

# **Top Journalists Explore the Complex Cross-Currents of the 2016 Election Campaigns**

## **Election Panel**

**Chris Wallace**  
**Anchor**  
**FOX News Sunday**

**Charlie Cook**  
**Editor and Publisher**  
***The Cook Political Report***

**Gloria Borger**  
**Chief Political Analyst**  
**CNN**

**Mike Allen**  
**Chief White House Correspondent**  
***POLITICO***

**November 2, 2016**

## **Excerpts from the Panel Discussion**

**Mr. Rubenstein: Do you think Donald Trump can win this election?**

**Ms. Borger:** I do. I think that this race, if nothing else, has been volatile with swings. And there are a fewer number of persuadable voters left, of course – some people say 6 percent, 7 percent; I'd say the number is probably smaller than that. But I do believe that Donald Trump right now is doing something we haven't seen before, which is he's staying on message. He has a simple message about Hillary Clinton. He's given his Republican candidates something they can cheerfully talk about, which is running against Hillary Clinton. So, for the first time in this campaign, they're singing from the same songbook here. And that will help him.

Will it be enough? Does Hillary Clinton have some built-in advantages in this Electoral College? Yes, she does. He's got to find blue states to flip, and he's looking for them. And he's looking in states like Wisconsin, he's looking in states like Michigan. And we don't – you know, at this point, overnight – as Howard Baker used to say, overnight is a lifetime in politics. And I believe in this race more than any other that is true....

**Mr. Cook:** Can, yes. I think because both Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump have such enormous negatives that each one has, in effect, a high floor, low ceiling, which keeps sort of

anything possible. But I think there's a better chance of Hillary Clinton hitting 300 than Donald Trump hitting 270.

**Mr. Rubenstein:** If Hillary Clinton wins, what was the turning point for her?

**Ms. Borger:** I would say that first debate.

**Mr. Cook:** I'd say exactly the same thing.

**Mr. Wallace:** I'd say the nomination of Donald Trump. [Laughter.]

**Mr. Allen:** I can't top that.

**Mr. Rubenstein:** Who is Hillary Clinton's most effective surrogate?

**Mr. Wallace:** Michelle.

**Ms. Borger:** Michelle Obama.

**Mr. Rubenstein:** OK. And who's Trump's most effective surrogate?

**Ms. Borger:** Mike Pence.

**Mr. Rubenstein:** Who gave the best speech?

**Mr. Cook:** Michelle Obama.

**Ms. Borger:** I think it was Michelle Obama's speech after –

**Mr. Wallace:** At the convention.

**Ms. Borger:** Well, no, I'm going to say it was her speech which was aimed at women voters and younger women in particular after the "Access Hollywood" tape came out.

**Mr. Rubenstein:** Who gave the most disappointing speech? Fell flat on its face? Anybody?

**Mr. Wallace:** Well, Cruz's speech at the convention. Being booted off – [laughter] – out of the hall is not a good thing. [Laughter.]

**Ms. Borger:** Right. [Laughs.]

---

DAVID M. RUBENSTEIN: (Sounds gavel.) Welcome, everyone, members and guests of the Economic Club of Washington. Welcome to this luncheon event in the Ritz-Carlton Ballroom of The Ritz-Carlton in Washington, D.C. I am David Rubenstein, president of the Club. Welcome to you all.

Today we have a great program. We're going to tell you who the next President of the United States will be – [laughter] – tell you who's going to control the Senate, control the House. We're going to tell you that, and we're going to be live on C-SPAN. C-SPAN will cover us live at 12:40, so if you are in the audience and you want to wave to your mother or anybody, you can email them and tell them live at 12:40.

Today we have our 2016 general election panel. We've done this for a number of years, and it's been always very exciting and interesting, as it will be this year: Mike Allen from *POLITICO*, Gloria Borger from CNN, Charlie Cook from *The Cook Political Report*, and Chris Wallace from FOX News Sunday.

So we have given you a ballot, and you are able to fill it out. We have a grand prize, which is an Apple Watch, I believe. The winner will get that, and we'll have a big ceremony somewhere, probably at the top of the Washington Monument or something. [Laughter.]

Now, the problem with the ballot is this. Once you submit the ballot, this is not like Pennsylvania; you can't change it. [Laughter.] So you submit your ballot, and that's the ballot, OK? No changing. [Results of the balloting will be reported at a future time. Ed.]

So thank you all for coming. We're going to have a great discussion of who the next President's going to be, who's going to control the Senate, and who's going to control the House, right? We'll get the answers at the end of this. [Laughter.]

Let me introduce our distinguished panel.

From my immediate left is Chris Wallace. Chris is, of course, the anchor of FOX News Sunday. And among other things, he's winner of three Emmy Awards, but also did a spectacular job as the moderator of the third debate. So thank you for that. [Applause.]

And we have now Gloria Borger. Gloria is the chief political analyst for CNN. She has previously been at CNBC and CBS and at *U.S. News*, and you probably see her many hours a day now on CNN, right? [Laughter.] OK, great. [Applause.]

And Charlie Cook, who is the founder and editor of *The Cook Political Report*, which he started in 1984 and is widely considered the Bible of political reporting. And he knows every Congressional district and can tell us who's going to win every single Congressional district and Senate race – [laughter] – right? [Applause.]

And Mike Allen, who is the chief political correspondent for *POLITICO* and also was, up until July, the editor of *Playbook*. And he is widely recognized for his encyclopedic knowledge of politics and government, and he also has political socks on that you might show here.

MIKE ALLEN: These are my beauties.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: Can you explain these? This is –

MR. ALLEN: Red on the right, blue on the left. [Laughter, applause.] Everybody coming together, healing right here.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: All right. [Laughter.] So are you selling those, as well, if anybody wants to buy those, or? [Laughter.] OK.

All right. Let's deal with the easy part first. If there had been no action by FBI Director Comey last Friday, would you say that this election was over? Before the events of last Friday, would you have said, Chris, the election was over, for President?

CHRIS WALLACE: No, because that's not what I do for a living. [Laughter.] But I –

MR. RUBENSTEIN: But privately would you have told us that?

MR. WALLACE: [Laughs.] I certainly think there was a narrative, and I think that the conventional wisdom pre-Friday, was that Hillary Clinton had a solid, steady lead in the polls, and especially in the Electoral College. And while I certainly wouldn't have said it was over, I thought she had a distinct advantage in terms of the many paths she had to getting to 270 electoral votes. So I think I would have said she was a clear favorite.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: OK. Would you have said the election was over before last Friday?

MS. BORGER: I wouldn't have said it was over, because it ain't over –

MR. ALLEN: But you would have thought it.

MS. BORGER: It ain't over till it's over. But I would have said that she had a glide path, and that the narrative before last Friday was that Hillary Clinton probably had her 270 and was just trying to rack up the numbers to have an impressive win and help the candidates down ballot, and make sure she got a Democratic Senate along with her. So, you know, the shape of the race was completely different.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: OK. Charlie, was it over before last Friday?

CHARLIE COOK: How about over-ish? [Laughter.] I mean, the first part of last week, it looked like the bottom was starting to fall out for a lot of House and Senate Republican candidates. And then I think it kind of firmed back up, kind of came back a little bit, and then Friday threw everything up in the air. So that now, you know, I think it is possible for Donald Trump to win, but I think it's still pretty hard. But I think things have changed a lot less in the last week than the conventional wisdom is.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: Mike, before the events of last Friday, would you say the election was over?

MR. ALLEN: We would have – I like the “glide path” idea. And the biggest change is that it gave new wind to Republican Senate candidates; that, until then, the first question that any Republican Senate candidate was asked wherever they went was about Donald Trump. Now it's not, and that's a tremendous advantage for them.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: Right. So, today, Chris, would you say that it's not impossible – in fact, it might be realistic – to think that Donald Trump could win this election today?

MR. WALLACE: Absolutely. I still think you have to say that she has an easier path to 270 than he does, and maybe we can get into those numbers later. But it is changed. And you look at the polls where he was behind by eight to 10 points, he's now behind by three to four – or, in some places where he was behind by two to three, he's now actually leading by a couple. And you've got the ABC tracking poll, which yesterday showed him with a one-point lead and today showed it as a flat-footed tie at 46-46. And I will say from my experience covering politics for mmm years – [laughter] – that there's nothing that can move faster than a political campaign where the tide is changing.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: Today, do you think Donald Trump has a chance of winning this?

MS. BORGER: I do. I think that this race, if nothing else, has been volatile with swings. And there are a fewer number of persuadable voters left, of course – some people say 6 percent, 7 percent; I'd say the number is probably smaller than that. But I do believe that Donald Trump right now is doing something we haven't seen before, which is he's staying on message. He has a simple message about Hillary Clinton. He's given his Republican candidates something they can cheerfully talk about, which is running against Hillary Clinton. So, for the first time in this campaign, they're singing from the same songbook here. And that will help him.

And will it be enough? Does Hillary Clinton have some built-in advantages in this Electoral College? Yes, she does. He's got to find blue states to flip, and he's looking for them. And he's looking in states like Wisconsin, he's looking in states like Michigan. And we don't – you know, at this point, overnight – as Howard Baker used to say, overnight is a lifetime in politics. And I believe in this race more than any other that is true.

MR. WALLACE: And can I just interrupt to say that he is doing something else very smart in his messaging now. It's not just about Clinton and the FBI emails. You started seeing him yesterday making a big pitch in terms of Obamacare and also in terms of trade and undoing NAFTA<sup>1</sup>. And those are the kinds of issues, particularly with yesterday the open enrollment starting for Obamacare and these huge increases in premiums and these huge increases in deductibles, those are very powerful messages, particularly in Rust Belt states.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: Can Donald Trump win this election?

MR. COOK: Can, yes. I think because both Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump have such enormous negatives that each one has, in effect, a high floor, low ceiling, which keeps sort of anything possible. But I think there's a better chance of Hillary Clinton hitting 300 than Donald Trump hitting 270.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: Mike, can Trump win?

MR. ALLEN: David, there's no doubt that Republicans have a new spring in their step. But you look at what's happening in the states, and Republicans at the top would still tell you that it would be very difficult based on the infrastructure, the ground game, the get out the vote that they have in the states. And also early voting, which makes such a difference. We were chatting backstage about how roughly 25 percent of the people you expect to vote have voted. Forty percent of people, Brooklyn<sup>2</sup> expects, will have voted before Election Day.

And just a tiny little stat that reminds you of the importance of that and what a science there is now to it. John McCain, in his primary this year, lost in votes cast on Election Day. He had banked his win before. That's what Brooklyn is counting on doing now.

---

<sup>1</sup> NAFTA is North American Free Trade Agreement.

<sup>2</sup> Brooklyn refers to the location of Secretary Clinton's campaign headquarters.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: Now, let me ask you, because I didn't realize this myself until last night, when I saw it on somebody's show. You can change your vote after you voted early. So how do you go back and change?

MS. BORGER: So the State of Pennsylvania doesn't have early voting, but it has absentee voting. So if you decide that you cast your absentee ballot the wrong way, my understanding of it is you can go into a polling place on Election Day and say – so you don't vote twice – say I cast an absentee ballot and I would like to cast another ballot, can I void it? And Donald Trump, as you saw, has been talking about, in states where people have voted early – you can change your vote, like in Colorado.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: Is this a new phenomenon? Do states really have the ability to go and find your ballot?

MR. COOK: I don't know how many states do that.

MR. WALLACE: No, I think it's four states. Wisconsin is one.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: OK. All right, it was new. Let me ask you, you prepared for the debate, obviously, very well. When you were preparing, did you tell anybody the questions in advance, or none of that, right? [Laughter.] No?

MR. WALLACE: No. Only a colleague from CNN, but I knew it would be safe with her. [Laughter.]

MR. RUBENSTEIN: No, but seriously, when you prepare the questions, do you actually have to show them to somebody else? You prepare them yourself. You do your research. Or do you have people helping you? And then once you lock in the questions, where do you hold them? Do you keep them in your chest pocket? How do you make sure nobody sees them?

MR. WALLACE: Well, actually, it's funny you're asking these questions. You hadn't told me you were going to ask them. [Laughter.] No, no, it's a funny story. [Laughter.] It's a funny story.

So I get a call from Janet Brown – this is in early September – who's the executive director of the Commission on Presidential Debates, and she says, you know, you're going to do the last debate, and I knew I was going to come up with the questions. And she said about a week ahead of time you have to tell us, and we'll tell the campaigns, what the topics will be, the six – because the way it was arranged, it would be six subject areas, 15 minutes each. And I said, well, who comes up with those? And she says, you do. And I'm like, holy – because I didn't know that. I didn't know how it was run.

No, it was totally me and my researcher on FOX News Sunday. We came up with all the topics, all the questions ourselves. It's almost like a scene out of "Ocean's Eleven," at the Encore Hotel in a suite, and I had it set up with computers from the staff. And as we were going and completely reworking the questions every day, we would take the questions and we would

rip them up, and it's like, now what do we do with them? Because we didn't have a shredder. This was how paranoid we got. And we literally stuck them in a laundry bag in the back of the closet, figuring that nobody would look at that. And then every time I left I had the book – this little loose-leaf book with my six topics. And you know the wall safe? I would stick it in the wall safe and lock it up so that it was never available.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: OK. And what's the key to keeping them from talking over you in these debates? [Laughter.]

MR. WALLACE: Well, I'll just tell you one quick story in that regard. So I had prepared to a tremendous degree the questions for each of the topics, and I even had a little cheat sheet on each of them with the sort of data points for each thing so that if they said, no, I didn't say that, or that number's wrong, I'd be able to cite a number. So I was really, really well-prepared. But the day before, the Commission said why don't we take you to the venue and you can work out on the stage, which was very interesting because anybody who's been there in person to one of these knows it's infinitely smaller than it looks on TV. Their canted podiums from corner to corner are eight-and-a-half feet apart, so they're really in each other's faces and you're very close to them.

And they got two students from UNLV<sup>3</sup>, and we did a practice debate. And the subject was, what's your favorite movie? And I said, all right, two minutes, Secretary Clinton. And the woman doing that did the two most persuasive minutes I've ever heard about – [laughter] – why “Shawshank Redemption” was the greatest movie ever made. [Laughter.] I mean, seriously. She talked about the cinematography. She talked about the script. She quoted from it. And she didn't know I was going to ask this question. Then I went to Trump and I said, well, what's the greatest movie? And in a somewhat Trump-like way, he said “Django Unchained.” [Laughter.] I'm like, what the? And then we – but the point was, and then they had been taught to interrupt me and to interrupt each other, and I came away from it realizing that, for all of my preparation, that one of the hardest jobs was going to be the incoming – the seat-of-the-pants decisions you have to make about when do you interrupt, when do you not interrupt, when do you throw it to the other person, and that was going to make or break the debate.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: All right. Yes?

MS. BORGER: And can I just say something about the importance of these debates? And you guys can talk about that, too. But I was speaking with some Republicans who are very involved in running the Republican Senate Campaign Committee and people who are doing analytics for Republicans. And what they said to me was, after the first debate – I said, what were the turning points in this election? And I presumed that they would say to me, well, the videotape, the “Access Hollywood” videotape, was a turning point, or the Gold Star controversy after the Democratic Convention. I just assumed that was going to be it. And both of these folks, unprompted, said to me the first debate. The first debate – and I don't know if you saw that and what you were looking at, but they said the first debate. Before the first debate, one person said to me, we gave Donald Trump a 65 percent chance of winning, and after the first debate that was cut in half.

---

<sup>3</sup> UNLV is University of Nevada, Las Vegas.

MR. COOK: Well, the well just got poisoned among the slice of people between the two 45-yard lines.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: In the Republican debates – I think there were 13 Republican debates in the primary, something like that. In those, in hindsight, what should the other candidates have done to beat Donald Trump? And why were they unable to bring out some of his negatives, as well as later they were brought out in the general election campaign?

MR. COOK: To me, Jeb Bush, Marco Rubio, even Chris Christie, there was no reason to do this because they were fishing in a different pond of voters than Donald Trump was. The question in my mind is, why didn't Ted Cruz, who was fishing in the same pond for the same group of voters, why weren't they dishing all this stuff out? Not do it personally, but dishing it out to the news media, because he would have been the beneficiary of Trump collapsing. Those people were not going to go to Jeb Bush or Marco Rubio or Kasich or Christie.

MR. WALLACE: But I mean, don't you think the common problem, Charlie, is that all of them failed to take Trump seriously enough early enough, and they thought they could get away and that he was going to collapse on his own, and he didn't.

MS. BORGER: Well, they wanted his voters. They didn't want to alienate the Trump supporters.

MR. COOK: But by March/April. I mean, to me the turning point was right after Wisconsin, just before the Acela primary.<sup>4</sup> And that was the time when Ted Cruz still had a real chance of beating him. And why they didn't drop the hammer on – I mean, I don't think they would have found all these women, but they could have found enough stuff that I think would have kneecapped him.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: Mike?

MR. ALLEN: Yeah, David, two things.

One, there was a failure of imagination. Like so many people in this room – maybe on this stage – like, they didn't think that they had to kill him. This is the idea of you need to drop an anvil on their neck. They couldn't give him oxygen.

But the second thing is – and Chris alluded to this – they were just afraid. None of them wanted him to go after them. I did an interview with Newt Gingrich the other day for – has a series, "Open Mike." I did a video interview with Newt, and he said that in a debate Donald Trump is like the bear in "Revenant." And I was like, so – [laughter] – that he will get you. And I'm like, so Rubio – Marco Rubio is Leonardo DiCaprio? And he's like, yes, exactly. [Laughter.] And so they just didn't want to go up against the bear.

---

<sup>4</sup> The so-called "Acela primary" brings voters to the polls in five Northeastern states. Ballots are cast in Pennsylvania, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Maryland, and Delaware, largely finishing up most of this election's primaries in the region.

MR. COOK: Well, but you have – I mean, you know, you could send an unmarked envelope to *The New York Times* or to any of these – [laughter] – I mean, you know, you don't have to have your fingerprints on it.

MS. BORGER: Right. But they were too busy attacking each other. There were some debates, you recall, where the incoming was flying over Donald Trump's head because they were too busy attacking each other.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: How come he was always in the center? Why was he always in the center of the debates?

MS. BORGER: Because he was leading in the polls.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: Is that how they do it? OK.

MS. BORGER: And that's how you do it. The person who is leading in the polls is in the center, and then, you know, the person who's last is at the end.

But I recall the debate – how could you not recall the debate – where Chris Christie finished off Marco Rubio.

MR. COOK: The suicide bomber. [Laughter.]

MS. BORGER: That was a sacrifice fly, I was going to say. OK, suicide bomber. Well, he did it. [Laughter.] He did it, and nobody else had to. And I think that they were all just waiting for Trump to implode.

MR. COOK: There's a great story that Rubio mentioned – said to Christie before the debate, I hear you're coming after me, and that allegedly Christie said: You have no idea. [Laughter.]

MS. BORGER: Nobody did.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: So why did Ted Cruz, at the convention, not endorse Donald Trump, and then later he did endorse him? What was the thinking behind not endorsing and then later endorsing him? Can anybody explain that?

MR. COOK: Let's just say I told you so. I mean, basically, assuming that Trump was going to lose and collapse and say I told you so. And then, when it started getting closer and closer, and he's thinking about 2020, he decided to do it. And I bet he wished he waited another week or so, until after the first debate, and then he would have not done that.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: So for the presidential campaign today, what states do you think will be most surprising to us on election night? What state would you say be the biggest surprises?

MR. WALLACE: Well, it's going to be a surprise, so we don't know. But I would – [laughter] – say, you know, people looking early, Florida is going to be a big indicator. If Trump loses Florida – and we'll know that – you were talking whether it's 8:00 or 9:00 when the polls close in the western part of the state, in the Panhandle – if Trump loses Florida, it's over. There's no way he gets to 270 losing the 29 electoral votes in Florida. On the other hand, if he wins Florida, we could be headed for a significant night.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: And the butterfly ballots, they're gone, right? They don't do those anymore.

MS. BORGER: They're gone. [Laughs.]

MR. WALLACE: The chads.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: Chads –

MS. BORGER: They're gone. They're all gone.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: So what do you think will be a big surprise we'll see?

MS. BORGER: Well, I'm not sure what's going to be – I'm going to look at Wisconsin, which I think, you know, you've seen Trump say he believes it's in play. The Republicans believe – and this is interesting to me because there's such a diversity of opinion between Republicans and Democrats. Democrats say Colorado is not in play, no way, they've got it. Republicans I've talked to say they've got it at a point or two. I have no idea.

MR. ALLEN: Well, excuse me, but Democrats just went up with ads there, so how sure are they?

MS. BORGER: Exactly. So there are – you know, they're looking at these states differently. We have new polling out today which shows –

MR. ALLEN: Breaking news. [Laughter.]

MS. BORGER: – which shows Trump up in Nevada 49 percent to 43 percent and up in Arizona 49 percent to 44 percent, Clinton up in Pennsylvania only by four points. She's been up in Pennsylvania by double digits. And Florida, as Chris was saying, is almost a dead heat, as Florida always is, 49-47 Clinton.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: All right, let me ask you about Bernie Sanders for a moment. Bernie Sanders said famously in the first debate, I don't give a damn about your emails, or something to that effect. Was that a big mistake? Had he said I really care about them, would he possibly have won the Democratic primary, or?

MR. WALLACE: I don't think he would have won. I think it was a mistake, and I think he could have made it more of a – I just wonder, in the end, whether a 74-year-old independent socialist from Vermont was ever going to beat Hillary Clinton. [Laughter.]

MR. RUBENSTEIN: That's a good point. Then to anybody – [laughter] – look how close he came with all those disadvantages.

MR. WALLACE: He didn't come all that close.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: He didn't?

MR. WALLACE: No, because of the superdelegates, who were never going to go for him.

MS. BORGER: That's was where the "rigged election" first started. [Laughs, laughter.]

MR. RUBENSTEIN: OK, but normally, if you have somebody who has not been a part of the Democratic Party and he does so well, why did he not choose to run a third-party candidacy? He was not loyal to the Democratic Party. Why did he not choose to run as a third-party independent?

MS. BORGER: I don't think he wanted to hand the election to Donald Trump, and I think that's what he thought that it was going to do. I mean, obviously, the third-party candidate now doesn't feel that way, although his running mate last night I believe went on MSNBC – Bill Weld went on MSNBC and said let me make –

MR. COOK: The guy that should have been at the top of the Libertarian ticket.

MS. BORGER: – said let me make the case for Hillary Clinton. [Laughs.] Yeah.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: So, well, now, there's been press recently – maybe you have some insight on this – that Chris Christie is saying that he was sort of offered, or somebody said he was offered the Vice Presidency, and at the last minute Trump got talked out of it. Is there any truth to that, he was actually offered it?

MR. WALLACE: I don't know, but there's also a great story that he was leaning in the direction of Christie and that Paul Manafort – and again, I've just seen the report; I can't verify this – manufactured – if you remember, Trump was in Indiana, and that Manafort made up the fact that the plane was broken so Trump would have to stay in Indianapolis for one more day, which gave Pence another chance to make the pitch.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: I see. Who came in second to Tim Kaine for Vice President? Was he always the first choice and there was never a second choice?

MR. ALLEN: He was, and you and I have talked about this. Tim Kaine was so perfect, and it was because he was a governing choice. It happened that he brought Virginia with him, which was very handy. But Secretary Clinton, who has seen the Vice Presidency up so close so many

times, she knew – she – married to this person, and it was a governing pick, somebody who will be very effective once they get the job.

MR. COOK: She was not a fourth and long yardage. This was a very safe, solid pick.

MR. WALLACE: Can I just give you one data point? Because I think I shared this four years ago, and it's my favorite statistic. And this tells you why we all are talking about Hillary having so much of an advantage just built in structurally in the electoral map.

If you go back and look, there are 18 states and the District of Columbia which have voted six elections in a row for the Democrat, all the way back from '92 through Clinton's two elections, Bush's two elections, and Obama's two elections. Six times in a row voted Democrat. They have 242 electoral votes, which means if she just holds on to what has voted Democrat every time since '92, she only needs 28 more electoral votes to win. Flip it to the Republicans: 13 states have voted Republican six elections in a row, 102 electoral votes. So she starts off with this enormous advantage. That doesn't include states like Florida or Ohio or North Carolina or Virginia or a variety of states that have voted. But she starts off with this huge structural advantage of 242 electoral votes.

MS. BORGER: And, David you were talking earlier about the impact of the Comey event last Friday, the Comey news. One thing that I'm really looking at is this question of enthusiasm among Clinton supporters, because we had seen before Comey that the enthusiasm – Donald Trump's voters had always been more enthusiastic about voting for him than Hillary Clinton voters were about voting for her. That number was starting to sort of equal out towards, you know, last week. And then came Comey. And then what you saw in some of the tracking polling – and I try not to look too much at daily tracking polling because it gives me anxiety for these things to shift 10 points in a day, which they do very often; they're not very dependable. But you do see over a period of time now, which is days, that her enthusiasm numbers tend to be shifting down. So the question that I then ask is, will that mean that some voters will stay home who say a pox on both your houses? So will that suppress her turnout? And will it make his turnout be more enthusiastic? I mean, we don't know the answer to that, but I think we ought to be looking at it.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: Yes, Mike?

MR. ALLEN: So I was visiting before lunch with Nate Tibbits, and sort of a glass-is-half-full view for Clinton voters is now they're nervous and you won't have the complacency that you did. But the turnout can flip both ways. One reason – and I know, Charlie, you talked to a bunch of Republican pollsters, and probably heard something similar – one thing that makes Republicans nervous is – that is discussed about the emails, the investigations – is the voter that then stays home a suburban, exurban, more-educated, higher-income voter? That exact voter would be Hillary Clinton and Roy Blunt. That voter would be a ticket-splitter. It would be Hillary Clinton and Kelly Ayotte in New Hampshire. So there's some worry about that. And that's why, even though there's the blue wall that Chris was talking about, that there's so much more nervousness in Brooklyn and among Clinton voters.

For 500 days, top Hillary Clinton voters – a number of them in this room – have been calling me and my colleagues here and saying, things aren't fine, like they never think things are fine. Now everybody's calling us and saying, tell us things are fine. [Laughter.]

MR. RUBENSTEIN: So talk about the polling for a moment. When you do a poll, a national poll, you need how many people to make it statistically significant, 1,500 or so, or not, for a nationwide poll?

MR. COOK: When you get it down to likely voters, 700, 800.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: Seven hundred or 800.

MR. COOK: But you start off with a base of, yeah.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: But do they call people who have stationary telephones – landlines – or do they call people with cellphones? And how do they get people who don't really have telephones?

MR. COOK: The good – the better pollsters – all the national name-brand pollsters, they're calling a mix that could be as much as half cellphones. So the problem is it's caller ID. It's response rates. You know, it's a generation ago somebody calls you up and asks your opinion about politics, and you felt empowered and flattered. Today, it's who's interrupting my dinner. But the thing is, and the way I would look at it is, a live person calling is always better than an online or a robocall, and a standalone poll is always better than a tracking poll because they could do the three, four callbacks over a couple of days to try to get the primary person. But the problem with it is – I mean, I think it's a good thing to look at averages, but the problem with the averages is it's turned polls into a commodity and it treats them all alike. And all these polls are not alike. Some of these are junk. Some of these I have to look up and see who the hell – you know, go on their website and see who in the hell is this pollster.

MS. BORGER: Well, you average the good polls.

MR. COOK: Yes.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: So what about exit polls? On the day of the election, the news media often get exit polls. And when you go on TV, you're kind of supposed to pretend you don't really know the outcome of the election, so you kind of fake it for a while.

MS. BORGER: Well, we don't. We don't.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: Well, you kind of know the exit polls.

MS. BORGER: But we don't. We look at the exit polls. They give you an indication on how certain questions are being answered. But we don't really know the outcome. I remember when John Kerry ran and the exit polls were wrong at 4:00 in the afternoon.

MR. COOK: Exit polls are not that accurate.

MS. BORGER: Right.

MR. COOK: I mean, here's what they're used for: after the election, for speech material to make the points you want to make. [Laughter.] But the thing is, a poll that you – I mean, a race that you don't know from *TIME* or – *TIME* magazine the week before who's going to win, an exit poll's not going to tell you.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: If the election were over tomorrow – and let's suppose for the purpose of this that Hillary Clinton wins – what would you say would be the turning point for her, as you look back over the last year, to have won this election?

MS. BORGER: I would say that first debate.

MR. COOK: I'd say exactly the same thing.

MS. BORGER: I would say the first debate, now, yeah.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: First debate. And what would you say would be the turning point for her if she won?

MR. WALLACE: I'd say the nomination of Donald Trump. [Laughter.]

MR. RUBENSTEIN: OK. What would you say? The same thing? All right. Let's suppose Donald Trump – [applause] –

MR. ALLEN: I can't top that.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: All right. Suppose Donald Trump were to win the election. Suppose he were to win. What would you say was the turning point for him?

MR. WALLACE: I could be a smartass and say the nomination of Hillary Clinton, but – [laughter] – which might actually be true. [Laughter.] And certainly the Comey announcement.

MS. BORGER: Yeah. I would say that, yeah.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: The Comey. OK.

And let's talk about the Senate for a moment. The Senate – Democrats need to pick up four seats if they're going to – if the White House is controlled by the Democrats, right, pick up four seats and then control the Senate. So what do you think is the likelihood the Democrats will control the Senate? Mike?

MR. ALLEN: Majority Leader Schumer, who's been prepared for that since I think he was like four. [Laughter.] I agree with my colleagues here that until a week ago that seemed very, very

likely. And Charlie was telling us that someone had even told him that Republicans could lose every close race. Now –

MR. COOK: A week ago Monday.

MR. ALLEN: And now that's not the case. And so it's completely on the cusp.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: Could go either way.

MR. ALLEN: No. No, there's three ways, because very possible that there could be a 50-50 Senate where the tie is broken by a Vice President Kaine or a Vice President Pence.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: Let's go down state by state, all right? New Hampshire. Who's going to win New Hampshire, the Senate seat?

MR. COOK: Flip it up in the air. It's that close. It's within a point.

MR. WALLACE: Talk to him. He knows.

MS. BORGER: Talk to Charlie. He's the expert.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: All right. OK. So, New Hampshire, all right. Pennsylvania.

MR. COOK: McGinty up a couple points. Toomey's run a great campaign.

MS. BORGER: He's a great candidate.

MR. COOK: He's a great candidate. He's a better candidate. But Pennsylvania, it's not Illinois or Wisconsin, but it's a tough state.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: All right. Illinois is over. Is that what you'd say?

MS. BORGER: Yes.

MR. COOK: Yes.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: Wisconsin?

MR. COOK: Over.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: Over.

MS. BORGER: Over.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: Florida?

MR. COOK: It's close, but over.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: What about Florida?

MR. COOK: It's a Rubio win by four points, five points.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: Nevada.

MR. COOK: A week and a half ago I would have said Joe Heck, the Republican. Now maybe not.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: North Carolina.

MS. BORGER: It's hard.

MR. COOK: That's the one that Republicans are very frustrated with because remember, you know, the old record players that get 78 RPMs and then there are 45 and then there are 33, and then there's 17 ½. [Laughter.] And that's Richard Burr. [Laughter.] The slow to organize, slow to raise money, slow to define his – he's doing it the way he's always done it. And Republicans want to pull their hair out over him.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: What about Missouri?

MS. BORGER: That's a tough one.

MR. COOK: That's a tough one. And that's where Trump is working against – somebody said Trump was running against Evan Bayh in Indiana and against Roy Blunt in Missouri, the whole anti-Washington –

MR. RUBENSTEIN: Right. What about Indiana?

MR. COOK: I think Bayh holds on, but it'll be close.

MS. BORGER: It's close.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: OK. Let's talk about the House for a moment.

MR. ALLEN: But excuse me real quick.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: Yes, go ahead.

MR. ALLEN: Like, one theme of Charlie's answer is we see there that, absent the top of the ticket, the Republicans would easily have a return of the majority.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: Yes, go ahead.

MS. BORGER: One other thing to add on that, and it applies to House races. But I've never seen a presidential race where you don't have on a stage all the candidates that are running when the President – when the presidential nominee comes to town and they're all holding their hands up together and saying let's vote for this ticket, you know, with our presidential nominee at the top, and let's support Kelly Ayotte and let's support –

MR. ALLEN: They want Pence to host it.

MS. BORGER: And they're doing that with Mike Pence to a degree. But you don't have that picture in this race.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: Well, that's a good point. I mean, Hillary Clinton has how many surrogates out there that are very prominent –

MS. BORGER: Five hundred? Yeah. [Laughs, laughter.]

MR. RUBENSTEIN: Who is her most effective surrogate?

MR. WALLACE: Michelle.

MS. BORGER: Michelle Obama.

MR. WALLACE: Michelle.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: OK. And who's Trump's most effective surrogate?

MS. BORGER: Mike Pence. Mike Pence. And a day or so ago, they were together somewhere, I think.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: OK. All right, in the House, the Republicans have, what, a 38-seat majority, or leadership? They need to hold on –

MR. COOK: The Democrats need 30 seats.

MS. BORGER: Thirty seats.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: OK. And what do you think is the likely outcome in the House?

MR. COOK: Republicans lose 13, 14, 15 seats.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: OK.

MR. ALLEN: But over the last few weeks it's gone from – it was five to 10, 10 to 15. A few weeks ago there was a worry of losing 20. Now I think people have dialed back from that. But either way you're going to have a weakened Paul Ryan because the Republicans who will lose are Ryan-ish Republicans, the more moderate ones.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: In the House or the Senate, what would you say will be the biggest surprise? Is there somebody you're going to tell us is really going to win that we think is not going to win, or vice versa?

MR. COOK: You know, we're seeing so much polling now that these out-of-the-blue Senate races don't happen so much. But one thing that's worth noting is our Senate editor, Jennifer Duffy, has noted a lot of times that when you get down to the last handful of races, the ones that are toss-up, they never split down the middle; that they overwhelmingly go one way or the other. It's just whatever that last gust of wind push the ones that are right on the knife edge one way or the other.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: Let's suppose Donald Trump loses this election. Will he concede on the night of the election?

MR. WALLACE: Well, I asked him that question. [Laughter.] Well, I think it depends. [Laughter.]

MS. BORGER: That's what he said. [Laughs, laughter.]

MR. WALLACE: I mean, if it's a – if it's a 2000 – if it's, you know, 55 – or 500 votes in Florida, maybe not. If it's millions of votes and dozens of electoral votes, I think he will.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: You think he will concede if it's –

MS. BORGER: I do think it depends what they see out there. States now have automatic recount rules. The State of Florida, if the margin is less than half of a percent, you go to automatic recount. That's what happens. Now, say that were to occur in the State of Florida, but Donald Trump had lost so many electoral votes, if Florida were to become irrelevant, then he probably wouldn't do it. I think that –

MR. WALLACE: You think he would concede?

MS. BORGER: Well, I think he'd probably recount Florida, but I think if there were no shot of him winning the presidency and everything seemed fair everywhere else, why should he? But I think that Donald Trump has put everyone on notice, particularly in answering your question, that he's not going to say that right now.

MR. COOK: I don't think we're going to hear anything that any of us would consider to be a normal concession. [Laughter, applause.] And the thing is nowadays, nobody ever loses. You win or you are cheated. [Laughter.] And I think it's an extension of every kid getting a trophy. And that – so I don't think he's going to throw –

MS. BORGER: You mean an effort grade? Yeah.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: Mike?

MR. ALLEN: Guarantee you that, whatever the result is, he will say that it is a precise vindication of exactly what he's been saying. [Laughter.]

MR. RUBENSTEIN: The best single speech in the entire campaign was delivered by whom, when? At some convention? Who gave the best speech?

MR. COOK: Michelle Obama.

MS. BORGER: I think it was Michelle Obama's speech after –

MR. WALLACE: At the convention.

MS. BORGER: Well, no, I'm going to say it was her speech which was aimed at women voters and younger women in particular after the "Access Hollywood" tape came out.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: And who gave the most disappointing speech that you thought was really – fell flat on its face? Anybody?

MR. WALLACE: Well, Cruz's speech at the convention. Being booed off – [laughter] – out of the hall is not a good thing. [Laughter.]

MS. BORGER: Right. [Laughs.]

MR. RUBENSTEIN: Let's suppose for a moment Hillary Clinton wins. Let's say she wins. Who would be the presumptive lead candidate for the Republicans in 2020? Would somebody be the lead? Would it be Pence? Would it be Cruz? Would it be –

MR. ALLEN: Buzz. Can I buzz in? It's going to be somebody who was not involved in this mess. I think the people who have been are so badly splattered. So I would rather be Senator Tom Cotton of Arkansas. I would rather be Senator Ben Sasse. I would rather be the Governor of South Carolina, Nikki Haley. I'd rather be somebody who was not in the middle of this.

MR. COOK: See, I would eventually want to be somebody that wasn't, but I think just off the blocks you'd probably say Pence, or I would say Pence. But in the end, you may very well be right.

MS. BORGER: And you know, the question is, what has all of this done for Paul Ryan? This is a big question for Republicans out there. I think that you have the Speaker of the House, who eventually endorsed the candidate but cannot say his name. He talks about Trump as the nominee and he has a very difficult time –

MR. COOK: Lord Voldemort, yeah.

MS. BORGER: Right. [Laughter, laughs.]

MS. BORGER: And what has he done for his own political future?

MR. RUBENSTEIN: And let's suppose it's the opposite. Let's suppose Trump wins. So who is the leader of the Democratic Party going forward?

MR. WALLACE: That's a good question. And one of the reasons that you didn't have much of a primary race on the Democratic side is there is not a deep bench. You know, there were a lot of credible Republicans running this time. I would defer, but I don't – I mean, you could say Andrew Cuomo or something like that, but there are not a bunch of names that spring to mind.

MR. COOK: Well, presidentially I don't know, but I'd say Schumer is going to come out of this as the presumptive leader of the party.

MR. WALLACE: Right, but presidential?

MR. COOK: President, well, I think we just, you know, have to wait and see.

But I think Paul Ryan's got to make a decision from the get-go, is does he want to be a part of governing or does he want to run for the Republican nomination. And I think he's going to decide to govern. And then House Republicans – I mean, I think the Senate will be more functional with a Mitch McConnell-Chuck Schumer relationship as opposed to with Harry Reid. But on the Republican side, you know, House Republicans have to decide, do they want to legislate or do they want to investigate? And I think at least half of them are going to want to investigate, and Ryan would rather legislate.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: If Hillary Clinton were to win the election, would the Supreme Court nominee that President Obama has proposed be approved in a lame duck? And would TPP<sup>5</sup> be approved in a lame duck?

MR. WALLACE: I don't know about TPP. I think that's going to be a very interesting question. You've got a lot of Republicans who are on record saying, no, we're going to stand firm. On the other hand, with Hillary Clinton as the President-elect, Merrick Garland looks pretty moderate.

MS. BORGER: Right.

MR. COOK: I'd say after a lame – not in the lame duck, but early next year he would get it.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: Not in the lame – after the lame duck.

MS. BORGER: Yeah. I think Merrick Garland – I never thought I'd be saying this, but I think he has a better shot of getting confirmed in that scenario.

MR. COOK: But TPP?

---

<sup>5</sup> TPP is Trans-Pacific Partnership.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: So how do you think the press and broadcast media will cover the next election differently from the way they covered this one?

MS. BORGER: [Laughs.]

MR. RUBENSTEIN: Do you think they've learned anything that they think they can improve upon? Or do they think they did a great job and they don't need to make any changes?  
[Laughter.]

MS. BORGER: Chris, I'll let you take that. [Laughter.]

MR. WALLACE: The answer is we'll make mistakes, but we'll make different ones.  
[Laughter.]

MR. RUBENSTEIN: All right. So –

MR. COOK: I think the media could not do a worse job than this year. I mean, I really believe that. [Applause.] I think early on basically cable news handed over their airwaves to Trump and then begrudgingly added Bernie and Hillary. So they gave him a free ride for a long time, and maybe were not as aggressive in holding his feet to the fire during the primaries and during the debates as they should have. But then the last month or so it's like watching a badly refereed basketball game where we're seeing makeup calls and we're seeing particularly print going – and I'm not a Trump defender at all – but going after Trump in ways that I think violate every canon of ethics for news reporting.

MR. WALLACE: I completely agree with that. If you read the adjectives – just look at the adjectives in the news stories in *The New York Times* or the *Washington Post*. You know, one I think today talked about Trump “lurching” into something. They just use – well, that's a verb. [Laughter.] They use adjectives and verbs in a very prejudicial way.

MS. BORGER: We can all debate the role of the media, and we will. And I think we all need some time to get through this election and then take a look back at it, which I think would be really useful. The one thing I will say about Donald Trump, which I think is a lesson to a lot of people running for office, which is if you make yourself available to the press, the press will interview you. And I recall during the primaries, would Jeb Bush talk to us frequently? The answer is no, because he was behaving like the front-runner who didn't have to speak to the media. I mean, you all know this because you're booking people on shows and you – and the thing that Donald Trump did, which served to his advantage – and this is not to say the press didn't do things that were wrong – but he put himself out there and talked to people.

MR. ALLEN: And he was interesting.

MS. BORGER: And was interesting. But now – but now Donald Trump hasn't had a press conference since I believe sometime in July, the end of July. And there was a guy who would talk to the press anytime all the time. So things shift. And now Hillary Clinton is talking to the press more.

MR. COOK: I would respectfully disagree. I think you could have given every other candidate infusions of sodium pentothal and – [laughter] – and they – and many of them would not have gotten coverage. I mean, I think this was about ratings. [Laughter, applause.] I think this was about ratings and it was about who was going to – you know, people giving – allowing him to do phone-in. You couldn't phone in, you know, these shows before.

MR. WALLACE: Some of us didn't allow him to phone in.

MS. BORGER: Right. But then Hillary Clinton started to phone in.

MR. COOK: Well, then they started allowing her because they were allowing him.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: If Hillary Clinton is elected, what role will Bill Clinton have in the Administration? [Laughter.]

MR. ALLEN: The First Gentleman.

MR. WALLACE: Well, I don't know. I mean, the answer is, I don't know. I assume he'll have a substantive policy role. Probably not out front, but, you know, he'll be an emissary. She's talked about wanting him to be the emissary to blue-collar America, to "I feel your pain," to get that economy going. And actually he'd be very effective at that.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: West Wing or East Wing office? [Laughter.]

MR. WALLACE: Probably both.

MR. COOK: If elected, President Hillary Clinton should try to get him a job as a lecturer on a cruise ship that had no telecommunications whatsoever. [Laughter, applause.]

MR. RUBENSTEIN: So, if Donald Trump is elected President – do you think he will be disappointed by the quality of Camp David, Air Force One, and the White House? You think he will be OK, up to his standards, you know?

MR. COOK: Well, Mike Bloomberg never moved into Gracie Mansion, so.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: So if Hillary Clinton is elected, who would you think will be Chief of Staff in the White House?

MR. WALLACE: Well, it won't be Cheryl Mills. I mean, actually they have a real problem because I would think a lot of the people who you normally would have thought of are so tainted by the emails and all of that that I don't think that they'll – I mean, you hear names. And I think we're all speculating, but you hear names like Ron Klain as a possibility, Podesta for a year – although I would highly doubt that.

MS. BORGER: Tom Vilsack.

MR. WALLACE: Tom Donilon is a possibility. Tom Vilsack, yeah.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: And if Donald Trump is elected President, who would be Chief of Staff for him?

MR. COOK: Donald Trump. [Laughter.]

MR. RUBENSTEIN: OK. And today – [laughter] – what time on election night do you think we can go to sleep?

MR. WALLACE: It depends. I was talking about Florida. If Florida goes for Clinton, it's over early. If it doesn't, and you begin to see these states – Ohio going for Trump and Florida going for Trump, it could be a longer evening.

MS. BORGER: I don't know about you, but we're on the air till 3:00 a.m. [Laughter.] So I know you're going to be watching, right?

MR. COOK: I think we'll know at midnight.

MR. WALLACE: Which would be late.

MS. BORGER: We won't know the Senate. We won't know the Senate.

MR. WALLACE: We knew about – we knew about Obama at 9:00 p.m. in 2008.

MS. BORGER: We won't know the Senate then, right? So I think that – you know, the Senate could be a very interesting election story–

MR. COOK: Nevada is the only late state, really. But you know, the thing is, if Democrats are at four going – with Nevada still out there – well, five with Nevada still out there.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: Any November surprises? Anything that can happen between now and the Election Day that could change the election that you can think is realistic?

MR. WALLACE: Are you kidding, asking that question in this campaign here? [Laughter.]

MR. RUBENSTEIN: So, I mean, do you expect the FBI director to come up with a more definitive answer on anything?

MR. WALLACE: I just – my gut says no.

MS. BORGER: I don't know, you know. They're reviewing email, – they must have a program to allow them to see whether there are duplicate emails. So I think maybe. And maybe it's not on that front. This campaign has been a surprise a minute. And so how many days do we have left, six days? Anything.

MR. COOK: You're the only lawyer up here, right? Are we likely to hear any good news for Clinton out of the FBI this week? I mean, it seems to me there's a greater downside risk than upside risk just because, if they find classified stuff in there, we'd probably hear it sooner; and if they haven't found it yet, they're probably still looking, maybe. So I don't know.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: So whoever is elected, Donald Trump or Hillary Clinton, do you think they can effectively govern, given this campaign and given the division with Congress? Do you think it's going to be very difficult to get anything done?

MR. WALLACE: I think they can. I mean, you know, it's interesting. There couldn't have been a more contested election than 2000 and George W. Bush – I mean, literally being decided by the Supreme Court and coming down to 500 votes in Florida. And yet, I know their reaction afterwards was, if you win, you govern like you have a mandate whether you do or not. And he actually had a very successful first year.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: Yes?

MR. ALLEN: I think Hillary Clinton should pray for a Republican Senate. A Republican Senate would help her constrain her own instincts, but even more than that it would be a foil for her left wing. For Elizabeth Warren, Sanders, she would say: I have to deal.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: Which individual who's not running for President do you think enhanced his or her reputation the most in this past year? Anybody that's just a star that you really –

MS. BORGER: Yeah, well, Elizabeth Warren certainly did with the Progressives in the Democratic Party. She became a star on the campaign trail for Democrats, aside from Bernie, who did run.

MR. COOK: I mean, I'm echoing Mike's point. If elected, I think Hillary Clinton will have as many problems on her left as on her right. But I would say the two things that make me less pessimistic would be, number one, I think it's always better to have a President who will meet with Members of Congress and pick up the phone and talk to them without having his arm broken. And secondly, I think the Schumer-McConnell relationship, I think, will be a functional one. So, you know, those are two things that might make things less worse.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: Who is the biggest flop, you might say, of this campaign, in terms of their reputation went so low – not a presidential candidate – that they couldn't possibly recover? Is there anybody you think really came out as a loser in this campaign? A surrogate, anybody else? No?

MR. ALLEN: Well, sure. And I think the people who waffled on Donald Trump will eventually pay a price for that. One of the truest sentences of this cycle is what David Brooks said, like, where you were on this will matter; people will remember.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: So do you have another presidential campaign in you? Will you do this another four years from now? Are you still going to cover a campaign?

MR. ALLEN: God willing.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: All right.

MS. BORGER: [Laughs.]

MR. COOK: I think I have to. [Laughter.]

MR. RUBENSTEIN: OK. All right. All right. Be another campaign?

MR. COOK: But, God, I hope there's not a second one out there.

MS. BORGER: Ask me the day after, OK?

MR. WALLACE: Do you know who my father was? I'll be here in about 20 years. [Laughter, cheers, applause.]

MR. RUBENSTEIN: Well, I want to thank you all for a great conversation. Let me give you a gift. [Applause.] On behalf of the members of The Economic Club of Washington, I have for each of you a framed copy of the first map of the District of Columbia.

MR. WALLACE: Very nice, thank you.

MS. BORGER: Oh, thank you!

MR. COOK: Thank you very much.

MR. ALLEN: What a treat! Thank you.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: Thanks a lot. Appreciate it. It was great. [Applause.]

---



From left: David Rubenstein, Chris Wallace, Gloria Borger, Charlie Cook, and Mike Allen.

## Chris Wallace

Chris Wallace is the anchor of FOX News Sunday (FNS), Fox's Sunday morning public affairs program. He joined FOX News Channel (FNC) in 2003 and is based in Washington, D.C. 2014 marked his 50th year in the broadcasting industry. In his years at FNC, Wallace has participated in coverage of nearly every major political event. Throughout his 50-plus years in broadcasting, he has won every major broadcast news award for his reporting, including three Emmy Awards, the Dupont-Columbia Silver Baton, the Peabody Award, the Sol Taishoff Award for Broadcast Journalism, awarded to him by the National Press Foundation. Most recently, he received the 2013 Paul White Award for lifetime achievement and service to electronic journalism from the Radio Television Digital News Association. Wallace has been described as "an aggressive journalist," "sharp edged" and "solid" by the *Washington Post* and "an equal-opportunity ravager" by *The Miami Herald*. Before joining FNC, Wallace worked at ABC News for 14 years where he served as the senior correspondent for Primetime Thursday and a substitute host for Nightline.

Prior to joining ABC News, he was with NBC News where he served as the chief White House correspondent from 1982-1989. While at NBC, he covered the 1980, 1984 and 1988 presidential campaigns as well as the Democratic and Republican conventions in those years. Wallace moderated Meet the Press from 1987-1988, making him the only person to have hosted two Sunday talk shows. He also anchored the Sunday edition of NBC Nightly News from 1982-1984 and 1986-1987. Wallace attended Harvard College and began his career with NBC at WNBC-TV (NBC 4) in New York in 1975. Most recently, Wallace became the first journalist from Fox News to moderate a general election presidential debate on October 19th, 2016 at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. He received notable praise from both sides of the aisle for his tough but fair questions to both of the presidential candidates at the third and final debate.

## **Charlie Cook**

There are political junkies, and then there's Charlie Cook--the man who knows more about everything political than anyone else." *The Washingtonian* magazine.

Charlie Cook is Editor and Publisher of the *Cook Political Report*, a political columnist for *National Journal Group* and a political analyst for NBC News. Charlie is considered one of the Nation's leading independent and non-partisan authorities on American politics and U.S. elections. In 2010, Charlie was a co-recipient of the American Political Science Association's prestigious Carey McWilliams award to honor "a major journalistic contribution to our understanding of politics." In the Spring semester of 2013, Charlie served as a Resident Fellow at the Institute of Politics at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard.

Charlie began writing for *National Journal* and its sister publication, *National Journal Daily*, in 1998. Charlie serves as an election night analyst for NBC News and has appeared on *Meet the Press* and *This Week*.

Charlie founded the *Cook Political Report* in 1984 and it has become one of the most respected political publications in the country. *The New York Times* has called Charlie "one of the best political handicappers in the nation" and has said the *Cook Political Report* is "a newsletter which both parties regard as authoritative." The late David Broder wrote in the *Washington Post* that Charlie was "perhaps the best non-partisan tracker of Congressional races," while CBS News' Bob Schieffer called the *Cook Political Report*, "the bible of the political community

## **Gloria Borger**

Gloria Borger is CNN's chief political analyst, appearing regularly on *The Situation Room* with Wolf Blitzer and Anderson Cooper's *AC360* and across the network's primetime programs. Borger plays an instrumental role in the network's daily coverage while reporting on a variety of political and breaking news stories, including America's Choice 2016, the Supreme Court rulings of 2015, the 2014 midterm elections and more.

In September of 2016, Borger reported the documentaries; *All Business: The Essential Donald Trump* and *Almost President: The Agony of Defeat*. In the two-hour long documentary about the life of Donald Trump, Borger went beyond the campaign trail to report in-depth on his journey from childhood to his early years in Manhattan and Atlantic City, to primetime fame, to becoming the Republican nominee for President.

The hour-long documentary *Almost President: The Agony of Defeat* profiles former presidential nominees and how they lived through the greatest public failure in American life, losing the American presidency. Borger interviewed Mitt Romney, John McCain, Michael Dukakis, and Walter Mondale who all described what it's like to live through this process and fail.

In October of 2015, Borger reported the hour-long documentary *Bush v. Gore*, the definitive story of the recount during the election of 2000 with exclusive insider stories from both sides.

In 2012, Borger reported CNN's 90-minute documentary on the life and career of Mitt Romney—his journey in politics and devotion to his Mormon faith. During this project, she traveled to France to report on Romney's missionary life and she conducted several in-depth interviews with Romney as well as his family. After the 2012 election, Borger conducted the first extended post-election interview with Romney and his wife Ann as they candidly discussed the campaign.

Borger also profiled House Budget Chairman Rep. Paul Ryan (R-WI) in 2012, before he became the GOP Vice Presidential nominee for Mitt Romney. Borger also interviewed Joe Biden exclusively prior to the second inauguration of President Obama.

Borger received an Emmy nomination for her 2010 special for CNN, *The Odd Couple*, in which she interviewed powerhouse Washington attorneys David Boies and Ted Olson. The two partisan political opposites teamed up in an unlikely legal alliance in support of same-sex marriage against California's Proposition 8. Borger revisited the topic again in 2013 when their case in support of same-sex marriage was argued before the U.S. Supreme Court. The result was a 30-minute CNN special, *Marriage Warriors: Showdown at the Supreme Court*, which earned a first place 2014 National Headliner Award and the 2014 American Gavel Award from the American Judges Association.

In addition, Borger is the correspondent for an acclaimed series of in-depth specials, *Gloria Borger Reports*. As part of that series, Borger interviewed Vice President Joe Biden exclusively the day before the 2014 midterm elections, as well as a news-making interview with former Defense Secretary Leon Panetta, an in-depth report on presidential dynasties and wide-ranging profiles on political stars and characters as diverse as progressive Sen. Elizabeth Warren (D-MA) to the legendary former Louisiana Governor, Edwin Edwards. The pieces run across all CNN platforms, and add value to the network's daily coverage.

Borger has been a prominent part of all recent CNN election coverage, and was pivotal to CNN's Emmy award-winning election night coverage in 2012. She also played a key role in the network's political coverage for the 2010 midterm elections, as well as the historic *America Votes 2008* coverage, which earned CNN a Peabody Award.

## **Mike Allen**

Mike Allen is the chief White House correspondent for *Politico*. He comes there from *Time* magazine where he was their White House correspondent. Prior to that, Allen spent six years at the *Washington Post*, where he covered President Bush's first term, Capitol Hill, campaign finance, and the Bush, Gore and Bradley campaigns of 2000. Before turning to national politics, he covered schools and local governments in rural counties outside Fredericksburg, Va., for *The Free Lance-Star*, then wrote about Doug Wilder, Oliver North, Chuck Robb, and the Bobbitts for the *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, where he nurtured police sources on overnight ride-alongs

through housing projects. Allen also covered Mayor Giuliani, the Connecticut statehouse, and the wacky rich of Greenwich for *The New York Times*.

Before moving to *The Times*, he did stints in the Richmond and Alexandria bureaus of the *Washington Post*. Allen grew up in Orange County, Calif., and has a B.A. from Washington and Lee University, where he majored in politics and journalism.