

Center for Strategic and International Studies

**Bob Schieffer's "About the News" with H. Andrew Schwartz
Podcast**

Subject: "Dan Balz is the First Political Reporter to Turn To"

**Speaker:
Dan Balz,
Political Correspondent,
The Washington Post**

**Hosts:
H. Andrew Schwartz,
Senior Vice President for External Relations,
CSIS**

**Bob Schieffer,
CBS Political News Contributor;
Former Host, "Face the Nation," CBS News**

Date: Monday October 31, 2016

*Transcript By
Superior Transcriptions LLC
www.superiortranscriptions.com*

(Music plays.)

BOB SCHIEFFER: I'm Bob Schieffer.

H. ANDREW SCHWARTZ: And I'm Andrew Schwartz.

MR. SCHIEFFER: And these are conversations about the news. We are in the midst of a communications revolution. We have access to more information than any people in history. But are we more informed, or just overwhelmed by so much information we can't process it?

MR. SCHWARTZ: These conversations are a year-long collaboration of the Bob Schieffer College of Communication at Texas Christian University and the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington.

(Music plays.)

MR. SCHIEFFER: Today we have with us my long-time friend Dan Balz, the chief correspondent at The Washington Post. To understand this campaign, my advice is: Read Dan Balz in The Washington Post. That is the place to start. Before joining the Post in 1978, Dan was a reporter and editor for The National Journal and the Philadelphia Enquirer. He also served in the U.S. Army from 1968 to 1971. He joined the Post almost 40 years ago and has served as national editor, political editor, White House correspondent, and the paper's Texas-based Southwest correspondent.

He is the author of four books, including two New York Times bestsellers titled, "Collision 2012: Obama vs. Romney and the Future of Elections in America," and "The Battle for America, 2008: The Story of an Extraordinary Campaign" (sic; Election), which he co-authored with Haynes Johnson. He's received many prestigious awards, including the Robin Toner Prize for Excellence in Political Reporting, often appears on Sunday political shows such as "Face the Nation" and on PBS. He's a veteran reporter who's seen it all. And I'm glad that he had a little bit of a break in his schedule, because he's almost on the road all the time now.

Dan, thank you very much for joining us. And let's just start with this campaign. Your book about the 2012 election discussed the future of elections. Did you see this one coming?

DAN BALZ: (Laughs.) Absolutely not. I think like everybody else I've been surprised and occasionally baffled, and often kind of disgusted by the way this campaign has unfolded – but mostly baffled and surprised by it. When I wrote the 2012 book I think my sense was that we were in a period of considerable polarization, partisan polarization, and that that wasn't going to go away and that the election of 2012, in which President Obama defeated Mitt Romney, was not necessarily going to resolve that problem. But what we've gotten in this campaign, Bob, is an overlay on top of that with Donald Trump and all that he has brought with him to the campaign trail.

MR. SCHIEFFER: How do you think he got the nomination?

MR. BALZ: I think a couple of things. One is I think he understood the modern era better than the other politicians – which is to say he understood social media, he was a practiced and professional live television performer – or television performer. He understood the new media. He understood how you could go directly to people through the media.

But I also think he – whether instinctively or accidentally or shrewdly – understood something about the Republican Party that the other candidates who've sought the nomination didn't understand, and that is that there was this part of the Republican Party – call it tea party, call it grassroots insurgents, whatever you want to call it – that distrusted everything about Washington, including the professional political elite of the Republican Party. And he tapped into that. And the combination of that kind of outsized personality, that celebrity that he brought to it, his ability to dominate the message, and his effectiveness at tapping into that grievance population I think combined to let him win.

MR. SCHIEFFER: And you know, I think it was not – this group that he tapped into – was not all in the Republican Party. Some of it, I think, was in the Democratic Party. And those were the ones, I think, in some ways, that were attracted to Bernie Sanders.

MR. BALZ: I think that's right. I mean, both he and Bernie Sanders were tapping into the resentment about political elites, whether it's in Washington or the Wall Street elite or the media elite. And that is not left or right. That is – you know, that is kind of them versus, you know, whoever. And they were both very good at that. And it's one of the reasons Bernie Sanders ran such a strong campaign against Hillary Clinton. But in the Democratic race, she always had so much more that she could bring to the table than Bernie Sanders did. And I think that's why she prevailed.

Within the Republican race, that field was very large and very splintered for a long time. And the other candidates didn't quite know what to do about Donald Trump. Most of them wanted to ignore him for a very long time, to their detriment. It turned out that by the time they kind of woke up and decided they needed to go after him, it was too late. He had too much going and they could never – no candidate could isolate him one-on-one. That was always Ted Cruz's hope, was that they could reduce this to a two-person race. Nobody was able to do that, and so he was – he was able to prevail.

MR. SCHIEFFER: You know, despite his success in the primaries and getting the nomination, I've never been convinced he was all that good a politician, in the conventional sense. I think what he was very good at, and I think you've hit it exactly, he understood in the beginning, because he understood television programming, that if you make yourself available to a certain number of television programs, you're going to get on some of them. And that exposure will lead to more exposure, especially if sometimes you say basically outrageous things. And I think while Jeb Bush was spending his time raising this \$115 million and some of the others were doing the very same thing – including Hillary Clinton on the Democratic side basically running very old-fashioned campaigns, slogging along, as it were – he figured out, while they're doing all that, I'll just go get on television.

MR. BALZ: He was very smart about a couple different things. I mean, I think you're – I think you're right about that. He understood that television advertising in presidential campaigns is much less relevant than we thought it was, and that it used to be. That I can be overwhelmed by what the – you know, what the politicians call earn media, which we call, you know, the media. And so he figured out how to go and get attention that way. And because he said outrageous things, the media came to him. And so his rallies were carried live constantly in that – in that summer of 2015 – the July, August, September period.

I remember having a conversation with Scott Walker, the governor of Wisconsin, who at an early stage in the Republican race was considered if not the frontrunner, one of the two or three frontrunners. And he – we had a conversation after he dropped out, because he disappeared fairly quickly, as it turned out. And he said: The problem for him was he couldn't get any attention. He couldn't find a way – he's not bombastic. He's not flashy. He's a bland Midwesterner. He found that there was no way for him to compete in the environment that Donald Trump had created.

The other thing that we know about Trump is both his use of Twitter and huge Facebook following, and by going on television, particularly going on early in the day, he could say and do things that forced everybody else to react for that day and several days. Another conversation I had with somebody who worked for one of the other Republican candidates, who said there wasn't an interview that we did with the press that didn't either begin with or include the question: Donald Trump said X, what do you think? So all of the others were forced to, in a sense, run Donald Trump's campaign. And he just kept up with that.

MR. SCHIEFFER: You know, it's what – you know the story as well as I do – it's what they call the dead cat theory. And I can't remember – it was this Australian political consultant that came up with the idea. And he said, you know, if you're having a dinner party, no matter what the conversation is about, if somebody throws a dead cat on the table suddenly everybody is talking about the dead cat. And we saw that through this campaign time after time. No matter what the narrative was, Trump would come up with one of these things and suddenly, as you point out, everybody was talking about that very thing.

MR. BALZ: And the interesting thing was a lot of the things he said and did were problematic. I mean, for a normal politician they would have inflicted considerable damage. One of Trump's – I don't know whether it was luck or skill or whatever – but Trump had the ability, whenever he was kind of in a bind like that, to do or say something if not necessarily worse, dramatic, that drew attention away from the problem he had and moved on.

MR. SCHIEFFER: The dead cat on the table.

MR. BALZ: That's right. So he was constantly throwing dead cats on the table, partly to get himself out of problems. But he also had the ability to survive some of those because the people who were for him just believed that he was what the country needed, that the country needed somebody who was just going to blow it all up, shake it all up, you know. And so he could say things and do things and never lose the allegiance of those people. And they were clearly enough to get him through the nomination.

MR. SCHIEFFER: What was interesting to me is that you don't really understand his appeal until you go to one of his rallies. And I say that as one who's been interviewing him for 30 years. I interviewed him after he made the ice freeze over in that ice rink in Central Park, which was a great story. I mean, the city had spent 11 million on it. They couldn't get the ice to freeze over. He said, let me take it over. And he did. Three months he had people skating in Central Park. It was a terrific story. And I remembered, you know, going up to his office. It wasn't Trump Tower in those days, but it was in another skyscraper. And he gave a fascinating interview.

But even though I had interviewed him all those years, I had never seen him in action on the stump, as it were. And I took Lucy Boyd, the producer who worked with me. We were down at the South Carolina primary. And we went out to a Trump rally. We divided the place up in two – and you do the same thing. Lucy went to one side of the house. I went to the other. We asked people: What do you like about Donald Trump? And to a person – if we interviewed 30 people that evening, 28 of them must have told us, I like him because he's not afraid to speak his mind. And it quickly became obvious to me that it was not so much what he was saying, but the fact that he was saying it that these people liked.

MR. BALZ: Well, I think that's a really smart point, because we are so used to, after so many years of political candidates and presidential candidates speaking language that comes out of polling and focus groups, language that is tested, phrases that are tested, that are designed to touch buttons to bring people behind that particular candidate – Donald Trump didn't do that. Donald Trump just spoke like Donald Trump. He spoke in a language that regular folks understood, there was a simple phraseology. It wasn't grandiose language. It wasn't what you would call a message, in the – you know, in the context that we now think of political messaging.

It was Donald Trump who, night after night, would get up – and I also said to people, it's like he is carrying on a continuing conversation from one rally to another, from one day to another. He kind of picks up where he left off the day before. It's like he's bringing you up to date on things, whether it's the latest polls, whether it's, you know, the news of the day. In all of that, he mixed, you know, his call for a wall on the U.S.-Mexican border and his – you know, his disagreement with every trade deal that had ever been cut, and the need for – you know, to do something about ISIS and national security. But it was – it was said and done in a way that was unique to politics.

MR. SCHIEFFER: Do you think because he did talk like that, and it seemed to spontaneous, is that what make him such a striking contrast to Hillary Clinton? Because throughout this campaign, you know, and the story on her always was she sounds rehearsed, she sounds vetted, you can't get an interview with her. I always thought it kind of the difference between a light artillery and a heavy World War I kind of artillery, where the mules were pushing the – pulling the big guns through the mud – (laughs) – and it took them a month to get from one place to another, and while a light artillery could just kind of, you know, hop and skip like the Viet Cong used to do in Vietnam. And hearing you say that, that he just kept continuing this conversation, maybe that's why her rhetoric did sometimes seem so stilted and so rehearsed.

MR. BALZ: Well, two things. One is, I mean, Trump was spontaneous – and spontaneous to a fault, often. And we've seen that very much so in the general election, the consequence of that. But he was. He was – you know, he was not necessarily rehearsed. He would bring – you know, he would have some notes with him when he spoke, and he would go off on tangents, and if you ever tried to diagram a paragraph of Donald Trump's speeches at a rally you'd – you know, if you were an English teacher, you'd drive your head crazy.

But for Hillary Clinton there was never a sense of spontaneity about it. I mean, this was a – this was a – this was a big, in a sense, old-fashioned campaign, one that was successful through – you know, against Bernie Sanders, and looks in a very strong position as we speak before the election. But there was a moment – there was a funny moment, Bob. This was back last fall. And it was the night of the Jefferson-Jackson Dinner in Iowa. It's always a big event during a presidential year. And she was there and Sanders was there. Big crowd. All the activists were there.

And Sanders had a – you know, a cheering squad up in the – you know, up in the balcony – or, not the balcony – up in the bleachers. Everybody was on the arena floor at tables who had paid for tickets. But he had a big group off the floor. And at a moment before the formal speeches began, he got up and he walked across the floor and he went right up into the crowd and, you know, just cheering and I mean, it was just this moment of the way Bernie Sanders operated. And one of Clinton's people was standing close to where we were. We were in the press pen at that point.

And somebody said to him: Why – you know, did you ever go – why didn't you guys do something like that? And he said, it would have taken us a week to plan that – to plan that spontaneous event. And that was – you know, it was a very funny joke on his part, but so telling because it was – there was very little about the way she has campaigned that has been spontaneous.

MR. SCHIEFFER: I wonder, though, in Trump's case, you live by the sword you die by the sword. He lived by getting on television, but now that he's been on television, like a lot of reality shows, people eventually get tired of them. And now we see some of his television exposure has been very negative rather than very positive, I would judge.

MR. BALZ: I think part of – I mean, you're absolutely right. And I think part of what happened was that, as you said, Trump is not a traditional politician and he may not even be a good politician. And what worked for him in the primaries was not necessarily going to work for him in the general election. And most people who have watched politics for a long time recognized that. Donald Trump did not recognize that. Donald Trump in one way or another wanted to replay the primaries. He thought he had taught everybody a lesson by winning the nomination and that therefore he understood in ways that he believed nobody else did how you campaign for the presidency.

And I think a couple of things happened. One was he continued to make unforced errors. And they had much greater consequence because he needed after the primaries – as every general election candidate does – he needed to reach beyond the base that got him to the

nomination. And he didn't know how to do that. He wasn't prepared to do that. He didn't know who he really wanted to go after. And so he would, you know, one day after another offend the very kinds of voters he needed to expand his coalition.

And I think the other thing that happened was that the more he said and did things, the more he was called to account by the press for those things he said and did. I mean, we've never had a candidate who has told so many falsehoods, so many lies as Donald Trump has in this campaign. And you know, the press is a little bit – was, as always, a little big ginger about those things in the early stages, but the more he did it the more it was clear that, as reporters, you had to set the record straight. You had to make it clear that many of the things he was saying were simply not true.

And so he never was able to make that shift. I mean, to him, it was, you know, the rigged system and a media that's determined to bring him down. But he was bringing himself down by the way he campaigned and the things he said.

MR. SCHIEFFER: Now that we're past the debates, where do you think the campaign is?

MR. BALZ: Well, I think Hillary Clinton is in a very strong position. The polls have widened, and they've widened to the point that, you know, we're looking at, at this point unless something happens dramatic, we're looking at a relatively easy victory for her. I mean, she's up five, six points on average. Some polls have her up eight, nine, 10 points. And if you think back, you know, President Obama won in 2012 by barely four points, not quite four points, and he got 332 electoral votes. She looks very strong in more than enough states to have a comfortable electoral majority.

And the remarkable thing is, I mean, there are – you know, there are states that are traditional battlegrounds. Florida is a battleground right now. North Carolina is a battleground right now. Ohio is a battleground right now. All of which is to be expected. Donald Trump has to win all three of those states if he hopes to become president. And even that won't get him there. So he needs – you know, he needs beyond that. The other is that Hillary Clinton is knocking on the door in Arizona. Georgia is more competitive than it ought to be. I don't know how that one will come out, but that's closer than it ought to be for Donald Trump. And Texas, a state that you and I know well, is in single digits in virtually every recent poll.

Now, again, I'm not suggesting that Texas is going to go for Hillary Clinton, but the fact that the electoral map looks the way it does, she's in a very commanding position. And Donald Trump – Donald Trump started the debates a little bit behind. He has ended the debates farther behind. And you know, we're now down to two weeks, a matter of days, really, in the great scheme of things, for him to dramatically change the equation. So it's really – he's in a very tough spot.

MR. SCHIEFFER: He basically at this point, I would think, would have to run the table on all the battleground states. I don't think he can lose one of them.

MR. BALZ: No. He has to win Ohio. He has to win Florida. He has to win North Carolina. And you know, they always looked at Pennsylvania as a state that because of his particular constituency – strong with – you know, with working class white voters. And Pennsylvania has a fair number of those voters. Pennsylvania was relatively close in 2012. It was five points. It wasn't – you know, it was closer than many other states. So I think they looked at Pennsylvania. They also looked initially at Michigan and Wisconsin as states that they could – they could perhaps win. Those seem off the table at this point. Pennsylvania seems pretty much off the table. So where else does he go?

He would – you know, he would have to have Nevada, which has been pretty competitive. He would have to have Iowa, where he's actually been leading in many of the polls. But even that might not quite be enough. So he's struggling mightily. And we see from him schedule that he seems to be looking at, you know, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Florida, and North Carolina, and then an occasional other state. But he would have to run the table.

MR. SCHIEFFER: What do you think at this point, Dan, that the impact on the Republican Party is going to be?

MR. BALZ: Well, I was in Gettysburg on Saturday morning when Donald Trump went to give a speech laying out his hundred-day agenda. And what was striking to me was the irony of him speaking at this place where we had one of the most historic battles of the Civil War, and you can see a civil war inside the Republican Party brewing, unless, you know, something totally unexpected happens. But I think – I think almost win or lose – and certainly if he loses – there is going to be a battle in the Republican Party for the future of the party, because even if he loses, the Trump constituency won't necessarily disappear.

How does that constituency get managed? Where do they – I mean, if they are angry and upset over the result of this election, how do they – how do they register that? Do they take it out on the Paul Ryans of the world, who've been ambivalent about Donald Trump, to say the least? Do they take it out on others in the party who've been more openly hostile to Donald Trump, who say they are not going to vote for Donald Trump? I mean, there's a division between the Republican Party that's going to have to get sorted out. And it's a different kind of division than we've seen before, because it really is kind of the establishment Republicans versus the Trump constituency. So that's the battle ahead.

MR. SCHIEFFER: And within that – well, it's not within the Trump constituency, but I just think of the Senate. If Marco Rubio wins, which he may or he may not – but if he wins, you've got Marco Rubio, you've got Ted Cruz, who's still hanging around. Over on the House side you've got Paul Ryan, who's kind of the leader of the – what I would call the establishment Republicans right now. And you can name three or four others. Do you think that the party could actually break their hand? I mean, could we see a new party emerge out of this?

MR. BALZ: You know, I'm not quite ready to go that far, but other people have suggested that that's possible, that it could just split. And that in a sense you have the formation of a – you know, what I would call a grievance party, a party that feels alienated from the political system and the political process, and that feels that nobody in power is speaking for

them or working on their behalf. You know, that's not by any means at this point a party big enough to be majority party, but it would – it would – you know, it would destroy the Republican Party as we know it.

My guess is that they somehow kind of muddle through and try to keep it patched together. But if you think of, you know, the three people you name – Marco Rubio, Ted Cruz, Paul Ryan – all are prospective 2020 candidates if Hillary Clinton is president. How do they operate? Do they say, well, it's important for us as Republicans to show that we can help to solve some problems, and therefore they work with Hillary Clinton, knowing that there's a part of the party – and a significant part of the party – for whom Hillary Clinton is anathema. I mean, they just – they can't stand her.

So if they work with a President Clinton to get things done, there's a price to be paid. If they don't, is the Republican Party continuing to isolate itself as a party simply of no, that doesn't have a governing agenda?

MR. SCHIEFFER: Obviously if she wins this time, she'll be a candidate next time. Who are the other people on the Democratic bench that you see right now?

MR. BALZ: Well, that's a great question because it's – you know, I mean, in a sense, because of this election in particular, the – Hillary Clinton was such a strong figure that she's kind of kept everybody else down. I mean, there's just been no room for people to come forward. And the other problem for the Democrats is that they are weak where you generally think of the – you know, the stable for grooming presidential candidates, and that's in the governors. I mean, the Republicans are so dominant in the gubernatorial races.

So the Democrats – I mean, there are some – you know, there are some young attractive Democrats, and a number of women who are, you know, attractive in that field, as much or more as the men. But in terms of exactly who that's going to be, I think as long as Hillary Clinton is president it makes it tougher. Now, obviously, she's elevated Senator Tim Kaine as the vice-presidential nominee. And if he's the vice president he would be in a – you know, in a strong position if she – you know, if she serves two terms.

It's also possible that she could end up as a one-term president. I mean, if you think of the last president who succeeded a two-term president of the same party it was George H. W. Bush. He made it only through one term. So she – you know, she'll have a tricky going, and no easy – no easy time governing in this environment.

MR. SCHIEFFER: Let me ask you a little bit about what you think of the job that we in the media have done. And I had a very interesting conversation with Marty Baron, who's obviously the executive editor of The Washington Post. He said: I don't even like to call it the media anymore because it is so diverse. I mean, it's the Post and the Times and The Wall Street Journal, the networks, and CNN and Fox News, I would include them in that too. And then there's just a whole bunch of other entities that have suddenly come to the fore.

And as we are finding out in this series of podcasts that we're doing, they have amazing

influence – influence that didn't really understand at the beginning of this election cycle. How do you think we're doing? Are people more informed? Are they getting the news they need to get? Is there something that we in our section of the journalistic landscape could be doing that we're not doing?

MR. BALZ: I think people are getting more information than they've ever had. And they are choosing, in a sense, what that information looks like, how it's shaped. People get information that now generally conforms with their view of the world. That's not healthy, but that's reality. And I don't think there's anything on the horizon that's going to change that. I mean, I think your point is right. There is no, quote, unquote, "media" anymore. This is not the era that you and I started out in.

And there's good aspects of that. I mean, I think in many ways the democratization of media has been healthy. There are no gatekeepers anymore. There's no three or four news organizations that in a sense can decide what the vast, you know, majority of Americans get in terms of news and information. All of that's healthy. The problem is it's – you know, it's atomized the political conversation. It's atomized the country. And it's contributed to the partisan division that we now see across, you know, the political spectrum.

I think there's no way to judge the performance of the media in this. There have been some institutions and organizations that have done very well. There have been others that have not done so well. I think every news organization has to take stock of itself. I mean, one of the decisions that Post made early on when Donald Trump announced was we don't know whether he's going to be a serious long-distance runner or somebody who's going to, you know, collapse very quickly. But we started taking him seriously, which is to say we started doing real reporting and accountability reporting.

We've been – we've been proud of that. You know, there are things we haven't done which we probably should have done. But on balance, we feel pretty good about that. But I've never gone through a campaign in which there has been more advice offered to the media from, you know, interested citizens and angry citizens as to how we're falling short and what we ought to be doing and how we ought to be editing the news, and what we should or shouldn't be writing about.

And so I think that there – this campaign has produced a kind of critical framework for the press. I think it's forced every reporter, it's forced every editor to think about the way we do our business and what's the right way to do it in this kind of an environment and with this kind of a candidate, like Donald Trump. You know, we'll wake up on November 9th and there will – you know, there won't be a campaign there, but I don't think that changes – I don't think we revert back to, you know, where we were before this campaign started. I think that this campaign has kind of tuned everybody up, and we'll see where it goes after that.

MR. SCHIEFFER: If there is one thing that is changing as dramatically as the media, as we call it, is the communications landscape, it is the political infrastructure itself of this country. You did a fascinating piece about the changing demographics. I don't think the surprised any of us, but when you see it all put down in one place at one time, it's pretty striking, isn't it?

MR. BALZ: Well, the dramatic thing – I mean, we’ve known that this is a changing country. I mean, this – we see that census to census and we see it anytime you go somewhere. I mean, you just see that this is a much more diverse country than it’s ever been. And it’s also a country that’s going through transformation, not just demographically but culturally and economically. But what’s happened is, with the two political parties, the Democrats are becoming more diverse at a faster pace than the country and the Republicans are becoming more diverse at a slower pace than the rest of the country. And so in a sense what you’ve got now are two political parties that are in a different place than they were, let’s say, when Bill Clinton was elected in 1992.

And the – you know, the Democrats have always thought of themselves as the party of the working person, the blue-collar worker. Well, a lot of those white blue-collar workers have migrated toward the Republican Party. But what we’re seeing is the country is becoming more educated every year, and every 10 years. More college graduates. The Republican Party has grown more rapidly among people without college degrees. The Democratic Party has grown more rapidly among people with college degrees. And so you also have that. And that division in this election, at least, has been one of the most striking in terms of the Trump constituency versus the Clinton constituency.

The Republicans – you know, so, in a sense, the Republicans are on the wrong side of these demographic shifts. They’ve got to do something to – you know, to reach beyond an almost entirely white base of support. I mean, in 2012 nine of every 10 votes that Mitt Romney got came from a white voter. I think it was four or four and a half of every 10 votes that President Obama got was from a non-white voter. The Republicans need to do better with non-white voters. And they need to find a way to bring back those white college graduates that have migrated away from them because of Donald Trump.

MR. SCHIEFFER: One thing that really underlines that is that Mitt Romney, this is something you know, got a larger percentage of the white vote in 2012 than Ronald Reagan got in 1980.

MR. BALZ: But the country is – you know, I mean –

MR. SCHIEFFER: Has changed.

MR. BALZ: The country was, what, 88 – the electorate was 88 percent white in 1980.

MR. SCHIEFFER: Yeah. I was just looking at some of these figures from the Pew survey that you referred to in your column. Non-Hispanic whites now make up 57 percent of all Democratic and Democratic-leaning registered voters. That is compared to 76 percent in 1992. That’s really an astonishing number. And while the change has been more modest in the Republican Party – 86 percent of Republicans and Republican-leaning registered voters are non-Hispanic whites, compared with 93 percent in 1992. I mean, the two parties – they’re much – the differences between the two are just strikingly different and just in that short period of time.

MR. BALZ: And, Bob, what's interesting is the Republican Party did its now-famous autopsy after the 2012 election. And one of the strongest recommendations was the Republican Party has to find a way to reach out and attract support from Hispanics and, to some extent, from African Americans. That's a tougher – that's a tougher constituency for Republicans. But they identified specifically the need to do that. And it looks as though they may be worse off at the end of this campaign than they were when they lost the 2012 election.

MR. SCHIEFFER: All right. Well, Dan Balz, you're doing a great job out there, as you always do. And I mean what I said at the beginning of this podcast. To understand this election, the first thing anybody needs to do is read your column and stay up with what you're thinking about.

MR. BALZ: Thank you, Bob. I appreciate that.

MR. SCHIEFFER: You're always very close to what we need to know.

This is Bob Schieffer. Thanks for joining us.

MR. SCHWARTZ: But that's not all, Bob. At the top of this podcast we gave you just a tease of the great music from my friend Aaron Neville's new record, Apache. Let's hear some more from Aaron Neville. I just know this record's going to win a Grammy.

(Music plays.)

If you like this podcast, leave us a review on iTunes, visit us at CSIS.org, and check out the Schieffer College of Communication at SchiefferCollege.TCU.edu.

(END)