

Center for Strategic and International Studies

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

Subject: "The New Yorker's Jill Lepore"

**Speaker:
Jill Lepore,
Staff Writer,
The New Yorker**

**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: Wednesday November 23, 2016

(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're at Harvard to talk to Jill Lepore, Harvard professor and staff writer for The New Yorker. She's taught at Harvard since 2003. She teaches classes on historical methods, the humanities, and American political history. She's been a staff writer at The New Yorker since 2005, writing about everything from women's breastfeeding practices to the 2016 presidential election. She's also written several books, including the recent bestseller, "The Secret History of Wonder Woman." She's a master of long-form journalism, known for her wittiness and her poignant observations. And, I might mention, my new good friend up here at Harvard. Andrew Schwartz will be along, chatting in from time to time, but from back in Washington.

But, Jill, let me just start off by saying how happy I am to have you here with us today. Let's just start with your general impressions. What happened Tuesday? Did you see it coming?

JILL LEPORE: (Laughs.) No, I didn't see it coming. I'm waiting to have a dinner party with someone who wants to tell me they saw it coming so that I can, I don't know, stamp my fork down in anger. No, and the surprise was I think even right down in Trump campaign headquarters. And one of the things I think is so interesting about that is really the role that the polls play, which is finally a question about journalism. So I think polls are often seen by people as being a social science, but really they're a form of journalism.

MR. SCHIEFFER: Yeah. And you know, one of the interesting things to me, and I think one of the things that – I'll just say this – that I think we did wrong, we did not talk enough during this campaign about the margin of error, which in the past it seems like we did. But we'd have these polls come out and say Hillary Clinton is leading by one point, or Donald Trump is leading by two points. Nobody leads by one or two points. That's within the margin of error. So if the poll said she's leading by one point, she could have been behind by one or two points. And that's what we've always kind of taken for granted. And somehow or other, we never got around to talking about that during this campaign.

MS. LEPORE: It's funny, because I think there are more polls taken in this campaign than ever before, and yet – the polls were more influential on the political process than ever before. At the same time, as we know, that the polls were less reliable than they've been ever before. There's been a crisis in polling really for decades now that has been well-remarked upon by people in the polling industry.

I remember when I was – I was reporting a piece on the history of polling last summer, the summer of 2015, before things really even began. And I came across this story that Mark Blumenthal, the pollster who has the website pollster.com. And he told a story about when he was at a polling organization in the 1980s, and the response rate – that is, the percentage of people asked to participate in a poll who actually agreed to it – had fallen into the 60s from – when polling started in the 1930s it was in the 90s. Anybody who was asked to take a poll, because it's a civic duty, it would be thrilling to answer.

And it had fallen to the 60s. And he said, if it gets below 50 we're out of business. Do you know what it is now? It's in the single digits. More than 90 percent of people asked to take a poll refuse to do it.

MR. SCHIEFFER: Well, I'll tell you just in real numbers. At the CBS/New York Times poll, which I think is one of the best, we spend more money on ours than anybody else does, in order to get 1,500 people in a random sample we used to call 3,000 people. We now have to call 30,000 people to get 1,500 people. And I don't care how you weight a poll, you still got to wonder who are those 1,500 people? And how accurate is it, what they tell you?

MS. LEPORE: Yeah. And there are all kinds of, you know, pollsters who want to defend that practice of publishing polls even though the response rate is so low that they've had to call that many people and get that many nos. Well, they'll say – they will admit that it's not a representative sample, in its random sense, because there may be – for instance, they're calling only landlines, if it's a phone call. And young people don't have landlines anymore. And especially people without a lot of money, and who are moving from apartment to apartment, don't have a landline.

So, say – they will say – and the percentage of the population maybe 8 percent of the population is Latino, Spanish-speaking. But in their sample, they were only able to find, like, one young Latino to answer the phone. And then they weight that person's response in proportion to the 8 percent of the electorate that they represent. That is, they overcount the very small handful of people from unrepresented populations in their sample.

So they'll say, well, we fixed that because we have these weighting algorithms. And, you know, you can't count a person nine times and expect that they represent their – I mean, there's a whole social science behind that. But it gets fishier and fishier and dodgier and dodgier. And that's why this whole industry, the kind of Nate Silver FiveThirtyEight industry, has blossomed of poll aggregators, where that whole industry is based on the reality that polls are unreliable, that the way to have them be reliable is to aggregate them to cancel out their errors.

MR. SCHIEFFER: You know, well, one thing to say, in defense of the polls, they all

showed it was very close, I think, for the most part. But they got – it turned the wrong way. They had it close and they had it that Hillary Clinton was going to eke out a close victory. I, for one, never thought that there'd be a landslide either way. And the polls were close, but at the end they turned the way that most of us were surprised that that's how it came out.

Do you think that's the main reason that we were all so surprised, the polling? Is that – is that what you think is at the heart of it?

MS. LEPORE: No. I think there's a – I think it's – I think there's an opportunity for a lot of scrutiny of the polling industry that is overdue. And this is an opportunity to do that. I don't think that's the main reason for the outcome of the election. And actually, I don't think the problem with polling has to do with the accuracy or inaccuracy of the polling. I think it has to do with the way that polling moves us toward something closer to a direct democracy than the system was set up to accommodate. And it interferes with the political process. Polling can be really accurate and I think still be a problem because of the way it interferes with the process.

But, no, I think – I do think, at the end of the day – I wrote a little piece last week about the speech that Frederick Douglass gave in 1862 when the Civil War began. It's called, "The Reason for Our Troubles." And Douglass said – you know, Douglass had escaped from slavery in 1838 when he was 20 years old, and had become this incredibly prominent public speaker. And he said, you know, people want to wonder how did we get to this – our sad and deplorable state, where we're fighting one another. And most people blamed the election of Abraham Lincoln. And a number of other people blamed the radicalism of abolitionists. And then a third group of people blamed Southern politicians for their villainy or their duplicity.

And – (laughs) – Douglass said, I'm sorry, but the real reason is slavery. Like, the cause of this war is slavery. And it's a chain that binds on both ends. You can't attach a shackle to the leg of a black man and not understand that the other end of it is around your own neck. And I thought a lot about that speech. It was very beautiful, powerful address, at a time when people were not – people did not believe the Civil War, at the time, was caused by slavery. They really talked about other causes.

And the piece I ended up writing was about, really, there were a lot of explanations for this outcome. But really, it's inequality. It's economic inequality that's been widening since the 1960s. The existing political parties, in their polarized state – the polarization is partly caused by that inequality, and they can't accommodate a policy solution. And inequality, like slavery, binds at both ends.

MR. SCHIEFFER: So, in your view, what happened here was that Donald Trump struck a chord that maybe some others in the political system just didn't see or hear?

MS. LEPORE: If you go back through the congressional record and look for talk about income inequality on the floor of Congress before, say, 2010 – which is around when some of the Thomas Piketty capitalism stuff starts coming out in journal articles and making its way into magazines – you don't actually find a lot of – people don't even really use the word. There's just really not a lot of explicit conversation about what is within the world of academic research a

very well-chronicled incredible stagnation among whites in particular who are high school educated, who just have not been seeing any economic – any wage gains since the 1960s. For two generations their real incomes have, in fact, been declining.

And you don't see hardly anyone talk about it, except for Bernie Sanders. I remember when Sanders made – when he made that eight-hour long quasi-filibuster speech, it's one of the first times there really is national press coverage of the widening income inequality in the United States, and what a kind of looming political crisis that represents. So by the time you get – I think really – there's not even that much in the campaign of 2012. I mean, you probably remember better than I having been so close to it and paid such close attention to it.

But around 2013 and 2014, you start hearing a lot of Republicans, who are eying a presidential bid, they're talking about income inequality all of a sudden. Ted Cruz, Marco Rubio – these guys begin talking about income inequality. And they're doing it because they're lining themselves up to run for the nomination. But they're also blaming Obama's administration for widening income inequality. So they want to sort of pretend that this is a problem that just started in 2009. And the way to secure their national reputations is to become spokespeople for that.

And some of the traction that they get, actually, is by spreading that word around. And that's where all of Sanders' traction comes from. I mean, he's really striking that same chord. But nobody does it the way Trump does it.

MR. SCHIEFFER: You know, I – one of the few things I got right in this cycle was – I came up here to Harvard last fall. And I said I thought Donald Trump was going to get the Republican nomination, because people were so mad. And I said – but what I didn't understand – I thought they were mad about the government being in gridlock. I live in Washington. I report on the Congress. I thought that's what they were mad about.

But those people out in Ohio, and you get out into the – into the middle of the country, that's just inside baseball to them. They weren't thinking about it in those terms at all. They were thinking about, they didn't have a job, they had no hope of getting training to get another job, there just wasn't any other place to turn. It was much more basic than I thought it was. And when somebody says, you know, I'm going to get you a job, it really – it really struck home to them. And I think that's the part I didn't really – I knew they were mad, but I really didn't understand how deep the anger was and really where it – really where it came from.

MS. LEPORE: Yeah. And I think how it can be marshalled as a political force, that kind of anger, by an effective speaker.

MR. SCHIEFFER: What did you think about Trump's approach? I mean, I went to his rallies and I heard him say things. What I later came to understand was that the people who really liked him, his core support, did not take him literally. I did. But I had people say to me after the election, already – that voted for Trump – look, I knew he wasn't going to build a wall. But I knew he was going to do something about immigration. And to me, that's different than other campaigns. Does it strike you as different?

MS. LEPORE: The way that people heard him, the different ways that people heard him?

MR. SCHIEFFER: Yes.

MS. LEPORE: Yeah. It is different and it's really interesting because so much of what Trump said in public, how his supporters, when I talked to them, said these are things I would only ever say in private. So where people were outraged by some of other things that he said in public, it was – it was that they had never heard them before. And yet, they're being spoken all over the country all the time. So there's a kind of closeted feel. I think some of that anger has not been seen, perceived by the press because the press has done a bad job. And this is a huge crisis from American journalism. There's just no two ways about it.

MR. SCHIEFFER: Do you think that part of it is because some people voted for Trump that didn't want people to know in advance who they were going to vote for? Was there a hidden Trump vote?

MS. LEPORE: Yeah. I haven't seen the research on that. I'm sure that's something that people will poke at an attempt to investigate. But it's sort of like the – it's like the whitelash argument. It takes you very far, because there is so much racist language and rhetoric with a lot of these – some of – the sort of dog-whistle argument about Trump. But then you look at those voters, and they voted for Obama. You know, and a lot of them voted for Obama twice before they voted for Trump. They were voters who were voting for change.

MR. SCHIEFFER: Let's bring in Andrew Schwartz in Washington. Andrew.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Thank you, Bob. And, you know, it's been another calm week in Washington while you've been up at Harvard. I can – I can tell you that first hand. (Laughs.) It is – it's nuts down here. The media's going crazy. As you all just discussed, the media has lost a lot of credibility over this election. Trump continues to spend time taking shots at the media too. And this week he's directed his tweets at The New York Times over their reporting on this transition. Do you think the so-called elite media companies, like The New York Times and The Washington Post, need to recalibrate their approach to covering the news?

MS. LEPORE: This is a question close to me. OK. That's a big question. You know, I think that they will. They have to. There has to be a great deal of self-scrutiny that's required here, on the part of elite media organizations. But I think in some ways the bigger question has to do with the non-elite media organizations. I think the scrutiny that Facebook is required to do right now is a much harder piece of business. Isn't it, I think, the case that 60 percent of Americans get their news exclusively from their Facebook newsfeed now?

MR. SCHWARTZ: Sixty percent of adults get some of their news from Facebook, that's right.

MS. LEPORE: That's an extraordinary filter of news from an organization, from a

company – a for-profit company, whose primary work is not journalism, and that doesn't have a kind of ethical board or an editorial board that's doing the work of thinking about that. I mean, I think it's not some sinister conspiracy on Facebook's part by any means, but it is an unintended consequence of Facebook's growing market, and its expansion of the services that it provides to its users.

I think that's really a concern. I mean, I know Google is having a big news summit next month where they're bringing in reporters from around the country to talk about Google News. And you know, the worry that there are a lot of people in Silicon Valley who are having an extraordinary effect on our political process and have never thought about what that affect is. It's one thing for a manufacturer to, you know, invent and sell a new version of its vacuum cleaner. And it might be a really fascinating leap head in the technology of vacuum cleaning. But it doesn't fundamentally change the idea of popular sovereignty.

But for a media – or, for a de facto media organization to inadvertently deliver the news to 60 percent of Americans without thinking about the relationship between the press and democracy, that's a whole other kind of question, and a bigger problem. Facebook has a lot more on its plate than The New York Times.

MR. SCHWARTZ: That's a really good point. But do you think the mainstream media, though – which reaches tens of millions of Americans too – has the ability to shape the public's view of Trump's presidency? Or do think niche news outlets are going to have more influence?

MS. LEPORE: That's hard to say. You know, one of the things we were just – you know, Bob and I have been talking about polls. I was at the Nieman Foundation, yesterday, for Journalism here speaking to the Nieman fellows. And we were talking about – and there's been a lot of chatter about – The New York Times had this moving needle on Election Day, where they began the morning at 9:00 a.m. when polls opened on the East Coast with giving Hillary Clinton an 84 percent chance of winning as odds, as sort of betting odds. And by the end of the evening it was – you know, Trump was up at 95 percent, he had the chance.

And one of the questions about that display on The New York Times homepage is I do not doubt that a lot of people looked at that and thought that was actually a poll, that 84 percent of Americans polled were going to vote for Clinton, as opposed to odds. And you know, Bob was saying that the margin of error isn't reported, but there's a lot – there's been a lot of sloppiness about the representation – this whole new field of data journalism is something that I think requires a great deal of scrutiny because although we've paid a lot of attention and a lot of columns have been written about the decline of the fact and post-truth, we believe that data is true. (Laughs.)

And so actually, the problem is not so much entirely that we have lost faith in facts because of fake news sites and the inability of fact check organizations to get their message heard or to overrun the original wrong fact, but equally dangerous is the faith that we place in data, as if data is a kind of higher category of truth than any other form of representation.

MR. SCHIEFFER: You know, let me get back to Google and Facebook. They have – to

their credit – have now decided to ban fake news, where they – where they find it. And that opens up a whole new area. How do you know it's – how do you know it's fake news or is it simply parody? And what does this do to parody, satire, which has always been a part of communications. But at least they're doing that.

But you really have put your finger on what we're dealing with today. I mean, people ask me how did the media do this and that. I said, well, I actually thought my part of the media – the mainstream media – did pretty well. I think there was a lot of good reporting in The New York Times and The Washington Post. But it didn't reach a lot of the people in this country. Nicco Mele, who heads the Shorenstein Center over at the Kennedy School, pointed out to me that in 2004 one reporter in 10 lived in either Washington or New York. Now 12 years later, one reporter in five lives in New York or Washington.

That tells you that in the middle of the country, where newspapers are having such a difficult time right now, there are a lot of people that are just not getting all of the news. And some of them, maybe they're getting most of their news now from social media. And as you well know, I mean, those of us in mainstream media, we have a certain set of standards that we follow. Mainly, we don't publish anything unless we've gone to some trouble to find out if it's true or not. And if you're a young fella sitting in his mamma's basement at 3:00 in the morning, and you suddenly have discovered the meaning of life, he doesn't follow quite the standards that we do before publishing. And now, in this digital age, this stuff goes around the world and back before you have a chance to knock it down. And to me, that's one of the things we learned here.

MS. LEPORE: Absolutely. And, you know, I agree that there has been a tremendous amount of really rigorous, fascinating reporting done by some of the major news outlets and by some smaller news outlets. And, you know, one of the things that I really cherish is a piece that Evan Osnos wrote for The New Yorker in the summer of 2015 about Trump supporters, well-before anyone was paying any attention to Trump's candidacy, except for his supporters. And it is a really a prescient piece.

But I think there's actually something else lost that we haven't really begun to notice and think about. And that is, with the closing down of those newsrooms and the beat reporters in the city halls in the small towns and the newspaper death watch that happened a number of years ago, where we just kind of watched the small-town papers and small city papers drop off one by one, and they replacement of a lot of beat reporting and man on the street interviewing with polling. Instead of going to the bar and to the tavern and to the PTA meeting and to the corner park and talking to a bunch of ordinary people and having little vignettes in the story it's cheaper to reproduce the results of a poll. And it provides the guise of greater accuracy. A piece of what's lost there is not just the accuracy of the stories themselves, but the civic work of those interviews.

If you think about the number of conversations and the minutes and the hours – the endless hours of all those reporters across the country, maybe thinking 30 years when people were really out there in the month before the election, going to every tiny little gathering, anything's going on at city hall, there's going to be a community meeting about, you know, renovation in this park and I'm going to go to this new opening of the new car dealership down

on Bloomdale Street and talk to people and say, what do you think this election? And how do you feel about this ballot referendum? It's actually the conversation – the conversations that those reporters had with people, with one other, face-to-face, that does a lot of the work of gluing together our civic community.

And when what's that replace by is now a data science company extracting data from your Facebook record and predicting your vote that way, and reporting it to a campaign or to a news organization that's going to represent that, there's just – actually, where there was once this ongoing national conversation face to face, there's – now there's silence.

MR. SCHIEFFER: You know, I want to talk to you a little bit about long-form journalism, and what you think the future of that is. I mean, you are – I don't know how you do what you do. I mean, I'm still in awe of the fact that you wrote a 6,000-word piece after the Democratic and Republican conventions, and got it the magazine within a week. I don't know how you did it.

MS. LEPORE: (Laughs.) I didn't sleep for a week.

MR. SCHIEFFER: I don't know how you did it. What do you think the future of magazines is, because there are not nearly as many magazines as there used to be? Well, there are a lot of – you know, there are special interest magazines, but I mean magazines like The New Yorker, Vanity Fair.

MS. LEPORE: Yeah. Well, I think, you know, it's an ecosystem, is the model that I think. And there are a lot of endangered species, and there are some species that have gone extinct. And every other organism in the ecosystem suffers with every extinction. It's great when things evolve and new species come along. And some things die out and they should die out. And, you know, it's not the end of the world. But there are some real losses in the journalistic ecosystem. And there are some terribly endangered species.

And we – you know, the kind of climate control – climate change model isn't inapt here. There's a kind of overheatedness. Everything's overheated. And we could – we would all thrive – all the organisms in our little journalistic ecosystem would thrive a little bit better and we'd all be a little bit better off if there was a little bit of cooling down. And some of those species might actually be able to plug along and survive. So I do – I think may hackneyed metaphor here makes at least one thing clear, is I think long-form journalism is really important.

I think beat reporting is really important. I think man on the street reporting, as derided as it has been in journalistic circles, was really important to American democracy. And it's replacing, you know, even in the 1970s when CBS and New York Times started first doing their polling, in 1975, and they moved away from that man on the street kind of Kermit the Frog in a trench coat with a microphone. I think that's a loss. I think that was a loss for public conversation.

So I – as a historian, I always look backwards. And everything – (laughs) – you always look – you know, there's a lot of nostalgia in some ways among historians for sort of things that

worked well. But we have a vantage now of thinking about what worked well. A lot of things that we try to do as a civic culture are ways to reinvent a town meeting. That's, in some ways, what the town hall version of the presidential debates that the Commission on Presidential Debates houses. There are radio versions, like NPRs "Talk of the Nation."

There are all kinds of things where we have kind of these ersatz town meetings because we know – we do actually understand, when you think about it – because you know this from your experience as a kid in a classroom – you actually need to sit down at the table together with people that you disagree with, and you need to come up with a common set of – a shared set of rules for how to argue about your differences and resolve them. And just kind of chirping at one another is not a substitute.

MR. SCHIEFFER: Andrew.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Jill, you know, we're talking about long-form journalism. And you also write short-form pieces now. The New Yorker's changed. The New Yorker has great long-form magazine pieces every week, but it also on a daily basis has short blog-type pieces, which you also write. The New Yorker's really changed a lot to make – to meet up with the demand of its audience. It also seems like the journalism community changes its mind about every 30 seconds about what really works. What do you think works?

MS. LEPORE: Well, different magazines, literary magazines, have taken different approaches, right? Harper's has more or less closed itself off to the online world. Doesn't publish online, is a print-only magazine. Is that right? I think that's right. And doesn't have a kind of blogosphere presence.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Right.

MS. LEPORE: The New Republic immolated itself over this transition and is trying to reinvent itself. The Atlantic, I think, has been very successful at mixing those – the world of short posts and the world of long, investigative pieces, and pieces with literary aspiration. The New Yorker's gambit is a different one. And I should just be completely clear, I have nothing to do with the editorial end of things at The New Yorker. (Laughs.) I with great gratitude and on bended knee accept my assignments and go off and do them. (Laughs.)

But I have seen some really interesting experiments that The New Yorker has tried to do, both with an online presence, but The New Yorker also has a radio show, "The New Yorker Radio Hour," that's hosted by the magazine's editor, David Remnick. It has –

MR. SCHWARTZ: They're into podcasts.

MS. LEPORE: It has – it has many podcasts. But it also has a regular NPR radio show. It has the podcast, "The Political Scene," that Dorothy Wickenden, a political editor, hosts. There are literary podcasts that come out of The New Yorker's website as well. And The New Yorker has an Amazon show, "The New Yorker Presents," which is a series of – a series of quite artful videos that are adaptations of spin offs from magazine pieces, that are just very beautiful.

Trying to sort of try a few different things out, while not auto-disrupting itself, has been, I think, been the magazine's approach.

MR. SCHWARTZ: So I think it's worked. And David Remnick spent a lot of time re-engineering the magazine. It doesn't seem to have lost any of its journalistic values, any of its long-form values. But there are – you know, we do have hot takes on the – in The New Yorker now.

MS. LEPORE: Yeah. And, you know, not everybody writes those short-form NewYorker.com pieces. I do a certain number a year. I feel like it's not my favorite thing. I really value writing at length. And I should confess that often when I publish a New Yorker piece that 4,000 words, my first draft was 10,000 words. As an academic I, of course, am incredibly prolix. I love having to winnow something down. I love concision, that's my favorite thing to do as a writer. So I don't object to that. But I start out at a very different place. So for me to write a thousand-word piece can be – can be tough.

But I recognize that that's a way – that's a part of work that the magazine needs to do in this media environment. And I don't think it compromises – you know, what's amazing to me about The New Yorker, it hasn't compromised its distinctive voice and its self-conscious literariness to these new forms.

MR. SCHIEFFER: Let me go back and ask you a little bit about history, because you a historian.

MS. LEPORE: (Laughs.)

MR. SCHIEFFER: Obviously from a historian's point of view, it's too early to make anything out of this campaign. I've never seen anything like it. I would guess that you've never seen anything quite like it. What do you think the impact of this campaign will be? What can we expect now?

MS. LEPORE: Well, historians really try not to make predictions, because we know they're always wrong. And history is not a predictive science. It's not economics. And I think people who are not economists might say economics isn't a predictive science either. It doesn't predict very well. I do think this is a realigning election in terms of how both parties will respond.

One of the things that's been so fascinating to see, one of the many blind spots of those reporters who live in New York and Washington, is all the stories written about the dismantling of the Republican Party, and none about the dismantling of the Democratic Party. And yet, it's the Democratic Party that has really fallen apart. That that was so missed is one of the great errors of this year of political reporting, and really is an interesting thing. But from a historical vantage, I think we will understand that both parties were being redefined and reshaped. Their coalitions are different. There's a kind of – there is a reckoning for both parties.

That absolutely will be the case. What remains unknown is whether the party system –

that is, the stability of a two-party system – will endure. Now, with that said, in 1972, a lot of people said – this is, you know, the party’s over, this famous polemic written in 1972. That a lot of people predicted, including historians – Arthur Schlesinger predicted that the party system was not going to survive the upheaval of the election of 1972. It wasn’t just that the parties were realigning, but that the party system was coming to an end, that it couldn’t survive this moment of technological change and acceleration, this particular crisis in the U.S. place – in the United States’ place in the world.

So it’s a similar election, even though it doesn’t seem now – you know, like, 1972, so what? Richard Nixon gets reelected. What was – but it felt huge to people.

MR. SCHIEFFER: Do you feel that this campaign had an impact on the culture? Or was it a reflection of our culture?

MS. LEPORE: I think this campaign had an impact on our culture. And I think this campaign has a kind of reckoning potential that, one hopes as an idealistic and someone who really believes in American ideals, and I do, is an opportunity to revisit, reclaim, and strengthen those ideals, because I think they’ve been really called into question by this election.

MR. SCHIEFFER: Jill Lepore, one of the best. For Andrew Schwartz, this is Bob Schieffer.

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)