obama suddenly found himself owning a couple of car companies, car manufacturers, trying to stop the hemorrhaging of jobs. And he had that priority of healthcare, the health care reform, which took another year to get done. Did he ever get a Republican vote in favor of healthcare reform? How did he negotiate and navigate those months?

Melody C. Barnes:

Sure. Well, first of all, it's wonderful to be here with you all this morning. And I do have to say this, when you reference *West Wing*, I remember, and I don't know if it was like this when you all went into the White House... You get tapped by the president for these different jobs. And everyone knows what the Secretary of State does, or the Secretary of the Treasury. But when you call home and you say, "Oh, I'm going to be the Director of Legislative Affairs or the Head of the Domestic Policy Council, as my parents said, 'Oh, honey, we're so proud of you. What is that?'" And what we did, and I talked to several colleagues, was that we use *West Wing* characters to explain to our friends and family what our jobs were. So *West Wing* does in fact-

Ann Compton:

So you were Josh Lyman or you were-?

Melody C. Barnes:

Right. It's like, "Oh yeah I'm..." Somebody's like "I'm CJ." And family is like, "Oh, yeah, yeah. Okay, got it."

Karl C. Rove:

I was that anxious guy on *Veep*.

Melody C. Barnes:

I still watch *Veep* and get the shivers. It's like, "Oh, yeah, I've had an experience like that."

Ann Compton:

So life does imitate art.

Melody C. Barnes:

Absolutely. Absolutely. And so much of what Karl was talking about in terms of the magnitude and the incoming of the office. You frame this up in terms of our initial few months, and I can tell you...

One, just putting this in context, as challenging as it was for us, as it was for you all, for the presidents who followed, I often start out just thinking about what this meant for George Washington. And literally reading the papers and understanding the back and forth he was having with Adams and with others, because he was quite literally making this up as he went along. "Do I ride into town on a big white horse to show that I'm in charge? How do I show foreign dignitaries that the United States has to be taken seriously?"

So we've gone from George Washington making it up, and thank God, making it up in a smart, thoughtful way. The evolution of the presidency, to when we walked into office and actually even before we walked into office, I think back, reflecting on your question, to that period of the transition...

Ann Compton:

We were in Chicago.

Melody C. Barnes:

We were in Chicago. The President-elect was still there for a while. And I remember a particular briefing, when he flew into Chicago, for an all-day meeting with him to talk about his priorities. The economy and also our thinking around healthcare at that time. And Christina Romer, who was head of the Council of Economic Advisers, was to lead the briefing. And she started out and she looked at him, and she said, "Mr. President, this is oh your blank moment." And she then told a chilling story, and understand, this is an economist whose background was the Great Depression. And she painted a picture of what we were walking into. And the fact that we were working very closely with the George W. Bush White House. And that partnership, that it was really a referendum on what the peaceful transfer of power ought to look like, for the good of the

country. So painting that, and the president looked at us, and he said, "Bring me the difficult problems. Bring me the big challenges. We are not going to back away with them."

And that's the attitude and the spirit that he took into the construction of the Recovery Act. We did much of it during the transition because we knew when we walked in the door that we were going to have to have something that we could pass, given the state of the economy and what you described, losing 800,000 jobs every month. To his priority, based on what we heard when we were moving through the country during the campaign, to pass health care.

And so even though the battle for votes wasn't there, or the ability to win votes ultimately on the other side of the aisle wasn't there, the president was still committed to trying. Now he got called naive. He was made fun of. But he still held true to this idea that he had to try. And in many ways, and I don't know if you all remember the cartoon of Pepe Le Pew, the very amorous skunk. There are times I felt like we were Pepe Le Pew. And we were kind of looking for votes and looking for ways to try and move Republicans on our side of the aisle, even including ideas that we thought would be appealing to them, because in fact, they had been generated in conservative quarters, including the Heritage Foundation.

And that didn't work. But it didn't dissuade the president from the idea that he had to try, to try and build a bipartisan referendum for what he was doing. And in fact, we, even though that story is notoriously known, the fact that we weren't able to get those votes, that we had to use reconciliation to do it, that we preserved the ability to use the authority of reconciliation to not only pass that but to pass a higher education reform bill at the same time, we still were able to move other pieces of legislation through with bipartisan support, including the Edward M. Kennedy Serve America Act. We moved child health. There are a whole list of other issues that we were able to move with bipartisan support.

It took some time before he recognized that this just wasn't going to work. But I think his faith and his belief that as leader of the entire country he had to try remained throughout his presidency.

Ann Compton:

Both of you served with presidents who often resorted to executive orders. Because and we see it still today, when a president can't count on getting something through Congress, he has a democratic tool, executive orders, that many people don't think hold the same authority because they don't represent a bipartisan agreement or two branches of government. Do you think that the executive orders are still a good, positive way and supporting the idea that democracy does give a president this kind of control? And does give him the authority? And it's a legitimate way to move, if you want to get something done and you cannot get a recalcitrant Congress or a divided Congress to get on board? Melody?

Melody C. Barnes:

Well, I think it's legitimate if we're using that in the context of legal. But at the same time it represents, and I think for us, it represented a frustration with the dysfunction of Congress and the inability to work across the aisle. And we can certainly talk about that and why we think that

is the case today. Why, when political scientists look at where we are, they say that we have the greatest levels of dysfunction and lack of overlap across the parties since the 1800s. And after trying, trying, trying, our White House decided that we had to move forward. That there were national crises and issues that needed to be addressed. And where the President had the authority in legislation that we were going to use it.

Would I argue and do I think he would argue that that was the optimal way to do it? No, I mean, in some ways, very practically, because executive orders can be overturned. They don't have the force of legislation or the longevity of legislation in that way. It's harder to do that legislatively, though certainly you can. But at a certain point, it was believed that it was a necessity.

Ann Compton:

Karl, is there a little sign on the desk? I mean, if the president has "The buck stops here." Or what was the Reagan one, "There's no limit to what you can achieve if you don't care who gets the credit?" Are there almost even virtual little signs at every desk saying, "Democracy starts here"? Is it front focus?

Karl C. Rove:

Before I address it, let me go back to the previous thing and make one point. I think sometimes one of the more difficult things to do for a president is to make certain that his legislative allies don't complicate the idea of working across party lines.

For example, I thought it was a very damaging to President Obama's goal of bipartisanship when Harry... there was a working group. Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee is Max Baucus, Democrat in Montana, ranking member Republican is Mike Enzi of Wyoming. Baucus announces that he's going to start holding work sessions among the members of the Finance Committee to discuss, that he and Enzi are going to lead this effort, to have work sessions to discuss healthcare reform. And this was clearly the attempt by the chairman of the principle committee to say, "Let's have some bipartisanship. I'm going to get the Republicans and Democrats together. We're going to talk this thing through." And Harry Reid announced that the Senate would not be bound by any of the discussions or agreements of the members of the Senate Finance Committee. Bang. Dead.

We had the problem on the creation of the Department of Homeland Security. We had a close ally of the president in the Senate, Kay Bailey Hutchison of Texas. Not only his senator, but a close personal friend, who was insisting, rightly that the TSA... that airports be given the chance to do what the Israelis do, and that is, outsource it to private companies. And the Democrats were insisting, led by Lieberman, close ally of the president on many issues, that in each and every instance, it had to be a federal workforce. And we're about ready to lose it in the Senate. Things were getting clogged up and so the President had to call Kay and say, "Kay, I'm with you. I understand it, but we can't get it done that way. Get out of the way." So we ended up having a bill with a major provision that we did not want to have, creating a gigantic new federal workforce and tying the hands of local authorities. But nonetheless, it got the job done. So occasionally a president has to intrude into this process and say, "My goal is bipartisanship."

Now, as to your question on, look, this question of executive orders. Let's be honest, a lot of the executive orders that presidents issue are the result of the abdication of Congress. Because Congress writes legislation saying, "It's up to the president to decide." So a bunch of what presidents do with executive orders is a requirement of, "We're going to say that we want to sort of move in this direction, but it's up to you to decide." And this is particularly true in things that are in health and human services, for example, where the authority is given to either to the secretary to promulgate rules or to the president. And this is particularly true also in foreign affairs, where the president is given under the Constitution wide latitude.

But I think the first consideration of every president has got to be when they write that executive order, what does the Department of Justice and what does the White House Counsel's Office say about the legislative authority from which this executive order is being derived? On what basis? On what foundation does it stand?

Because if you look back over history, executive orders that are promulgated with a solid foundation in law tend to be respected by presidents even of the other party who succeed them. What happens mostly is, and far more rarely than we think, executive orders come in and are put in place and then removed by the next administration because they view them as not being based in law. Generally there's a policy to discriminate. You wanted to do it A, we want to do it B. But in each instance, we believe the president has the authority to do that.

So if you don't like executive orders, my advice is make certain that Congress does a better job of legislating. Because outside of foreign affairs, outside of international affairs, that's where most of this authority comes from. Their abdication of it, saying we... and sometimes it's right. "It's the executive branch, it's up to you to decide how to execute it. We've given you the general direction. We've given you the goal, and we're going to let you determine how to get there." But a lot of the time, it's just simply, we don't want to describe.

Ann Compton:

Do any of you tweet? Or follow? Yeah, we know you do. And Bill Antholis and some... Twitter didn't exist during the *West Wing* years on television. The only career I've ever had is as a journalist. And it was the Bush administration, the George Bush administration was first time that the White House actually even used email to send out materials and communications.

The Obama administration, they gave him a Blackberry when he got into office, not an iPhone. I don't even think they existed yet. And the President did tweet. And he did have his own little newscast on Friday mornings on [whitehouse.gov](http://whitehouse.gov), the government website, that was a behind-the-scenes video by his own personal videographer who tracks the president. All week long, they put together a little newscast every morning. I think as a reporter, I would argue that the biggest challenge to democracy is how media now cover presidents of the United States.

Do either of you fear that the direction which cable talk news and Twitter and the internet, the availability of comfort zones on the internet or comfort zones for news on cable television is a real threat to democracy? Melody?

Melody C. Barnes:

In a word yes. And I think we have to have a nuanced conversation about this.

Ann Compton:

Is that possible?

Melody C. Barnes:

My answer is yes. I'm deeply concerned. We also know that mass media, social media has allowed engagement in ways and a democratization in ways that didn't exist before. At the same time, I think what concerns many of us and certainly concerns me - it's an issue that we are considering in the democracy initiative that I'm co-directing at the University of Virginia - is the way that media is now helping to fracture deliberation, undermine deliberation and the thoughtfulness that needs to be a part of the democratic experiment.

If we are consenting to be governed, if we need an educated citizenry, to propel our democracy, to fuel our democracy, then what's happening right now on many of these platforms is doing quite the opposite. And the question though, well the challenge and the problem, is that the toothpaste can't get stuffed back in the tube. That the genie is out of the bottle in many ways on this, so we have to confront the challenge and consider whether or not there are new and different kinds of platforms. And there are people who are experimenting with these issues.

The person who will be leading some of the research on this at the University of Virginia is also considering and thinking about these issues. Are there new ways and new platforms that help to increase deliberation, as opposed to undermining deliberation? I also know that this is a great frustration to the media, I mean, your friends and colleagues and peers, because it means that a president, and we certainly did it, a president is able to go around the normal channels of media, as opposed to going through the Walter Cronkite to propel their message. They can go around normal forms of media to speak directly to the American people. That also means that what we hoped existed in the fourth estate in terms of the fact checking, the asking the tough questions, probing and pushing to try and put information in front of citizens so that they are able to consume and make smart decisions, that also gets challenged as well. I mean, I could go on but I will also turn to you to speak to some of this, and we can continue the conversation.

Karl C. Rove:

Well, I'm not certain I've got an answer for it. We have these disruptive moments where new technology changes the way that we cover news and how we absorb information. And it takes sometimes a while for government to adjust to that. We had a rash of newspapers starting in the 1870s. We've had the telegraph, which nationalizes news, starting in 1844. But it takes till 1897 for us to really have the first White House press secretary. And we really don't have a White House press office until Taft. So it takes a while for the institutions of government and certainly the presidency to adjust to these new things. And this is the most dangerous of all, because in every other previous change in the media, the form of media, radio, TV, wide distribution of mass newspapers, instantaneous news through the telegraph, there's always been an editor. There's always been somebody charged with sort of saying, "Let's get this right." And now we have democratize the news to such a way that there's no editor.

I mentioned yesterday, some of you may have been there, I mentioned my friend Polly Sal. She's 94 and sends out weird emails. Well, last night I got an email from her. I'm on her list. She has about 300 pals, and the email says this, "The Trump Drain the Swamp legislation is being blocked in Congress. Here are the seven provisions of it. Members of Congress, their pay gets cut if they don't do this, and blah, blah and blah, blah and blah, blah. And this has been opposed in Congress, and we must get everyone to write their member and immediately demand that this legislation be brought up and supported." Well, the bill doesn't exist. Trump never proposed it. Nobody's ever introduced it. There's no piece of... the HR 555 has not been introduced by Louie Gohmert of TX-01. Nobody... This doesn't exist!

Melody C. Barnes:

So no one's also opposing it.

Karl C. Rove:

Yeah. So nobody is opposing it. So I emailed her and say, "Polly, there's no such bill. President Trump has never recommended this. Nobody has ever introduced this." And she literally says, "Oh, okay. I'll let everyone know." I've got 650,000 Twitter followers. Who the hell are these people? When are they going to get a life?

Ann Compton:

They are not people.

Karl C. Rove:

They're not all people. That's right. So how we adapt to this is beyond me, because there is no editor. We are now required as citizens to do things that we ought to be doing in terms of being skeptical and being reasoned and restraining our instantaneous judgments and trying to figure out what the real truth is. And we've sort of gotten lazy.

But let's also be clear, part of the reason that people are using these new means of communications with such veracity and such velocity is because the trust in the regular media has declined. You look at the secular period from 1970s to today, and virtually every institution in our society has lost the confidence of the American people. With the exception of two, law enforcement and the military. And you cannot build a democracy if those are the only two institutions that are trusted. Supreme Court is more trusted than most other parts of government. But even that has hit the lowest point it's ever been.

Melody C. Barnes:

Religious institutions are facing the same challenge. I mean, I think to also build on the point that you're making and your friend Polly. There are conversations that people are having because of the media with which they engage that represent people living literally almost on different planets. And there are nights that my husband and I will go from channel to channel just to see, not only how something is being covered, but if it's being covered at all. And then we'll do the same thing and scroll through different radio channels, which is fascinating and frightening. And you understand many of the ways that wedges are being driven, the narratives that people are

articulating, and really critically importantly, the fact that it is hard to have a debate about an issue if A, some people don't even know an issue exists, or B, there is no way to convey facts to people and data and information. [Moynihan] famously said, "You can have your own opinion, you can't have your own facts." We are operating in different stratospheres on many of the issues that are critical to our country today.

Karl C. Rove:

Yeah. I'm not as worried about that as much because it has always been thus at big times.

Melody C. Barnes:

Yeah. I think it's far, far worse. But we can disagree.

Karl C. Rove:

Yeah. Look, it has been worse before. I mean, I mentioned the Gilded Age yesterday. I didn't tell you about the debate on the floor of the House that prompted the five and a half month period during which no bill is passed in the House of Representatives. You know what the Congress was voting on in this period in 1889? By this point, it's 1890. They've not passed a bill in two and a half months through the Congress because the Democrats refused to answer the roll call.

And on one day in January of 1890, the Speaker of the House Thomas Brackett Reed decides I've had enough of this. So on a routine measure in the Gilded Age, if you were in the majority in the Congress, in the House of Representatives, and there was a member of the minority who had been re-elected by a small number of votes, you phoned up an election challenger and kicked him out. This happened every session in the U.S. House of Representatives from 1872 until 1896.

So in the particular day of January 1890, Republicans are going to kick out a West Virginia Democrat who won re-election by 50 votes. And so Reed tells the sergeant at arms that after the vote is called and someone calls for a roll call, they are to take up arms and lock arms in front of the doors to the exit in the House of Representatives chamber. Unbeknownst to the sergeant at arms, he has a second group of men who will, upon that signal, will barricade the doors of the House of Representatives from the outside. So the vote on the expulsion of the Democrats is held, the Republicans prevail. A Democrat says, "There's no quorum. I call for a roll call." They call the roll call. No Democrat answers the roll call; they do not have a quorum to conduct business. And Reed, six foot three inches tall, 300 pounds, looks like a bowling pin with a walrus mustache, directs the clerk to show Mr. Jones present, Mr. Smith present. Calls out the name of every Democrat on the floor of the House.

All hell breaks loose. Every Democrat runs for the doors. One of them gets out. Constantine August of Rust County, Texas beats the crap out of the sergeant at arms and uses his cowboy boots to kick out the slats in the door and makes good his escape. One Democrat stands up and screams at Reed, "Under God and the Constitution, you have no right to count me present without my permission." To which Reed calmly replies, "The chair is merely stating the fact as the honorable gentleman from Kentucky denies he's present upon the floor of the House."

For two and a half more months, they battle it up in the Supreme Court, all the way up to the Supreme Court on whether or not he had the right to do that.

But to give you the tone of the times, the debate begins the next day. Guy stands up. William Henry Martin of Athens, Texas. Six foot six inches tall, thin as a rail, mean as a snake, fought the entire Civil War with the Hood's Brigade. He points a bony finger at Reed, turns to his fellow Democrats, and says, "If any member will order me to remove this dictator from his position of power upon the podium, I will do so by force forthwith." Reed says, "The honorable gentleman from Texas is out of order," and moves on. Martin is so pissed off that the next day, he shows up on the floor of the House of Representatives, takes a seat in front of the podium on the well of the floor, takes out his 16 inch long bowie knife, and spends the entire day methodically sharpening it on his boot sole in an attempt to menace the Speaker of the House.

Now correct me if I'm wrong, but I do not remember Nancy Pelosi doing that with her stilettos in 2011. So we've been here. Now the question is, how the heck do we get out of here? But we have been here and worse before.

Melody C. Barnes:

All that being said, and also understanding the history, understanding that we are not at the brink of or in the middle of civil war, at least not yet, I think the challenge that faces us today, given the kind of technology and media we have today, is that it takes it to scale. And it does it much more quickly. So, and in particular, as we're talking about representative democracy, we're talking about democratic values and ideals, which for me also include the liberal - small L, not ideological - philosophical liberalism, of tolerance and pluralism and rule of law, that our ability to take to scale, not only across the country, but around the world, misinformation and what is infecting and spreading so quickly across our country and in the world today is what concerns me about media. And the type of media that's being used.

Karl C. Rove:

Look, I share your concern. I'm just trying to strike a note of optimism. Because look, these men-

Melody C. Barnes:

I wake up optimistic.

Karl C. Rove:

These men just didn't have the disagreements normal to political parties that have fervent beliefs. These people are still fighting the Civil War 20 years later, and we were going...

And the Democrats had control of the House, when they had it during the Gilded Age, only because they were systematically wiping out the black Republican vote in the south on a scale that is hard for us to grasp. There are three states in the South in 1896 that have, in which a majority of the eligible voters, men over the age of 21 are black: South Carolina, Mississippi, and Louisiana. And the best, the best that McKinley can do in any of those three states is 22% of the vote in Louisiana. 60% of the eligible voters in Mississippi are black men. And he gets 7% of the vote. Think about that. Think about, we talked about voter suppression today. Hey, they

knew how to suppress back then. They did it by killing people and driving them away from the polls. And yet somehow or another, our country found a way to move forward.

And I'm with you, we have huge challenges with this new way that information flows around. We need leaders who are going to say, "Okay, for a moment, let me put away the partisanship and find a way to do something about it." I hope to God that this administration is doing something to plan for the attempts, not only by the Russians, but the Chinese and the North Koreans and non-state actors, to be involved in our elections next year, because they've already tried. And having tried, they're going to try again.

Ann Compton:

And that leads me to the last issue I want to talk in our few minutes left here. The most important audience for a president when it comes to defending democracy are those audiences across the oceans, overseas. Melody, the first stop Barack Obama made when he became president, first foreign stop was Cairo. And I sat in the orchestra pit of this big orchestra hub as he delivered his big speech to the Muslim world. And then he went on to Saudi Arabia. How did Barack Obama, I know you were domestic policy, but you were part of the senior team there. How did President Obama view his role in pushing that notion of democracy in the best possible way overseas?

Melody C. Barnes:

Well, these are my words. People often think about democracy as inevitable. And democracy is far from inevitable. I mean, there is the, whether true or not, the old Ben Franklin... "A republic, madam, if you can keep it" If you can keep it.

Democracy is not just not inevitable, it is actually unlikely. It is hard. It has to be fought for relentlessly and in a dogged matter every day and everywhere. And I believe that the president, President Obama, particularly because of the popularity that he had, because of the way many across the globe saw him and in that regard also saw America, and the historic sense of America as a beacon of hope and as an exemplar of these democratic principles, that it was important to take that message to the rest of the globe. To share those values with the rest of the globe, and to be a representative of those values here at home. And that is challenging, and there are places and there are, certainly we see it, Russia, China, other parts of the world, where those values are not held in esteem.

What is it Putin recently said, "The liberal democratic idea is dead"? And in those places, it is important, because we have to still work with them, to show why democracy is critical. The effectiveness, the importance, the vibrancy of democracy. And in those places where democracy is nascent, or among our democratic partners around the world, it is important to also to continue to show the strength of democracy and work in partnership.

And in doing so, what we see are the benefits, not only for us in the United States of America, but also in the rest of the world. The ability of the leader in America to bring coalitions together, to fight for difficult things, things that really are existential threats to us at home and to the rest of the world. So he saw that as being critical. And there he also did it, and there was much work that happened that followed behind that, with regard to issues of religious tolerance. And

working in partnership with religious minorities here at home, but those also who may be in majority, but religious groups around the world.

Ann Compton:

Karl, I remember a private conversation I had with President Bush up in the residence. I believe it was 2006. He, of course, had met Vladimir Putin early in his administration and looked in his eyes and saw his soul. But on that day, a cold, rainy March day in 2006, he turned to me and says, "Putin as a democrat is gone." He saw that very quickly. How did he deal?

Karl C. Rove:

Well, he wanted to have a good relationship, and Putin came in as sort of a pseudo-democrat. But by 2004 and '05, when the Color Revolutions began to break out, Putin changed. I think Putin the KGB agent became scared. And remember, this is a period where... how we act in our personal lives, how leaders act in their personal lives, is often a reflection of what's going on and what will happen in policy. Well remember, 2004, '05 and '06, Putin dumps his wife of 20 some odd years, takes up with the 23 year old gymnast, and starts allowing pictures to be shown of him shirtless, fishing and shooting and being out. And he changed dramatically.

And in a way, it was just the opposite of the brash, bare-chested, Siberian hunter. He became worried about a country that was in collapse, and he changed. And he went from being a proto-democrat, small D democrat into being a big T Tyrant.

But Bush tried to keep up the personal relationship because sometimes personal relationships matter. And it turned out that it mattered a lot in 2008, when the Russians began to move on Georgia, not the state, but the country. And there were two breakaway regions. And Putin was sending "little green men" in in order to create great problems.

And Condi confronted Lavrov, the foreign minister, in Geneva, and Condi had this amazing ability to just peel Lavrov like a grape and get him to just spill his guts. And he did. He said, "We're going to Tbilisi, and we're removing Saakashvili," the president of Georgia, "and there's nothing you can do about it."

So the next day, the administration ordered naval assets into the Black Sea. And shortly thereafter, Bush calls up Mikheil Saakashvili and says, "Mikheil, you've been a great ally in Iraq. But now's the time to bring your troops home." They had a brigade of very tough Georgian fighters who had been U.S. trained, U.S. equipped. They were mean little buggers. And Bush said, "You need to bring them home. And we'll provide the air assets to bring them home."

And then he called up Putin. "Vladimir, how's it going in Moscow? October starting to get a little cold? Hey, I just want to let you know you're going to be picking up some big blips on your radar scope, coming up from the south. That's going to be U.S. C-130s. We are rotating out the Georgian Iraqi brigade. That's 800 tough fighters, U.S. equipped, U.S trained. And we're going to be sending them home on our airplane. So don't worry about it. Just wanted to let you know." And you can just imagine sphincter tightening in Moscow, and he hangs up the phone and says,

"Oh shit. We're not going to be facing the police department. We're going to be facing tough troops. And what the hell else is Bush putting on those C-130s besides the Georgian fighters?"

And Bush knew it. Bush knew that the way to get to Vladimir was to be Cool Hand Luke and just talk to him.

But that's what we have to live with in the world. A president, through public statements and private actions, has to be constantly trying to advance democracy. Maybe it's not easy.

But Bush was telling the president of Egypt, "You better let a serious contender run against you for the presidency, and you better allow free elections for your Congress. Otherwise, this energy is going to build up, and you're not going to be able to hand this off to your son as you want, because the energy will be so much you'll be overthrown." And he got a little bit of movement, but not enough. And, sure enough, what happened. But the President of the United States has got to be an advocate for our values and our views. And not only in their public statements, President Obama's Cairo speech, Bush's Whitehall speech in London, but also more importantly in their private actions, because that's where... the personal relationships they build up, is where... I thought it was weird, but the personal relationships matter almost as much as the public statements.

Ann Compton:

I wish we could go for another hour. There is so much more territory to cover, but ladies and gentlemen, please thank this exceptional team of... and thank you so much.

### **Democracy's Next 400: The Path Forward**

**The Honorable Ryan T. McDougle, Virginia State Senator**

**Dr. Robin Niblett, Director of Chatham House, the Royal Institute of International Affairs**

**The Honorable Abigail Spanberger, United States Representative from Virginia**

**Dr. William J. Antholis, Director & CEO of the Miller Center of Public Affairs, University of Virginia**

The Honorable Ryan T. McDougle:

Good morning, how are y'all doing today? Thank you for being with us as we move into our last panel. I think it's appropriate that we're ending having the conversation not about where we've been, but where we're going. When we look at our past, as we heard from our previous panel, there are a tremendous number of lessons about what has occurred. We tend to find ourselves in the moment of what is going on immediately around us. But when we look back, we oftentimes see that the struggles were greater than the ones that we face now, or at least they're not new struggles, they're ones that that people who have come before us has already encountered.

So as we go through this next panel, I'm excited to talk about not where we've been but where we are going. We have three great panelists. First we'll hear from Dr. Robin Niblett. He has had a longer trip than most of us. He is the director of Chatham House, the Royal Institute of

International Affairs in London. And he is, I think, the farthest traveler to be with us. So if you could welcome Dr. Niblett.

Next we have with us someone who's not traveled quite as far, but is equally important. The Honorable Abigail Spanberger. She is a member of the United States Congress from the 7th District and want to welcome her. Thank you for being with us. And the final member of our panel is William Antholis, the director and CEO of the Miller Center of Public Affairs at the University of Virginia.

Dr. William J. Antholis:  
Thank you.

The Honorable Ryan T. McDougle:

So I just mentioned we learn a lot about our past as we prepare for our future. As I've listened to the conversations over the last few days, one of the things that keeps being repeated is the fact that democracy is something that's not just present, it is a continual struggle and one we have to continue to fight for. And it is interesting that regardless of the ideological perspectives of the individuals that have presented today or the conversations we've gone through, that seems to be a pattern: that democracy is a never ending assignment. My seven year old would not like that very much knowing that it never ends, but it is something that we continue to struggle for and fight for.

So as we've dealt with a lot of key issues over the last few days, the balancing of majority and minority rights, how to make the rule of law work, how to rise above and work around partisanship and policymaking, how to promote civic engagement and foster a culture of citizenship, how to address the global and geopolitical threats from adversaries to democracy, and how we ensure that political and economic fights flourish together. We've had those conversations, and we want to talk about the fact of how we'll continue to have those conversations moving forward.

All politics is local, and democracy oftentimes is local. I had that experience just last night. I've been on the road for a few days, and my seven year old, Reagan, was very unhappy that I was going to spend another night and morning away from her. And she advocated quite profusely for her position of why she thought I should not be here today or last night. And for seven, she is very voracious in her advocacy. But as that passed, then as she knew I was coming, she went on to the next issue. So we tend to focus on our political fights, our thoughts about democracy in the immediacy, certainly social media and how our receiving of information has made that more prevalent.

But I want to talk about whether the principles that underlie... we get tossed and turned in those waves that are immediately crashing upon us, but we really need to have that focus on what those principles of democracy are and how we apply those principles going forward to make sure that we're moving in the right direction.

So to make sure I don't get it incorrect, I'm going to read a quote from George Mason in his Declaration of Rights that, "No free government or blessings of liberty can be preserved to any people, but by a firm adherence to justice, moderation, temperance, frugality and virtue by frequent recurrence to fundamental principles." So as we look ahead, if they have the ability to have a Nostradamus-type proclamation over the next 400 years, we'll all be welcome to receive it. But really we'll talk about the struggle to preserve democracy and what is going to happen over the next five, 10, 40 years as we go through that conversation.

So first Dr. Niblett, look forward for you to offer us some international perspectives from that view. And you had some interesting ones yesterday, and we look forward to your continued insights, particularly of the future of democracy in Britain or as you indicated maybe yesterday, England as it's going forward and Europe in a whole.

Congresswoman Spanberger, we're interested in your perspective as an officeholder in Congress, and the importance of democracy in the United States capital, and how legislatively that works going forward on a policymaking level nationally.

And Bill, we look forward to your perspectives from the academic arena at a university that is focused on political perspectives, particularly on many of our presidents historically, and how leaders are investigating democracy, and where it's come, and where we're going. So with that lineup, Dr. Niblett, we're going to let you jump right in and start off.

Dr. Robin C. H. Niblett CMG:

Well, thank you very much, and I'm delighted to be here today as well. Very much enjoyed the conversation yesterday. A great panel and pleasure to be with you and to share these concluding thoughts.

What to do, I think, is part of the idea of this last panel. Just a quick reminder on the international side of what we're doing something about. I just want to note a couple of things I didn't have a chance to touch on yesterday in terms of the context.

Number one, leaders of democracy are on the ropes at home. I'm not going to get into the US side. You've got a lot of people who are more qualified than I am to talk on that side. But as a European the rise of populism, the fear of immigration, the fear of continual austerity, we've got an aging population there. You're not in a position in Europe to be thinking about democracy promotion right now. You're trying to fight for it at home against a neighbor in Russia that pretty determined to undercut it.

Secondly, internationally, we have a democratic recession. More countries becoming less free, partially free, this lovely phrase that Freedom House has developed. Some flashes in the pan of democracy: Egypt, Burma gone the other way. Very few good examples, I'd throw in Malaysia, Ukraine hanging in there despite the odds in particular. But if we look at Turkey, Thailand, Philippines, as we worry about Mexico, it's not a great picture internationally.

And the third point, technology. Technology is changing so much as obviously it does. It's not just the impacts on economic dislocation, fears for a middle class, which tend to be the absolute root of democracy. And if a middle class feels insecure and technology is threatening their jobs, you're going to find that it makes it particularly difficult for politicians to push democracy.

But I wanted to throw in one angle from the international side, we haven't talked about at all, which is the tools technology gives to authoritarian governments, not just to control their own populations, but potentially others. How many of you know about the social credit system in China? A couple of hands going up. Obviously, this panel I think would know about it. There's a table over there, clearly well informed. But I came to America, lived here for 10, 15 years, a while ago in D.C - which isn't America, I understand that - but still I was here. And I tried to buy a mattress, and I put my credit card down, and I wanted to buy it over a lease thing, it turned out that I had no credit record. You know, I hadn't lived here long enough, and I had to get out cash and buy the thing.

China's taken the credit system to a whole new level whereby your credit worthiness is not just associated by what you do economically, whether you pay your debts and so on, but also about your contribution to societal harmony. I used to travel to Shanghai a lot, people crossing the road, crazy. Everyone all the time. Now you can go to Chinese cities and people wait by the light. Wait by the lights to change. Because if you're one of those people crossing the light when it's red, obviously facial recognition, you are picked up, that goes into your social credit score. Next thing you know maybe it's a little harder to get loans. Maybe it's a little harder to get a job promotion. You are suddenly marked, and what China's developing with this social credit system is a capacity for citizens to police themselves. And you police yourself politically. It is the antithesis of what democracy is, where people are able to drive the government. We discussed yesterday, citizens becoming servants of the state, run the other way around.

Enough of the context. Very quickly what to do. At home, economic renewal. I know it's easy for me to say as a non-elected official, but incredibly difficult to do. But how you get it done? I think it cannot be driven centrally, and America is a federal country. I will again let my American colleagues describe it.

If you look at a country like the UK and France, we are too centralized politically. One of the big problems we had with Brexit was large amounts of immigration that people didn't really expect. Those immigrants had good jobs, they paid taxes, they paid more in than they took out. But that money all went to London.

By the time it got distributed again, the money was not going to the schools, to the housing, to the hospitals and the communities where they moved in. Those people simply saw the pressure of immigration, not the other way. We need to decentralize more power to mayors, more power to local government.

Number one, we also need to, I think have a more liquid type of democracy where technology comes in. There's this phrase developed by a German party, the Pirate Party actually, called liquid democracy. People these days don't trust parties of right and left. In the UK we have a

Labor Party that's meant to represent labor against conservatives, which were the owners of business. Yeah. That doesn't work anymore. Owners of businesses are not the kind of people always simply thinking about how to reduce taxes and how to get the greatest opportunity.

You've got divisions now that have separated the parties across a lot of Europe in different spaces. How can we give citizens more of an opportunity to engage in political discourse as they go forward? Online petitions, online legislative scrutiny. Technology need not just be a negative for democracy. We've got a commission on democracy and technology at Chatham House, you can go look on our website, and there is stuff in there. Lots of good ideas being developed. Technology could be part of the answer, not just part of the problem.

I'm going to go on too long, so I'll just say a couple of quick things on the international side and stop. We can come back to it maybe later on. Open economies, open investment, and open trade, I think, support democratic development globally. You can contest me on this later on or not. We can discuss it. Let's go for that or keep what we've got. We may need to be careful about regulatory openness, which can make societies very uncertain, but trade openness, investment openness, I think we should be encouraging.

We need to prevent the enemies of democracy from using us to get stronger. So therefore we've got to have regulations. I would say to be careful about the types of investment that come in. Limit it if you need to. Do media screening. What of our laws on media and media ownership? We have the regulatory tools to manage the threats.

And the last point I would make is about the developing world, promoting democracy. Simply telling certain countries in Africa, telling certain countries in Southeast Asia that they should be democracies is not going to do it. What we can do is help administrative quality of government as well as wealth. It's policing, it's judiciary, it's tax collection. These areas would start to create a greater sense of confidence between citizens and government, can create the space for middle classes to then demand political change, and for governments to be confident enough perhaps to relinquish power. And here the role of NED, IRI, and others is essential. So let me stop there.

The Honorable Ryan T. McDougle:  
Thank you. Congresswoman Spanberger.

The Honorable Abigail A. Spanberger:  
Yes. Thank you very much for having me. Thank you to everyone in the audience. I appreciate the opportunity to participate. We're here because we've reached a 400 year mark for our country's founding and for the General Assembly. And 400 years ago, some of the first things that our General Assembly was talking about was the business of corn production and canoe theft. And when you think back on these things, they seem historic and rather quaint, but in fact, these were the business items that kept the country moving. These were the issues that, to some degree, really dealt with people's very ability to survive.

And so 400 years later, we are faced with different challenges. We are faced with the challenge of healthcare, with economic development, with infrastructure issues like broadband internet in

some of our communities in the 7th District. We are faced with a retiring population, challenges to Social Security, Medicare, individuals who want to move throughout their business and professional career, and what might their 401Ks or their retirement pensions look like.

These are the challenges that we're facing today, but they're not so dissimilar from the challenges back then because they're the challenges that impact people's ability to survive and to exist and to live here in our democracy. They're issues of survival. And in an ideal scenario, our federal system can and should be up to the task of recognizing what challenges are facing people throughout our communities and people throughout our countries and addressing those. But we continue to see challenges to our democratic system overall.

The day to day in Congress, despite what you may see on the news or on social media, God forbid, is that we are actually really working to try and address some of these issues. We are really working to understand what is the future of work? How do we strengthen and save Social Security and Medicare into the future? How do we address the challenges facing our rural communities versus our urban communities?

But so frequently the conversations become boiled down to a very binary, yes, no, this, that, this group against that group. And I think that that's one of the biggest challenges to our democracy is that, for individuals who want to engage in a larger conversation about what is important to this community to a localized extent, or what is important to our state, to our Commonwealth, it becomes very difficult, very easily, to go down these paths of very insular information and a lack of access to our democracy overall.

One of the things that I think is incredibly important and I'm committed to as a legislator is recognizing the need for individuals to be involved in their democracy. And so, on the campaign trail, I've heard so many people say, "Oh, what's the point? I just don't believe in my government. Nobody really listens. And you're going to get to Washington, and you're going to do what you want to do anyway. So what's the point?" And to me that is a heartbreaking warning sign. It's an alarm bell that we should all listen to, that people, when we knock on their doors, when we're going to their space, when we're trying to talk about political issues, people think, "What's the point?"

So I think it is so vitally important that we recognize that that is the first path, the first warning sign that we could be really at risk, that our democracy could be at risk. Because when people stop taking ownership over everything that is ours, our political system that is oh, uniquely and beautifully American, I think that's when we really get to a challenging place.

And so there are many legislators, some are new and some have been in Congress, speaking from the federal perspective, for a while, who are really truly committed to reengaging. And we can do it through town hall meetings, we can do it through easy access in a time of social media. We should be using those tools to reach out to people, to let people know what we're thinking and what we're working on.

And what I found fascinating at our town halls - we have 10 counties in the 7th District of Virginia, and we've done now eight countywide town halls in eight of those counties. And the ability of a community to come together in a big open space and ask questions of me, their legislator, and not just hold me accountable, but be able to hear what are the other things on people in the community's minds? In a district like ours, there's a lot of people in the room who voted for me, and a lot of people in the room that didn't vote for me. So you get a perspective of a lot of different pieces and points of view.

And I think that for our engagement, that was the real purpose of our original town halls in Colonial America was having people come together and having people debate and talk about things. And so when we're looking into the future, I think we have to look back to some of the places we've been in and some of our original communication methods to see what was the point of doing it that way. Part of it was that there was no Facebook, there was no television, but there is also an element that is very, very human.

So when we look at so much of the partisan divide, it is very easy to fight on Twitter. It is very easy to degrade a conversation when there's no face to face. It is far easier to find common ground and to look for bipartisanship and to look for places of agreement and frankly to better understand the places of disagreement when you can do it face to face or when you can do it in a place where you're allowed to use more than, what is it, 240 characters? So looking to the future of our democracy, part of, I think, the element is giving ownership back to the people, giving voice back to the people, engaging people of all ages and all backgrounds in our political discourse.

But there's also recognizing the external threats. I serve on the Foreign Affairs Committee; I'm a former CIA officer. I heard the last group talk a bit about the threat of foreign adversary nations such as the Russians who have and will continue to try and meddle in our elections either through hacking and theft or through disinformation campaigns. And this is a place where all Americans really should be united in our efforts to fight these challenges. This is no different than an attack military-style. This is an attack on the very foundation of who we are and what makes us strong at home and in the world.

And so from a legislative perspective and the federal side of things, we've put forth a number of bills. I'm involved in a task force focused on the threat of disinformation and how through the legislative process we can address that. But it is a much larger conversation that all community members really can be involved in to recognize it is a nonpartisan issue to protect our democracy, to stand up for our democracy. And the education of what did happen, not just in the United States, but in other countries where there's been disinformation efforts and attacks against democratic ideals and democratic values, to be able to learn from that, stand up against it and find this point of unity.

I think one of the other things that's been tremendously challenging, even looking at recent debates and looking at what's covered in the news, it's always about what we're against. It's always about what we're fighting against. And it is so infrequently what we're for. And I think that really if we are going to move into our next 400 years and find tremendous success and be a

country, the beacon in the world of prosperity and ingenuity, the America that everybody knows us to be, we have to continue to be for something. We have to continue to have that level of idealism and excitement that I think has, despite many of our ups and downs throughout our history has been a driving factor in the American dream and who we are as a nation.

The Honorable Ryan T. McDougle:  
Yeah. Thank you.

Dr. William J. Antholis:

Well, it's great to be here. It's truly an honor to be on stage with three really distinguished public servants and to be here in this place that captured my imagination for politics when I was Reagan's age. I remember the interminable drive in the back of the station wagon - we had station wagons back then - from New Jersey to Florida and we spent a week in Virginia from Williamsburg to Charlottesville. I am a wahoo; I went undergrad to UVA. I have spent half my life living in Charlottesville, and this was essential to capturing my imagination. And so it's great to be here.

I'm going to talk about what I've learned as essential to our democracy, both there, here, and elsewhere, and how I think we are at another crossroads in our country for our democracy. We've had them before, and in the last panel we heard Karl Rove talking about the Civil War, World War I, World War II, the Vietnam/Civil Rights era, and each of these other moments in our country.

We've had a confluence of, I think, at least three things hit a crisis. One is the role of individuals, how we think about individuals, how we think about citizenship, the rights of individuals, who get to be a citizen. Two is the body politic. What is the body politic? Who counts? Who are "we the people"? And then three, what is the role of the state? What is the role of our government as both a series of connected institutions, not one institution, but the brilliance of the founding was to reconsider government as distinct institutions that have to work collaboratively and then place them in the world.

In each of these moments in our history, we have been at this crossroads. So to guide us, I want to go to the great Yankee political philosopher, Yogi Berra, with four tweets that I think should guide the conversation. The first is, "It's tough to make predictions, especially about the future." It really is. We don't know what the crossroads moments are in the next 400 years. We have some big things today, and we should focus on them because a generation from now, they'll be different. Second is, "The future is not what it used to be." Karl used a phrase in the last panel that I use all the time. It's both the velocity and the variety of news and information that comes at us, and the speed with which we're addressing issues, is faster than it's ever been.

But then looking backwards, the third Yogi quote is "Deja vu all over again." We keep seeing historical patterns presented again and again and again, and we really should learn from the past. And then finally, and I really think about Congresswoman Spanberger on this, "When you come to a fork in the road, take it." She lives in and represents a swing district. And on any given issue, she is having to think about as a Democrat in a district that was held by the member of Congress

that beat Eric Cantor to his right. And increasingly as a country, I think we have to think in Spanberger terms. What does it mean to represent a potentially very divided district at a moment when we really have to come together?

So let me go through these three areas and just point to one or two issues just as headlines and then go to conversation. As individuals, who are we, what are the next essentially civil rights issues? And I think of two in particular.

One is, and they are so many, but I'll just flag two. One is education and particularly equality of opportunity. We will always have debates. We've had them in the past. We'll have them in the future about education for two things. One, to be a productive, economic, growing place. How do we educate workers and consumers? And we're both producers and consumers, and we need to be educated, but also secondly, how do we educate citizens for citizenship? I think that's going to be a critical issue for our democracy. I list it first, because I think it's the first.

Second is individuals' privacy. Robin mentioned in China the lack of privacy in individuals, but we're really close to it. I've got two daughters, 15 and 17. They have more followers on Instagram than I do. I have more followers on Twitter, but not by a lot, which means they are constantly showing themselves to everyone. And then there's the fact that they move around with their telephones, and someone can build a mosaic of what they have done on a given day. I wish I could. I can't, but somebody smarter than me can. And that gives me pause.

Two, who are we as a body politic? I think the thing that connects individuals to body politic is the media, is this technology. We have to understand how we communicate and build a common we. That common we breaks down from our family, our town, our state. Nationally, we are constantly reinventing who we are. And the media is a part of that conversation, and we need to pay attention to it carefully.

But then I think secondly, this has been the case since I was at the White House, thinking about how our body politic continues to be a democracy in a globally integrated era. We can't run away from that. I don't think building a higher wall is the way to do that, either a cyber wall or a physical wall. And yet we have to retain our identity as a people in a global era, and I think that's critical.

And then finally the state. I'll just point to one piece of our complicated institutions that I think is critical in the next two years. The functioning of our elections. We mentioned cyberattacks, but not the attacks within and the integrity within. We could very easily come to a situation where we have a winner of a popular vote and a winner of the electoral vote that is challenged by the opposing party on issues of fraud. The Supreme Court gets pulled into the decision. The Supreme Court may decide against the party, which it is currently a majority, and yet that party, either in Congress or in the other elected branch of government, refuses to leave office. We as a political system, I thought about James Madison on this stage last night standing right about where I'm sitting. And we think of him as the father of this incredibly beautiful document, the Constitution. There are weaknesses, there are glitches in our constitutional system, and the only

way that we maintain them is by guarding them vigilantly and together across party lines. And we have to start that planning now.

And then the other piece that I really worry about, and Karl and Melody talked a lot about this, is the breakdown in the executive legislature and how that works across party lines. Over 400 years, who knows how it develops? Over the next four years, I feel like we're close to a breaking point. I think Karl's right. It has been worse. People are not sharpening their knives on the bottom of their shoes or their stilettos, but sharpening a stiletto on a stiletto is something I want to see Nancy Pelosi do. But I do really worry about those sets of issues. And so with that, let's go to conversation.

The Honorable Ryan T. McDougle:

I think that's a perfect segue into the fact that we tend to focus these conversations about those things that are divisive, whether it be about Brexit, and what separates the UK currently from the rest of Europe, or politically in the political arena, what separates Republicans from Democrats or conservatives from liberals. My assistant this morning called and said we had a \$20 check from Congresswoman Spanberger's district. Somebody wrote a letter about how they were concerned about the political discourse. They had taken their child to a legislative meeting and were yelled at and called names by the other side, and they were concerned about that future.

So how do we take those divisive, very personal feelings that engage people in the system? So those are the things that get people active and come out and have conversations because they feel strongly about their issues. But internationally, internally, for democracy, how do we move those from being so divisive? In addition, the media tends to focus on those as opposed to the things that are bringing things together. I don't think that this panel, as intellectual and influential and insightful as you are, are going to get the same media coverage that one act at other events during this remembrance will have. So how do we break through that on the things that are binding us together to move forward as opposed to those that are divisive?

Dr. Robin C. H. Niblett CMG:

Right. You started by saying how do we overcome what divides us, and I'll play my role here. You said Brexit from Europe. I think the problem we have is, in Britain, we're divided over Brexit. So some want to be close to continental Europe, and some want to head off in a new Elizabethan kind of future for Britain. Ditto a continental Europe, some reject what Britain has done or what the referendum decided. Others think it was brilliant and why don't they get a shot at having their own vote? So we have a very divided... the problem with Europe is it's so divided internally, divided between, as you know, probably same here, urban and rural, between those who have more openness and are comfortable, I would say, in a globalized world and those who see it changing their societies, but each Member of Parliament has to deal with that divide constantly.

And what strikes me is we're probably going to have to go through some mid-stage to get to the other side because one way to fix the divide is to get people to unite around something. That worries me as a European. Well, nationalism. Nationalism rather than patriotism is, in our

experience in Europe, a dangerous thing. It's what, part of... We had a pretty messy 20th century around...

And that is where a lot of the uniting the country dialogue is going right now in Europe, whether it's in Hungary, whether it's in France, it's in the UK, you can take your pick. Parties are saying, "Hold on, there's an old identity that we need to hark back to that's going to help us unite and overcome those divisions and anyone who doesn't agree with this is not one of us because they're not national, not part of our identity."

That is very frightening to me. I think there is an alternative. It is a bit different, but it's about uniting around values. There is another, you often need another person to be able to identify yourself against. Fortunately, we do have them at the moment. I don't want to overplay them, but those who believe that, as I said before, citizens should be servants of the state, you can see in Russia, you can see in China, you can see many other authoritarian countries. We need to engage people around the freedom agenda that makes our society such incredible places to live in, even if we are divided. And I think you're going to see in Europe, if I can talk at least for Europe, is it's going to turn a bit in on itself to rediscover a shared set of identity around its values, hopefully not around nationalism.

And I think the UK, even if Brexit happens, it may not, even if it does, we'll still feel as part of that European identity of the rule of law, of accountable government, of a media that is governed, but at the same time is free. And that identity will be different from the identity they see in Russia, that they see in authoritarian countries. And that could be something to build around, because it will then pull down, hopefully, these tribal divisions that are going to divide us and give those other societies, the unfree societies the chance to dominate us. It's got to be a little bit of a battle, but I'd rather battle around the values identity than around the national or the tribal.

The Honorable Ryan T. McDougle:  
Other thoughts?

The Honorable Abigail A. Spanberger:

Well, I think it comes down to leadership. When we see around the world authoritarians who take charge, they do it by sowing division, they do it by dividing, they do it by exploiting political fights, they do it by reverting back to nationalism. And it all comes down to leadership. It is about our elected officials and those who have a voice in our democracy, how it is that they choose to push themselves forward. Is it by dividing our communities? Is it by insulting constituencies? Is it by acting in an unprofessional manner, in a way where our children can't even watch the news anymore? Or is it in a way that uplifts our communities? Is it a way that recognizes our problems, seeks to get to the root of those problems, and then seeks to find solutions because there's a lot of blame in our political system.

There's a lot of angry discourse, but it all comes down to leadership. And in fact it's true, those who put their heads down and try to solve those problems and address the problems and understand the problems and be accessible, that's not flashy, it's not newsworthy. You from time

to time may end up on a panel, but no disrespect to those in the room, but you're probably not live tweeting this to a million followers. And so it becomes, I think, up to everyday Americans to determine what is and isn't acceptable. Because I think that when we see a degraded political discourse, it all starts at the top. If it starts in a home, it starts with the parents. If it starts in a community, it starts with community leaders. If it starts in a country, it starts at the very, very top.

And every single person who can have an influence and demand to see better engagement, more professionalism, more empathy and sympathy, and fierce debate, but one that is done with respect for our differences and our points of view. That's where we'll get to a point where we can uphold our American values. He spoke very eloquently about having it based on values, and I think that's incredibly important. But when we've arrived at a place where we've accepted that leadership in this country, starting at the top, says things that are just horrific, and that's what gets reported on in the news, I think that we have to pull back to actually addressing real issues and actually talking about those issues and demanding more of leaders in our community, be they elected or not.

Dr. William J. Antholis:

Let me violently agree with that, and use this great phrase of a great Southern political philosopher. There was a Texas member of Congress or, no, I think he was the state Railroad Commissioner in Texas, Jim Hightower, who said, "The only thing in the middle of the road is a yellow line and a dead armadillo." But it's really important to be in the middle of the road, not as a compromise but actually the complexity of problem solving is always found in the middle.

And what I think that really means is valuing both the role of expertise and the role of facts. It's very easy to have conversations about facts and values and have the values start to polarize when actually, we believe in common facts, and we share values. We might think about the values differently, the role of an individual in society, the role of one's group identity. We all value those, but we place different values on those things. When we come to actually dealing with the pragmatic facts of who gets into a school, what it means to succeed in school, we can come to agreement on those things guided by real research and knowledge. And so I think it's very important to not let our conversations polarize, but instead come to some agreement in the middle of the road because it's actually better. It's not a compromise. It's where the reality of our lives are.

The Honorable Ryan T. McDougale:

Well, those are all positive aspirations, but in the society that we're moving to now, it is not those individuals who have the ability to have their voice heard. It's through social media, through technology, through the Instagrams or tweets or trending. How does that social media, that technology piece of communication change when our conversation about democracy and how we defend it and protect it in that struggle, because as you go through, the things that are more visceral move right to the top of the list. So when we have conversations out there, and so many of our citizens, our constituents are receiving their information not from the evening news, not from a five minute, which seems like it's short now, compared to what it used to be, BBC News story, to not even a 30 second news story, but two characters or short blips on your screen.

Dr. William J. Antholis:

Can I take that one? There was a study done on the Democratic side by a centrist Democratic organization called Third Way that was something to the effect of just looking on the left side of the political spectrum. Those active users on social media, 20% of the active left of center commentators are producing 80% of the tweets and the real Democratic primary voters, it's considerably toward the center of the political spectrum from where the social media is being generated. So part of it is, don't pay attention to the shiny object on your phone because that's not actually where most voters are in the conversation.

Then again, there are some really creative people in the center that need to use that tool as a medium. And this is the case, I think on the Republican side as well. I think of someone like John Kasich, who is building quite a following for being clever and being selective about where he engages on the issues he cares about.

Another friend of mine who is a close associate of Karl Rove's - they used to joke that Karl was George Bush's brain, but within the Bush White House, they joked that this guy Pete Wehner was Karl Rove's brain. And Pete is a big believer in the fact that there are four heroes in understanding democracy, Aristotle, John Locke, Abraham Lincoln, and the truth. And Pete is constantly, relentlessly out there on social media striking down untruths because he thinks that it's essential to build a sensible Republican Party around truth and those other three heroes. I think about those as my heroes on the right, and this group, Third Way, on the left, as people who are not going to get caught up in the flashiness of the latest tweet that has no connection to reality. They're going to focus on where most voters actually are, which is much closer to the center.

Dr. Robin C. H. Niblett CMG:

Yeah. Just quickly on the technology. This is the world we're in. We know as human beings we are more attracted to crisis and danger than we are to good news. I mean some great good news stories and sites out there, and that actually started with a website called Crush, which does a lot of good news stories, has got a big following, but in the big battle, as you noted, it makes life incredibly difficult to get there. So I think we are going to live in an information polluted society for quite a while to come. And the only way you're going to be able to manage this is by making sure the next generation are sufficiently educated to be able to make up their decisions and to understand what is true and what isn't.

Even in the UK, my daughter's now older, but a good 10 years ago when she was doing history in the UK, I was taught history. It's all dates. Dates for this, the dates for winning battles, kings and queens, whatever. You just worked a way through the dates, you knew the stuff, you wrote the essays, you passed the exam.

And I saw my daughter doing her homework. This is a good eight, nine years ago on this homework. And what they're given is a particular moment in history, three versions of it, three reports, and then you write what each report was telling you about what they would try to communicate. You had a propaganda piece about the First World War, you had a historical piece

about the First World War, you had a government report about the First World War. She was being taught at that stage, how to ply a truth from another truth.

It doesn't mean you won't click onto the latest bit of hot celebrity gossip, but what you don't want is for them to then be click baited onto untruths about politics. Russia Today, which uses traditional media as well as new media to get itself out in the British, it's watched by 0.5% of the British population. And there was a bit of a debate we heard with Bob Gates saying yesterday that maybe we should ban them from the US where our people are banned from them.

Actually, what the British government does is keep fining them when they don't give balanced news, which by law you have to give in the UK in any news program. And eventually they'll have to decide how much money they want to pay. And I think you've got to kind of be consistent and realize you cannot fix this technology problem with a wave of a wand. We as citizens need to become more educated about our own truths.

The Honorable Abigail A. Spanberger:

Well, I would add that as elected officials, we function within this party construct in a two party system, and I think that part of it is we have to recognize, where we could potentially benefit from some of the flashiness, we have to reject that when someone within our political party says something objectionable. I think we need to show the strength of character to say, "This might be attention getting, this might even benefit me, but it's still objectionable. It's contrary to our values and I won't be a part of it."

So frequently, the media asks me about all of the drama in Washington and in this group versus that group, be it party against party or within the party. And it is so vitally important that we reject this daytime television view of politics because there are real people's lives who are impacted. And there are some truly objectionable things being put out there by elected leaders in this country. And no matter where we stand with our party affiliation or where we stand with our political ideology, it is incredibly important and incumbent upon every person who has some level of a following because they've been elected to denounce what is objectionable and to say, "I want to be part of setting a new standard. We can fight about the issues, we can argue about the issues, but we should not accept things that are unacceptable just for political benefit." And I think that as long as we have elected leaders in this country who are unwilling to do that, we will continue to see these challenges facing our communities.

The Honorable Ryan T. McDougle:

We only have a short time left, but that's a perfect segue. How do we encourage individuals who are of that thought process or individuals we look up to in our community to run for public office, to endure the slings and arrows and personal attacks, whether it be internationally or here domestically, to have them be the voice of our democracy going forward instead of the ones that are seeking attention and divisive?

The Honorable Abigail A. Spanberger:

I'm going to take this one quickly. Nonpartisan gerrymandering or fighting gerrymandering through nonpartisan redistricting, excuse me, is absolutely vital. The more separate and

gerrymandered our political districts are, the worse it is for democracy. The benefit of representing a district where a lot of people voted for me and a lot of people didn't is that I have to find common ground with my constituents. I have to find common ground with my colleagues and campaign finance reform. As long as we have a system that is sick with dollars and money, and it's hard for new candidates to get a start, particularly if they exist in gerrymandered districts, the harder it will always be for people with good intentions and true desire to serve to step forward and do it.

Dr. Robin C. H. Niblett CMG:

You said at the beginning, and I think the words you quoted there are moderation, temperance, frugality, virtue. I was listening to those words at the beginning and thinking about British politics, American politics right now. Not exactly terms you would associate with the leaders of both countries at the moment.

And the question is, you said, can you be a successful leader and stand up for those kinds of values? Internationally, it does exist. Now, Emmanuel Macron in France might be a particularly unpopular leader right now. It's mainly because he just put his foot wrong politically in a couple of cases. But he overthrew, with his En Marche! Movement, both the party at the right and the party at the left. Drove a coach and horses through the middle and then got his party elected into the French National Assembly after it.

Execution might be more complex, but there is a hunger out there for it. And Jacinda Ardern in New Zealand stands up as a leader who people want to emulate, want to emulate the values she stands for. There are people getting through. It's a battle. Democracy is a battle. It's a process, but there are examples out there who are succeeding and we need to focus on them as I think Congresswoman Spanberger said, and not focus on the other side, not look at their success, but build our own success.

The Honorable Ryan T. McDougle:

Oh, with that, I want to thank our panelists as they've offered some insights as we go forward in our democracy experience.

### **Concluding Remarks, Acknowledgements, and Adjournment**

#### **The Honorable M. Kirkland Cox, Speaker of the House of Delegates of Virginia**

The Honorable M. Kirkland Cox:

Well, that was a great way to wrap up this very special several days. Please join me again in thanking Senator McDougle, Congresswoman Spanberger, Dr. Niblett, Dr. Antholis for being here today and sharing their insights. Thank y'all so much.

Thanks again to Ann Compton, Melody Barnes, Karl Rove, for peeling back the curtain on the White House and giving us their views on the role of the President. It's been an excellent program and everything has been said that probably needs to be said, so again I'll be brief.

Again, I want to thank our entire team for making this possible. So let's give them another round of applause. I want to pay special tribute to our distinguished speakers, those here this morning and those who have enriched this entire 400<sup>th</sup> anniversary program over the last several days. We thank you, especially those that came from great distances, like Dr. Niblett. I think he wins the prize for coming all the way from London. But Texas and California aren't so close either. For taking time out of their busy schedules to take part of this important reflection.

Finally, thank you to all who attended this program. We hope it has informed you and maybe inspired you a bit as well. Now, to return to our daily grinds, where the real hard work of democracy takes place. I'm knocking doors tonight. My hope is that we will carry and keep a little of this week with us. Let's remember that we stand on the shoulders of 400 years of patriots, some great visionaries, and just dedicated, diligent citizens. And some who paid the ultimate price that we might have this opportunity to govern ourselves as free people.

We've been reminded of our history this week. And it's been an awesome thing to pause and reflect on. This great and noble democratic tradition of which we are a part. Let us continue to feel that sense of awe. Let us never take this great gift of representative democracy for granted. Let us each do our part to hand off to our children a more perfect union. In doing so, we will honor the past and help secure the future. Thank you for being here and God bless you. We are adjourned.