

THE REPUBLICAN CHOICE FOR 2018:

WIN OR LOSE

By Newt Gingrich

TABLE OF CONTENTS

[PART I: The Big Choice Election - A Contest Between Two Alternative Universes](#)

[PART II: Key Principles for Creating a Big Choice, Alternative Universe Election](#)

[PART III: The Big Choice Alternative Universe Campaign Implementation – Steps for 2018](#)

[PART IV: Big Choice Alternative Universe Versus Small Choice Single Universe Campaigns](#)

[PART V: Appendix](#)

PART I: The Big Choice Election: A Contest Between Two Alternative Universes

Do Republicans want to win in 2018?

They can.

In fact, by growing control in the House and the Senate, Republicans might win one of the greatest victories in American history.

However, Republicans won't win with the way they are currently campaigning and the way they are currently thinking about the November midterm elections.

Almost no one understands the real nature of the 2018 election — and until you grasp what the underlying dynamic is, you can't develop the strategy and invest the resources to win.

The 2018 election is a Big Choice Election between two alternative universes.

Ironically, despite all the current hand-wringing among Republicans, they are the ones who have the power to define which universe will win the 2018 election. It is the Republicans who hold the key advantage this fall – if they decide to embrace it. Why? It is because the Democrats are so vulnerable on so many topics. Their positions are so indefensible to the average American that a really aggressive Republican effort would push the Democrats into a catastrophic defeat that is beyond the current system's imagination.

Only a confused, passive, defensive, and timid Republican Party could save the Democrats from such a tremendous defeat. Democrats are so far out of touch with the American people and their radicalism is so unacceptable to most Americans, that they cannot defend themselves. The only hope Democrats have is if Republicans are so intimidated and confused that they fail to frame a big choice and historic confrontation properly. However, if Republicans are focused and bold, we will likely see a Democratic collapse of historic proportions.

In the media-Left-Democratic Party universe, every day is dominated by scandals, tax cuts are bad, identity politics define everything, the real immigration problem is the government hurting children at the border, and Republicans must be kept permanently on the defensive. In the Left's universe, President Trump is horrible, indefensible, and the source of all problems. If the Left's universe defines 2018, the Republicans will lose the House and will be lucky to gain one or two seats in the Senate.

In the grassroots rebellion-conservative-Republican universe, President Trump and the Republican Congress have had two of the most successful years of governance in more than six decades. In this universe, tax cuts have created economic growth, we have the lowest Black unemployment rate ever recorded, and we are standing up for the American worker. We believe conservative judges are worth fighting for and protecting Americans from criminal illegal immigrants is a key role of government. We are rebuilding our military, and America is respected again in the world. In the grassroots rebellion-conservative-Republican universe,

President Trump has achieved an enormous amount, shows great courage, and his flaws are dramatically less important than his strengths. If the grassroots rebellion-conservative-Republican universe defines the 2018 midterm fight, election night will be as big of a shock for the Left as it was in 2016. Republicans might actually increase the number of seats they have in the House and could win as many as eight additional seats in the Senate (remember, in 1980 no one expected the GOP to win the Senate, yet they won control with a pickup of 12 seats, four of which had a combined margin of less than 65,000 votes).

But the universe defined by the grassroots rebellion-conservative-Republicans cannot just be a referendum on successful Republican performance in office. Republicans have to go further and focus the American people on just how outrageous and dangerous the Democratic Party has become. The Democrats promote open borders (the Feinstein bill has been endorsed by every Senate Democrat), hostility toward American law enforcement, raising taxes, turning all health care over to the government, rising Democrat support for socialism and socialist candidates, and a wide range of other out of touch issues.

With President Trump, Vice President Pence, and the entire Republican and conservative system driving home the message about how dangerous, destructive, and extreme the Democrats' policies and values are, the 2018 election could become a referendum on the Left, rather than a referendum on the President.

If this happens, the Democrats will get annihilated.

Republicans were in this same position in 2016. Look at the parallels.

All the so-called experts in the media who today believe that the Republicans will lose the House were the same supposed experts who said that candidate Trump could not be nominated or elected. In defeat, they claimed Trump would cost the Republicans control of the Senate.

It might help you remember just how bad the bias was by looking at an interview I did with [Megyn Kelly](#) exactly two weeks before the election.

In the interview, we opened with a discussion about a conclusion made by *The Cook Political Report* claiming that Democrats were poised to pick up five to seven Senate seats.

Megyn asked if candidate Trump badly losing the election and taking down the Senate Republicans with him meant that, "the Republicans nominated the wrong candidate."

When I suggested we had two weeks to go and there were signs of Trump turning out votes in Pennsylvania, she asked with derision if I really thought that he could win Pennsylvania (which of course he did). She responded that, "all of the polls in Pennsylvania have [Hillary Clinton] winning." She cited poll after poll and put up the October 25, 2016, Fox decision map that showed Hillary Clinton at 307 electoral votes, Trump 174, and 57 votes that were still a tossup.

My key contention two weeks out was that there were two alternative universes in competition to define the 2016 election. In the establishment universe, Clinton won, and Trump collapsed. In

the grassroots rebellion universe, Clinton underperformed, and Trump won. I kept saying during that time, “in the establishment universe, Clinton wins; in the grassroots universe, Trump wins.”

Finally, I said the key argument against Clinton winning was that she was the most corrupt and dishonest person ever nominated by a major party, and I simply did not think the American people would elect her.

It is a tribute to President Trump’s toughness and tenacity that over the next two weeks he turned my comments from hope to reality. The fact is, he might have lost on October 25, but the election was not going to be held that day. Every day after that, he gained ground on Clinton.

My views about the two universe theory of current politics was reinforced by a recent [New York Post article](#), “CBS News pollster reveals why ‘blue wave’ is unlikely,” by Mary Kay Linge. She interviewed Anthony Salvanto, the lead pollster for CBS News. He has a new book [Where Did You Get This Number?](#) explaining what happened on election night in 2016.

Salvanto’s book has a very understandable breakdown of the different factors that led to the shocking results of election night.

Salvanto focuses on what he called “reluctant Republicans.” These folks had been avoiding a commitment because they did not like candidate Trump, but they were too Republican to vote for Hillary Clinton. As they came home the last two weeks, the race tightened up every day.

Then there was the difference in turnout intensity. Republican National Committee Chairman Reince Priebus and his team had spent four years building a grassroots system, which was the key partner in winning the election. They had developed a very effective voter contact system. As then-Michigan Chair Ronna McDaniel (who is now the RNC Chairwoman) said, she knew down to the precinct what our vote was likely to be, and it was eerily accurate. Their model showed Pennsylvania, Michigan, and Wisconsin were in play at a time when no one believed it was possible.

In contrast to our combining RNC organization with Trump energy and charisma, the Democrats let their grassroots system atrophy, and Clinton simply could not reach people.

As Salvanto notes, he began to realize something was profoundly wrong for Clinton when cities, such as Philadelphia, came in with a voter turnout far below the past Obama levels (something I had forecast in the Megyn Kelly interview on Fox News two weeks earlier). Had they gotten the big city turnout they wanted, Clinton might have carried enough states to win. But they didn’t – and she didn’t.

Finally, the sheer energy of the Trump candidacy was drowning Clinton. He was doing five or six rallies a day. With 20,000-plus attendees, each bringing his or her own cell phones and sending out tweets, Facebook posts, Instagram photos, and so on. Each rally represented hundreds of thousands of human contacts. So, one day of six rallies personally touched millions of people – not counting the television coverage. Meanwhile, Clinton was doing one evening

event for about 1,500 people. The sheer difference in energy and reach was shifting victory away from her and toward Trump.

In 2016, the grassroots universe beat the establishment universe. The margin was narrow, but the result was decisive.

The challenge for Republicans in 2018 is recognizing the potential for a Big Choice Election – between two alternative universes – that could be every bit as consequential as the 2016 election. To win, Republicans must ignore the news media, the supposed experts, many of the traditional consultants, and design and implement a bold campaign highlighting the historic stakes of the current moment – and the dangerously destructive beliefs and values of the Democrats.

The first step is to decide that a big choice alternative universe campaign, like 2016 (and similar to Reagan in 1980, Bush in 1988, and the Contract with America in 1994) is the right approach. The next step is to design and implement such a campaign.

A big choice alternative universe campaign requires thinking, planning, and training to make the transition from “politics as usual” to “politics as history.” It is also the only path that will keep a Republican majority in the House.

The current pattern is a war of district-by-district attrition. The consultants and professionals believe Republicans can outspend Democrats one district at a time and use traditional attack tactics to overcome them even in an unfavorable environment. This explains the number of Nancy Pelosi attack ads and the relatively few big picture, big choice ads. It also explains the constant search for personal weaknesses (DUIs, past business deals, etc.). However, in a potential wave election, this kind of district-by-district effort simply gets drowned by the national messages (see 1974, 1980, 1994, 2006, and 2010 for examples).

Republicans must move from district-by-district attrition to a national message – and do something unexpected. Republicans need a national brand campaign, so Americans actually hear that there are more jobs than unemployed, we have the lowest level of African-American unemployment recorded, the average American family will have \$2,000 more in their budgets, retirement savings have increased, wages have gone up, etc.

In order to define a big choice, we must ensure that people believe the choice we are defining is real. Right now, there is a lack of belief in many of the accomplishments that have been made.

We need to be defining the value proposition of the Republican Party to the electorate, so we can break from patterns of the past and propose a compelling future.

PART II: Key Principles for Creating a Big Choice, Alternative Universe Election

After 60 years of studying big choice alternative universe elections, it is clear there are patterns and principles that get repeated over and over. These patterns and principles distinguish big choice alternative universe elections from small choice single universe campaigns, which are the norm.

This section focuses on outlining a series of principles that can be applied to 2018 (and then to 2020) to gain the support of the American people for center-right ideas to implement a broad set of policies that lead to more jobs, more take home pay, a better health system, a more effective and leaner government, and more safety – and Making America Great Again for All Americans.

As you work through these principles, you will find that an amazing number of them apply to 2018 and 2020, and in fact, the developments that we are living through are begging for a big choice alternative universe campaign.

Vision for a Better Future

Emerging majorities in big choice alternative universe elections spend a lot of time defining their vision for a better future and the policies that will create that better future. They then contrast their vision with the alternatives, which they methodically take apart.

Big choice campaigns invariably describe a better future, a future that is worth voting and fighting for, in personal terms. (You will be better off. Your family will be better off. Your community will be better off.) At the same time, the emerging majority describes the threat that the other side presents to potentially make life worse, in similarly personal terms. These aren't campaigns about abstract philosophy or ideology. These are campaigns about two different ways of life, with two different impacts, at personal levels. They work very hard at finding the right words and images, and picking the right fights. Attacking Nancy Pelosi personally seems tactically clever, but tying her to outrageous and unacceptable policies is strategically far more powerful.

Small choice campaigns look for petty, personal weaknesses. Big choice elections focus on big differences and describing magnets of a better future to attract the voter, while they simultaneously hammer home wedge issues to drive the opposition away from the voter. Too many Republican consultants and candidates have no faith in the American people. They run small choice campaigns, because they think that voters can only understand small things.

The great leaders have all had faith that the American people can understand a lot if it is framed in clear, direct language. This is the job of a big choice campaign. Furthermore, big choice campaigns are about stories and narratives. People don't remember facts well, but they remember stories, sometimes, for a lifetime. Candidates must become storytellers to communicate effectively, especially in a time of change.

Make the Contrast Clear

The contrast of the positive achievements of the Trump-Republican program with the destructive proposals of the Left creates a remarkable opportunity. We represent lower taxes, more jobs, rising take home pay, the lowest black unemployment rate historically recorded, fewer people dependent on food stamps (because they are getting jobs), better trade agreements, less bureaucratic red tape, and skyrocketing small business confidence. The Left represents higher taxes, more bureaucratic red tape, more people dependent on food stamps, and bankruptcy through a totally unaffordable government-run health care system. The opportunity for defining two alternative universes has seldom been better, nor the choice clearer.

Reach Out and Grow

Emerging majorities reach out to groups that they never have before. They grow into a majority because they appeal to all Americans and believe that virtually all Americans would be better off under their program.

Andrew Jackson's appeal to urban workers was a key to his majority. Abraham Lincoln's appeal to border state voters was the key to winning the Civil War. (He once said, "I hope to have God on my side, but I must have Kentucky.") It was the conversion of formerly Republican blue-collar workers which made the FDR coalition so big. It was the former southern and ethnic Democrats who flocked to Ronald Reagan that led him to carry 49 states.

With the lowest black unemployment ever recorded, serious efforts at prison reform, a real commitment to better education for inner city children, HUD Secretary Ben Carson's vision for centers in poor neighborhoods, Senator Tim Scott's enterprise zones for poor neighborhoods, a new urban program to make America great again for all Americans, and an intensified fight against drugs and criminals ravaging poor neighborhoods, there are a lot of grounds for a major Trump-GOP campaign among African-Americans.

With an aggressive use of social media to find and bring together minority supporters of better outcomes, it should be possible to grow the first grassroots Republican support in black neighborhoods in a half century. Simply moving the GOP vote from eight percent in 2016 to 20 percent would be a political revolution. Furthermore, an inclusive GOP would do better with suburban women who instinctively want Americans to live and work together.

The same pattern is even clearer with Latino Americans (note Governor Greg Abbott's appeal to nearly 50 percent of Texas Hispanics and Governor Rick Scott's appeal to Puerto Ricans and Cubans in the Florida Senate race).

Small choice campaigns seek votes narrowly and, "go where the ducks are," (to use a phrase from the Goldwater campaign in 1964). Big choice campaigns crowd their opponents and try to peel away every possible vote. The very real possibility that Republicans are about to break through in the black and Hispanic communities explains a lot of the dramatic increase in viciousness and hostility by the news media, politicians, and left-wing activists. They keep yelling, "racist," because they see President Trump's policies beginning to erode the monolithic, long-time support for the Democrats in minority communities.

Every time you see a new vicious race-based assault on President Trump and the Republicans, remember it is a signal that the new policies are working and there is a real possibility black, Hispanic, and Asian votes for Republicans are about to grow dramatically.

Always on Offense

Big choice campaigns relentlessly attack their opponents. Thomas Jefferson pounded away at the Federalists until they disappeared. Andrew Jackson furiously attacked the elites from 1824 to 1836. William McKinley hammered William Jennings Bryan's anti-industrial model so thoroughly that it was disreputable in urban America until it was resurrected by the Great Depression. Franklin D. Roosevelt attacked the wealthy as the source of Americans' problems, so it became almost embarrassing to have succeeded (a theme that still resonates in Hollywood, on campuses, and in news rooms). Ronald Reagan was relentless in attacking Jimmy Carter, left-wing policies, and the Soviet Union. While Reagan had a reputation for a smiling, sunny personality, reading his 1980 campaign speeches is an exercise in how to use ideas to overwhelm your opponent's lack of vision.

Not until President Trump has any president used language as tough as Reagan's continual condemnation of communism and the Soviet Union. This principle is important because most Republicans are uncomfortable being as direct, clear, and tough as a big choice campaign requires.

For instance: Gavin Newsom, Democratic candidate for Governor of California has proposed universal health care for illegal immigrants. On a static model (assuming no population increase) this would cost an estimated \$35 billion to \$40 billion every year. However, when combined with Senator Dianne Feinstein's open borders bill (which every Democratic Senator has cosponsored) the full insanity of the Newsom proposal becomes clear. If everyone in the world learns that they can get free health care in California, how many additional people will show up?

Newsom's proposal would create "medical refugees," and all over the world people would leave for California as soon as they discovered that they had a serious illness. Finally, even if the money could be found to pay for this, the medical system would collapse under the weight of all the new patients. Hard-working, law-abiding Californians would find themselves unable to schedule a doctor or get checked into a hospital.

A big choice alternative universe campaign would make Newsom's proposal and Feinstein's open border bill household taboo words. So much so, that by mid-October, they would symbolize the absolute irrationality of the Democratic Party. They would represent the very real dangers to financial health and quality of life these ideas pose to every day working, tax-paying Americans and their families. There are other policy opportunities for defining a "loony left" in the American system but these have to rate close to the top.

Many Republican candidates and consultants (and their families and friends) get very uncomfortable with blunt, hard-hitting campaigns. Yet, history shows that in every successful big choice campaign, the winning side was relentlessly tough in forcing the opposition to bear the burden of their policies. In the California example, Newsom's universal health care for illegal immigrants will bankrupt the state; force law-abiding, tax-paying Californians to wait endlessly

for care in an overcrowded collapsing health system; and potentially attract every sick immigrant on the planet to try to get to California for “Newsom Care.”

Every American must confront the fact that in the age of social media, open borders 2018 is a very different proposition than it was in 1880. Also, the American welfare system (including health care) makes the decision to migrate to America very different than it was 140 years ago. In this new communication reality, the Newsom proposal is true madness with potentially devastating consequences. Driving these consequences home would almost certainly defeat Newsom in a huge and unexpected upset. Merely talking about them will be shrugged off by the news media and drowned in Newsom attack ads on other issues.

This principle can be applied in virtually every race in the country. The Democrats are very vulnerable *if* and only *if* Republicans have the courage to stand toe-to-toe with Democrats, left-wing activists, and the liberal news media, and slug it out.

Campaigns Matter

Campaigns really matter in big choice alternative universe campaigns. The very definition of a big choice campaign means that there are two sides in intense competition. Each side believes it is right and believes it is mortally threatened by the other side.

There is an intensity and a ferocity to the big choice campaigns which simply does not exist in small choice single universe competitions. This is why the great change agents have all been effective campaigners. In a sense, they impose their will in an environment that could go either way.

For 2018 to be a Republican success, candidates must be willing to campaign with the mental toughness and psychological resilience required to force the issues past the other candidates and their campaigns, as well as and the hostility of the liberal news media. Victories that are possible become reality only through brutal hard work, determination, and courageous persistence against the liberal system. It is the power of candidacy and campaigning that enabled Harry Truman, Reagan, and Trump to win, when all three seemed likely to lose in the early fall.

Instead of talking about the likelihood of losing the House – or which incumbents to write off as unelectable – big choice elections seek victory everywhere. Just ask Senator Ron Johnson, who was written off in September 2016 then, through personal determination, came back to win re-election and help Trump carry Wisconsin. Like Johnson, the Republicans’ job is to create the wave, not hide from the wave. There is an intolerable arrogance to Washington apparatchiks who think they are so smart they can write off campaigns weeks before the American people have voted. If my advisor Joe Gaylord and I had run that kind of “cautious expert” campaign in 1994, we would have picked up 25 seats and remained a minority. If we had been that cautious in 1996, we would have failed to get the majority re-elected (which was the first time since 1928 that House Republicans retained the majority).

It is amazing that two years after every supposed expert wrote off Trump as a certain loser, the same people are dictating what incumbents the National Republican Congressional Committee should dump. A big choice election takes the opposite strategy: invest everywhere, spread your

opponents' resources widely, hunt for possible pickups, and stay on offense. This is what a campaign-oriented party is like. And this is what wins big choice elections. Campaigns are so important in a big choice election, because the final breakthrough is often the cumulative impact of five, six, or seven issues. In the 1988 campaign, no single issue would have beaten Michael Dukakis. It was the cumulative impact of issue after issue that convinced swing voters he was too liberal. Similarly, in 2016, Trump assembled a series of powerful issues, each of which first took votes away from his primary competitors, and then won support from Clinton voters she alienated in key states.

A big choice campaign needs at least five major issues to build cumulative momentum. A big choice campaign also needs the intensity and drama to convince voters that this isn't just politics as usual. The Trump rallies created a dramatic force that took on a life of their own. They communicated a seriousness of intent which was dramatically more powerful than normal candidates. Big choice campaigns require candidates who want the change badly enough to put themselves on the line emotionally and physically. Voters cue off of how serious and determined candidates are. In this sense, the candidate *is* the campaign. They personify whether it is historic or merely political.

Communicate Everywhere

Emerging majorities aggressively use the communications technology of their time. The Founding Fathers wrote the Declaration of Independence to explain their case, then widely spread Thomas Paine's pamphlets to explain the war, then developed *The Federalist Papers* (the most sophisticated campaign brochure ever written and maybe the most effective). Through this communication strategy, they displayed constant attention to public opinion.

The Jacksonians in Congress set the all-time record for franking weekly newspapers to communicate their case against the elites. From ensuring the publication of the Lincoln-Douglas debates as a book (widely distributed to Republicans in the nomination fight), to his masterful 7,200 word speech at Cooper Union, to his understanding of daily newspapers and constant interaction with them, Lincoln focused deeply on communicating his principles and rallying the North to endure four years of war, while re-electing him.

McKinley's campaign published and distributed more than 200 million brochures in every major language (and a number of minor languages). FDR mastered radio, and his fireside chats allowed him to bypass the news media and reach the American people directly. Reagan understood and used television to reach beyond the media and appeal directly to the American people. As Reagan put it, his job was to turn up the light for the American people, so they would turn up the heat on Congress.

Of course, President Trump's amazing use of Twitter and Facebook gave him an enormous advantage in both communicating and organizing. By starting the day with bold tweets, he both reaches his followers directly, and gets the news media to cover his arguments. Then by building a large Twitter and Facebook following, he has been able to organize mass rallies on short notice at virtually no cost. This social media dominance helped him beat 16 other Republican candidates for the nomination, and narrowly beat Hillary Clinton's billion-dollar campaign, which was also backed by the liberal news media.

For 2018, Republicans should expand their social media presence to include more video, more YouTube, more communication directed toward minorities, and a series of vivid, dramatic video explanations of the dangers and costs of crazy, left-wing ideas. Imagine, for example, a video entitled *California 2028*. It could dramatize the human and financial costs of the Newsom universal health care for illegal immigrants plan, including a visualization of the collapse of the health system and the rise of a “go to California if you are sick” worldwide “medical refugee” movement. Other hopeless left-wing ideas lend themselves to similar visualization and dramatization.

Fight Distortion

Emerging majorities in big choice elections never allow the news media to distort or redefine what they are doing. Reagan was a master at taking a reporter’s biased question and reframing it to make his point on his own terms. We wrote the Contract with America with every pledge scoring above at least 70 percent approval from voters, with some above 80 percent approval.

The liberal media is more biased than ever, and so it is going to take training, discipline, and constant vigilance to avoid getting drawn into their definitions, their worldview, and their distorted contextualization of facts.

Jeremy Peters in [*The New York Times*](#) on August 29 provided a classic example of the bias, slander, and hostility the Trump-Republican team will have to defeat. After describing a wonderfully diverse Democratic Party, Peters asserts, “some in the Republican Party, taking their cues from President Trump, are embracing messages with explicit appeals to racial anxieties and resentment.” He goes on to charge that, “Mr. Trump and his Republican allies have made crime, violence, gangs and societal unrest a centerpiece of their attacks against Democrats in this election, often linking them to causes that have a common racial thread — the policies of liberal leaders in heavily minority cities, illegal immigration and Mr. Trump’s continuing campaign impugning the patriotism of professional athletes, many of whom are black.”

Note in this *New York Times* diatribe, anti-crime is racist, being pro-Pledge of Allegiance is racist, criticizing massive urban failures that hurt the poor is racist, and favoring legal immigration is racist. This is the kind of one-sided, constant hostility and deliberate reframing of the issue that Republicans must be prepared to repudiate with facts, re-contextualize, and overcome. Every Republican candidate, media spokesperson, and consultant must learn the art of knocking down the liberal media bias and presenting our version of facts, principles, and values.

Lead the Coalition

Emerging majorities attract a lot of new people as they win the big choice arguments and create growing support for their alternative universe. Because an emerging majority is, by definition, larger than the minority that preceded it, the old guard will be worried by the new people, the new interests, and the new style.

However, an American majority consists of a lot of people. It is always a coalition. No single issue or principle motivates and brings together the entire majority. Big choice leaders must learn

to lead a coalition. Each group must have enough of its values and concerns addressed, so it will then give the coalition permission to do the same with other groups (think of social conservatives getting conservative judges while economic conservatives get deregulation and tax cuts).

Balancing all the key demands of the major elements of the coalition is essential to keeping the emerging majority together. One of the key responsibilities of big choice campaign leaders is bringing together the newcomers and the old leadership to form a larger party. In building a coalition, the Reagan theme of “bold colors, no pale pastels,” is vital. The new coalition members must hear very loudly and very clearly why it is in their interest to change their past behavior and join the new majority. As the new coalition members express their interest, big choice leaders must give them assignments and roles to play that further bind them to the new majority and uses their influence to expand the coalition.

Dealing with Dissent

Despite the best efforts at conciliation and integration, some members of the old system will simply be repelled, either by the new issue positions, or by the style changes. Anti-New Deal Democrats began to emerge by 1935. Some moderate Republicans never fully accepted Reagan. Later, the Reaganites were purged at the beginning of the Bush Administration in 1989. The current tension in both parties is actually pretty normal. The key to growing a new majority is to minimize personality-driven defections without giving up the core principles of the new system, while creating inclusive policy input opportunities to reflect all of the majority coalition. Importantly, leadership must take responsibility for ensuring the balance.

Solve Critical Coalition Problems

Big choice campaigns often face crises when there are problems that must be solved. Lincoln had to hold together pro-Union slaveowners in the border states, and abolitionists in New England, or his coalition would fall apart. McKinley had to shift from a tariff-centered campaign to defeat Bryan on the issue of silver and inflationary currency, or Bryan might have won. Roosevelt balanced a Democratic Party coalition that included northern Black congressmen and southern segregationists. Reagan learned from Goldwater’s alienation of the moderate establishment and chose George H.W. Bush as his Vice Presidential nominee to make his candidacy acceptable to those who supported President Ford in 1976.

The Trump Coalition faces a crisis, because it is losing educated suburban women. This group is the difference between a majority and minority for Republicans. This is an especially difficult challenge, because much of their unhappiness is based on a repudiation of the President’s style – not his policies. Policy and issue-oriented appeals may be inadequate, because they currently stipulate they are so uncomfortable with the style that they can’t even think about the issues.

Educated suburban women don’t want to define themselves as accepting certain tones and behaviors. Unless the President and the GOP solve this, they may have a difficult time building the size of the majority. Growing the majority is possible at an issue level but currently may not be possible at an emotional level. Sometimes words, language, and tone become more important than specific issues. The winning side must adjust to that reality. This is the kind of challenge on which big choice campaigns must focus and ultimately solve.

PART III: The Big Choice Alternative Universe Campaign Implementation - Steps for 2018

Successful, big choice campaigns require relentless, determined implementation. They require resilience and cheerful persistence. They require a focus on outcomes and an understanding that “you get what you inspect, not what you expect.”

The first phase is for senior leaders to decide they want a big choice election and are prepared to win the argument – with their own party and the country at large.

For 2018, this means President Trump, Vice President Pence, Republican National Committee Chairman Ronna McDaniel, and their teams must agree that the American people should be given a dramatic choice between two very different futures – and sets of values. They also must agree on five to seven big choices on which they are going to focus. If they agree, then they need to recruit the House and Senate leaders and campaign committees.

Once the core group understands the big choice strategy and the themes that will be built for the next nine weeks, every effort must be made to recruit the candidates (including incumbents), their campaign staff, consultants, and the major outside groups.

This kind of big choice campaign requires serious training. It requires clarity and intensity of argument, both by the candidate and through advertising, that is far greater than that required for small choice campaigns. This is the necessity captured in Margaret Thatcher’s phrase: “First you win the argument, then you win the vote.”

KEY THEMATIC FOR THE ELECTION

The overall key to the 2018 big choice election is simple, but it has been methodically blocked by the liberal news media:

President Trump and the Republicans have accomplished a great deal in economic growth through tax cuts, deregulation, and trade negotiations. They have nominated and seated a record number of constitutional conservative judges through the Senate. They are addressing the challenge of illegal immigration, an out of control border, and a safer country. And they are beginning to develop a better health system with lower costs and greater access. America is making progress thanks to Republican policies. All of this progress will be reversed, and America will decay dramatically, if the left-wing Democrats take control.

The choice is that clear and simple.

THE BIG CHOICES OF 2018

Paycheck Republicans versus Food Stamp Democrats

The first choice must be: prosperity, more jobs, and higher take home pay, versus higher taxes, increasing unemployment, and more Americans dependent on food stamps. The contrast between the Trump-Republican economy and the Democratic economy must be driven home every day. This is the objective reality of success affecting individuals, families, communities, and industries. It should be the opening choice of every Republican speech. The election of Democrats will pose a very real threat to the employment and take-home pay of every American. In the McKinley tradition, we want to contrast paycheck Republicans with food stamp Democrats. Our more aggressive trade policy must be combined with tax cuts, deregulation, and a psychology of encouraging small business owners and entrepreneurs, so they can create more jobs. Republicans must hit this theme home every day, because the liberal news media will never communicate that our policies are working. The story is so powerful, and affects so many people personally, that it should be the key step every day in every campaign appearance. (See Appendix 1.)

Legal Immigration versus No Borders

This theme has to be the second big choice in the 2018 campaign. Because of the unending bias of the liberal media, there is a perception that Republicans must be on defense about protecting our border, insisting on legal immigration, ending sanctuary cities, and supporting ICE and its agents. Nothing could be further from the truth. The American people support Republican immigration policies by 60 percent to 84 percent, depending on the issue. So, immigration is a potential Democratic electoral disaster. If the economy and jobs draw votes to Republicans, open borders, sanctuary cities, and abolishing ICE push Americans away from Democrats. One recent survey showed 46 percent of voters are much less likely to vote for a Democrat who supports amnesty and abolishing ICE. (See Appendix 2.)

Health and Prosperity versus Bankruptcy and Bureaucracy

Health is the unavoidable issue from which Republican consultants and candidates like to hide. However, the topic of health in 2018 is comparable to silver and inflation in 1896. If McKinley had not changed his campaign to take on Bryan's silver policy, he might have lost the election. The liberal news media and the Democrats are going to avoid fighting over the economy – they would lose – and instead, they will try to demagogue health as an issue.

Having taken \$712 billion from Medicare to pay for Obamacare, the Democrats now are attacking the Republicans, claiming they are taking money from Medicare to pay for the tax cuts. This is a key argument to win on two fronts. First, the Republican tax cuts are generating so much economic prosperity (see Appendix 1), that the tax cuts will be paid for through this economic growth. Second, it is the Democrats who endanger Medicare. “Medicare for all” will rapidly become “Medicare for none” as the system breaks down – both financially and through bureaucratic mismanagement. The Republican challenge is to demolish the idea of government-run universal health care as a risky scheme that would endanger the millions of Americans that rely on our current healthcare system, and then offer a practical plan that builds on what works in both the public and private sector to lower costs and meet the needs of the American people. The side that wins the health care argument will have a huge advantage this fall (see Appendix 3).

The Constitution versus Radicalism

Focusing on seating constitutionally-focused judges is an easy and obvious choice that is especially important to the socially conservative wing of the Trump-Republican Coalition. The dramatic difference between the radical judges that Hillary Clinton would have picked, and the constitutional conservatives President Trump has picked, is overwhelming. Just ask audiences to close their eyes and imagine the two Supreme Court Justices President Hillary Clinton would have nominated, and the case makes itself. This amazing difference is especially important in the Senate races. However, any Republican candidate, if asked what has been accomplished in the first two years, can point to the record number of federal judges that have been approved by the Senate. This can remind conservative voters that the philosophical gap between the two parties matters and makes a difference.

Peace Through Strength versus Dangerous Appeasement

President Trump's commitment to a stronger military, an aggressive trade negotiation strategy, and blunt talk with both allies and opponents, is making the world safer. Democrats would weaken the military, appease our enemies (recall the billion dollars of cash that was flown to the Iranian dictatorship), and hide from tough problems. The choice of an effective, safe America providing leadership based on strength, and an uncertain, timid, appeasement-minded Democratic policy, is a real choice between the safety of and the national security risk for the whole country.

PART IV: Big Choice Alternative Universe Versus Small Choice Single Universe Campaigns

Introduction

This is the last of four parts on how Republicans can decisively win the 2018 elections.

The first part argued that the precondition for winning this November is for Republicans to understand the nature of the 2018 election. This section further argued that if Republicans can recognize that the combination of Republican success and Democrat extremism presents a historic opportunity for Republican victories, then – and only then – will it be possible for Republicans to conceive and execute campaign strategies and tactics to win what can be described as a “Big Choice Alternative Universe Campaign”.

The concept of a Big Choice Alternative Universe Campaign is so different from normal politics, so little understood, and lacks any educational material to teach people that it needs to be examined in detail.

That is why this fourth section outlines a series of historic examples of such Big Choice campaigns, and highlights the distinctions between alternative and single universe campaigns.

Many of our most effective political leaders have intuitively understood that they represented a big choice alternative universe contrasting the establishment of their time. Yet, none of them that I know of ever outlined the concepts and operating principles that guided them in effectively distinguishing their campaigns, and how they became so much more effective in office than traditional leaders.

Accordingly, the second part applied these principles to outlining a Republican strategy for 2018 that could shatter the Democratic Party, and lead to dramatic gains in the Senate, and potentially, an increase in the House GOP.

The third part explained the implementation steps, that are required during September and October, to convince the American people that they want to be in the grassroots Republican universe and would be deeply hurt by the Democrat-Left-liberal media universe. If we win that argument, the results will be catastrophic for the Democrats, and on election night the news media and the Left will once again be in the same state of shock that they were in 2016.

This following and final part will make three major points:

1. The concept of a big choice alternative universe campaign is based on history - not theory. The number of campaigns cited in this section should convince any reasonable person that the big choice alternative universe campaign is evidenced and supported by the successes of a wide range of political leaders who have previously used this approach. This is not a theoretical strategy. This is a very practical strategy based on over 200 years of specific campaigns.

2. Big choice Alternative Universe Campaigns have learnable patterns that can be developed and applied in 2018. There are certain principles that recur again and again. The challenge for experienced, competent politicians, consultants, and professionals is that they spend their careers learning all of the correct lessons for small choice single universe campaigns. Developing an alternative universe campaign requires dropping the principles and patterns that have worked in the small choice single universe, and learning the historic patterns that have worked in times of big choices; times that are defined by a vivid contrast between a new political universe, and an old political universe.
3. All of this applies directly to 2018. The next two months will lead up to radically different outcomes depending on which strategy Republicans implement. A conventional strategy operating within the current political universe has a very high likelihood of leading to Speaker Pelosi and a Democratic majority. Only a bold, big choice alternative universe strategy creates the energy, the clarity, and the reality, of the two sides that is needed to keep the House Republican, despite every effort of the liberal media and the Left.

Historic Examples of Big Choice Alternative Universe Campaigns

Two of the best examples of alternative universe politicians are British. Both Winston Churchill and Margaret Thatcher knew they represented a radically different reality from their opponents.

In the case of Churchill in 1938, he was not arguing with Prime Minister Chamberlain over the details of the Munich Agreement with Hitler. Churchill instead was making the case that *any* effort to appease Hitler was doomed to failure. The very radicalism of Churchill's critique isolated him from the political and news media establishments. Tragically, the Churchill Universe proved to be real, and the Chamberlain Universe collapsed under the reality of Hitler's aggressiveness.

Similarly, Margaret Thatcher saw herself in the Churchillian tradition. She served in several weak, conservative governments, which had operated within the establishment-welfare state inevitable-decline-of-Britain model. Her election as opposition leader proved to be a decisive break with the recent past, and a return to Churchillian moral arguments, personal certainty, and mental toughness. As Claire Berlinski brilliantly argues in her book [*There is No Alternative: Why Margaret Thatcher Still Matters*](#), Thatcher saw herself engaged in moral warfare against socialism, which she considered evil and a destroyer of human independence. She also saw herself simultaneously engaged in political and economic warfare with the coal miners' union, which she saw as a direct threat to the elected parliament's ability to govern Britain.

When Prime Minister Thatcher said, "First you win the argument, then you win the vote," she was referring to arguments on a grand scale. She understood that she was proposing for Britain a new model, that was pro-work, with smaller government, support for free enterprise and economic growth, and critically, fundamentally in conflict with the model that had dominated both parties in Britain from 1945 to 1978.

The Left's reaction to Prime Minister Thatcher was remarkably similar to the current American Left's reaction to President Trump. The more militant and aggressive Thatcher was, the more it

energized the radical Left. By 1987, eight years after her initial victory, the British Press was routinely referring to “the loony left” and looking for personalities who fit a “loony left” style. Keith Ellison may become a model of an American “loony left” and comments like Governor Cuomo’s “[America] was never that great” further add to this concept. In Britain the “loony left” became a major weakness for the Labour party.

Thatcher won the political-cultural argument with the British people so decisively, that Tony Blair moved the Labour Party away from socialism, and renamed it “New Labour” to finally win an election in 1997 - after 18 years of Conservative Party rule. Historian Paul Johnson described Blair as Thatcher’s adopted son because he had adopted so many of her attitudes and policies.

In the United States there have been a number of Alternative Universe elections with stunning results. In fact, the American system has been more open to profound shifts in the defining universe of its governing system than any other country. This process has been a significant part in our ability to rethink, reform, and renew our policies and our institutions.

In a dramatic sense, the Founding Fathers lived through three Alternative Universe struggles.

The first division into alternative universes was between those who found British tyranny unacceptable, and those who were still loyal to the Crown or simply too afraid to rebel. Most estimates assert that only one-third of the Americans were genuinely committed to the Independence alternative universe, but their militancy carried them to victory after an eight-year war.

The second division came after victory and independence. One faction, the Federalists, saw the weak Articles of Confederation and the ineffective central government as a threat to liberty, because it invited foreign governments to meddle in American affairs. The other faction, the Anti-Federalists, identified with the states as independent countries and feared that the consolidation of power would become a threat to American liberty. Thomas Jefferson feared the concept of federal power, but James Madison, a passionate advocate of strengthening the central government, convinced him to support the Constitution in return for the Bill of Rights to protect individuals from their own government.

This struggle, like the War for Independence, was much closer at the time than it appears in our history books. In both cases, the alternative universes of defeat for independence, and defeat for the Constitution, could have occurred. It is often the case in struggles between alternative universes that small margins of success lead to significant and consequential differences over time.

The third alternative universe campaign for the founding generation was Jefferson’s invention of the Democratic-Republican Party (a radical innovation at the time). Jefferson overwhelmed and ultimately destroyed the Federalist Party. In 1788, Federalists were the dominant party, however, by 1812, the Federalists had virtually disappeared and everyone was organizing within Jefferson’s universe.

In 1828, after a generation within a single Jeffersonian universe, a new, big choice alternative universe exploded on the scene with Andrew Jackson's candidacy. Every other leader was prepared to cut deals inside of the existing order. Jackson was determined to blow apart what he saw as a corrupt, elitist system on behalf of an urban-rural populism that genuinely shifted both the power structure and the popular culture.

For three decades, the Jackson-anti-Jackson system worked as a defining system, but with increasing stress from the growing tension over the slavery issue.

The only presidential campaign with three alternative universes was in 1860. One universe consisted of southern slaveholders who understood that population growth was against them, and the rules had to be changed if slavery was to survive. The second alternative universe included the northerners, who would not accept the expansion of slavery nor the states trying to leave the Union. The third alternative universe was comprised of the moderate Democrats who were desperate to avoid war, and tried to find a compromise in a world in which compromise was no longer acceptable to the other two factions. It is this alternate universe intensity that led newspapers in South Carolina to condemn Abraham Lincoln in language remarkably like the Left's assault on Trump (as Civil War historian Allen Guelzo has written). It was Lincoln's genius in bringing together two alternative universes, and isolating the pro-slavery universe, that enabled the Union to win.

A generation later, in 1896, a new alternative universe campaign erupted when 36-year-old William Jennings Bryan was nominated by the Democrats in a populist repudiation of their own Democratic President, Grover Cleveland. The Bryan nomination was an eruption against the old order, as powerful as any in American history. The class warfare, populist language of Bryan still resonates in the Democratic Party 122 years after his "Cross of Gold" speech.

Karl Rove's [*The Triumph of William McKinley: Why the Election of 1896 Still Matters*](#) is one of the best studies of two alternative universes that has been written. Rove captures McKinley's desire to focus on the issue that had developed for a decade: the power of tariffs to create American jobs. However, as Rove outlines, during the summer it became clear that the emotional power of the issue of money (gold standing for stable money and silver symbolizing an inflationary policy) was sweeping the country. If McKinley couldn't defeat the attractiveness of cheap money, Bryan could win the race. These two candidates represented two alternative universes. McKinley's campaign stood for sound money, high tariffs, and urban industrial growth (the full dinner pail buttons symbolized McKinley's commitment to good jobs for urban workers). Bryan said he wanted grass to grow in the streets of the cities. McKinley organized the wealthy and successful. Bryan demonized them.

McKinley's victory created a political-intellectual framework for a new America that was modernizing, urbanizing, and industrializing. That system governed from 1896 to 1932, and was only ended by the Great Depression and President Franklin D. Roosevelt's brilliant use of the crisis to create a new political universe. Woodrow Wilson was the only Democrat to win in that 36-year period, and it took the split in the GOP between Presidents Theodore Roosevelt and William Howard Taft, combined with Wilson's acceptance of the McKinley urban-industrial model, for him to win. It was a generation with a single dominant political system, and Bryan's

second and third failed presidential campaigns proved how decisively the American people had rejected his model. As Rove suggests, Republicans in 2018 can learn a lot from McKinley.

The Great Depression was so severe, and President Franklin D. Roosevelt and his Left-wing allies were so effective, that the Republican model rooted in free enterprise and economic growth lost believability for two generations. It was only when Ronald Reagan began reminding the American people of the power of free enterprise in his October 1964 nationally televised speech for Barry Goldwater that the tide began to turn back toward the McKinley model.

The combination of very popular government policies (e.g., Social Security), a new legal framework for Democratic Party allies (e.g., labor unions that grew dramatically), donors who benefit directly from big government, and the intellectual support of the academic Left created such a stable system of government and politics, that it dominated the U.S. House of Representatives from 1930-1994, with only four years of a Republican majority in a 64-year period. It also defined the boundaries of acceptable policy options from 1932-1980. The one effort to challenge the Rooseveltian universe failed disastrously in 1964. All other Republican campaigns promised change around the margins, and frugality within the Democratic Party's definition of appropriate government.

One reason many politicians, analysts, and consultants do not understand the alternative universe model is that it did not successfully exist for a half century. As it turns out, Roosevelt had created a single universe system just as successfully as Jefferson.

Modern Examples of Big Choice Alternative Universe Elections

I have worked in a series of big choice alternative universe elections.

The first was Barry Goldwater's creation of an alternative model for the GOP in 1963-64. Goldwater winning the GOP nomination shattered the power system that Tom Dewey had created in the 1940s. Suddenly, power shifted to younger, more conservative, and more southern and western Republicans - some of whom had recently been Democrats.

The shattering disruption of an alternative Republican universe winning the nomination sent the Old Guard Republicans into a frenzy of hostility. Many GOP leaders publicly attacked Goldwater and helped Lyndon Johnson defeat him in the general election. Their view was that it was better to wreck the party and own the wreckage, than have it be successful with new leadership that made them obsolete.

In fact, the hostility to Goldwater among the Old Guard Republicans was vastly bigger and more intense than the Never Trump movement. Anti-Trumpism never solidified the way anti-Goldwaterism did. If it had, Trump might have lost in 2016.

Ronald Reagan created the first successful general election campaign that broke with the FDR system. There was some irony in this, since Reagan had been an FDR Democrat, and as late as 1948, he had made commercials for President Truman and for the new Minnesota senatorial candidate Hubert Humphrey (both appealed to Reagan because of their anti-communist views).

Over the years, Reagan developed a model of limited government, lower taxes, entrepreneurial free enterprise, and social conservatism at home, combined with a strong national security and anti-communist position overseas. He also developed a remarkable issue-oriented communications system during his years working with General Electric (Thomas W. Evans' [*The Education of Ronald Reagan: The General Electric Years and the Untold Story of His Conversion to Conservatism*](#) is a brilliant outline of the principles that Reagan used to educate a nation).

The Reagan big choice alternative universe stood in stark contrast to the failing big government models that President Carter had to defend. As bureaucracies failed to deliver goods and services, and high tax, big bureaucracy economics failed to produce prosperity and jobs, Reaganism became a viable alternative to the old order.

Reagan won a surprisingly big victory in 1980 (he carried 44 states with 489 electoral votes to President Carter's six states and the District of Columbia with 49 electoral votes). He also helped the GOP win control of the Senate with a 12-seat pickup (which no one expected) when four close races were decided by a combined total of under 65,000 votes. In the House, Republicans won 34 seats.

The Reagan model was so powerful, and had moved the American people so deeply, that by the 1996 State of the Union, in preparation to run for reelection, President Clinton felt compelled to say that, "The era of big government is over."

There are remarkable parallels between Clinton accommodating Reaganism and Blair accommodating Thatcherism as the price of their party adjusting to the new universe within which they operated.

In both cases, the accommodationists paid a severe price as they were reviled by the activist wing of their party. Matt Bai's 2008 book [*The Argument: Inside the Battle to Remake Democratic Politics*](#) is a remarkable account of the depth of the liberal and Left-wing hostility toward the Clintons. While the scandals hurt the former President, in the eyes of the Left-wing activists, the real scandal was his willingness to sell out Left-wing values to compromise with the Republicans. What worked in the general election and got Clinton reelected, poisoned his ties to the Left, and may have made Hillary's two frustrating presidential campaigns much more difficult.

1988: A Case Study in Choosing a Big Choice Alternative Universe Campaign

In May 1988, Vice President Bush was running 19 points behind Massachusetts Governor Mike Dukakis. The Reagan Administration had been tarnished by the Iran-Contra scandal. In the 1986 elections, House Republicans had lost five seats while in the Senate, Republicans lost eight seats and went from being the majority to the minority.

Furthermore, Democratic nominee Dukakis was getting a big build up from the national media as a "new Democrat" who was not really liberal, but was a smart, problem-solving technocrat. He

was being credited with a “Massachusetts miracle” of economic growth, fully ignoring the degree to which this was simply a reflection of the massive growth that Reagan’s tax cuts and regulatory reforms had created for the entire country. Dukakis was also a new model Democrat who could speak Spanish, and did part of his acceptance speech in Spanish to the confusion of most Americans.

If Vice President Bush had run a traditional campaign narrowing the differences with Dukakis and trying to appease the news media, he would have lost. He could not have made up a 19-point deficit with a timid campaign of small choices.

However, in May, the very month when Bush was behind by 19 points, the campaign conducted a series of focus groups among Reagan Democrats. After eight years of Reagan, at least half of the original Reagan Democrats had become Republican. The ones who remained were true Democrats and wanted to go back to voting for a Democrat. Their initial bias was to be for the Massachusetts Governor.

However, the more these Democrats learned about Governor Dukakis, the less they liked him.

Dukakis belonged to the American Civil Liberties Union and the epithet, “ACLU liberal,” became a key part of the Bush mantra describing his opponent.

Dukakis vetoed a bill requiring teachers to lead the Pledge of Allegiance. This led to a fight on the House floor that created a new rule that the Pledge would open every session. It led to massive numbers of flags at Bush rallies.

Dukakis approved a bill to give murderers weekend furloughs. One of them, Willie Horton, raped and tortured a couple in Maryland while out on a Dukakis furlough. Al Gore first brought this up in the Democratic primaries. Then it turned out, the Lawrence, Massachusetts *Eagle-Tribune* wrote an entire series on Willie Horton and the furlough program for murderers. The paper had earned a Pulitzer prize for its series. In July 1988, *Reader’s Digest* published a seven-page article entitled “Getting Away with Murder” by Robert Bidinotto outlining the Dukakis furloughs and Willie Horton’s violence. *Reader’s Digest* at that time was so widely circulated that you could see the drop in support for Dukakis within a week of its publication. The crime issue also came up in the presidential debates and on television commercials.

The furlough program is a great case study of alternative universes, and in some ways, parallels the disconnect in the current debate over illegal immigration.

For Republicans and Independents, the idea of letting murderers out on weekends was insane. Having a convicted murderer rape and torture a couple while out on furlough was despicable in and of itself.

For liberals, the issue couldn’t have been about crime. Even though neither the *Eagle-Tribune* or *Reader’s Digest* emphasized Willie Horton’s race, liberals immediately began to argue that emphasizing Horton’s identity was racist.

To us, it was amazing that just being against a released murderer raping and torturing people wasn't a legitimate issue. Yet, the Left and their news media allies so intensely attacked the entire concept, that it became radioactive after the election.

Fortunately for Bush, and unfortunately for Dukakis, the news media-liberal view did not match the average American's view. The murderers furlough program was surely Dukakis's biggest weakness.

However, combining the "ACLU liberal" label, the Pledge of Allegiance decision, and support for letting murderers out on weekends, worked to paint a picture of Dukakis as just *too* liberal.

As one Reagan Democrat in a focus group said when given a series of Dukakis positions: "Why that would mean he is a liberal. I couldn't vote for a liberal."

Then, Bush moved to the heart of the Reagan economic program when he announced in his acceptance speech:

"And I'm the one who will not raise taxes. My opponent now says he'll raise them as a last resort, or a third resort. When a politician talks like that, you know that's one resort he'll be checking into. My opponent won't rule out raising taxes, but I will, and the Congress will push me to raise taxes, and I'll say no, and they'll push, and I'll say no, and they'll push again, and I'll say to them, 'Read my lips: no new taxes.'"

This pledge has to be viewed with the notion in mind that four years earlier, Walter Mondale in his acceptance speech at the Democratic Convention promised to raise taxes. The Republican platform that year had adopted a pledge to not increase taxes. The contrast between tax-increasing Democrats and tax-cutting Reagan Republicans had been drawn sharply. Reagan carried 49 states, while Mondale barely carried his home state of Minnesota.

By emphasizing these obvious and significant choices - conservative versus liberal, patriotic pledges to the flag versus allowing teachers to refuse to pledge allegiance, getting tough on crime versus letting murderers out for the weekend, no new taxes versus liberalism's need for more money - the Bush campaign turned 1988 into a big choice election between two alternative universes.

The result was a shift from 19 percent in favor of Dukakis, to an eight-point victory for Bush. That meant slightly more than one out of every four Americans changed their mind between May and November.

Big choice campaigns that vividly portray the two alternative universes can have a decisive effect and turn defeat into victory if the candidate and the party believe in the values and concerns of the American people.

PART V: Appendix

APPENDIX 1

THE ECONOMIC CASE

The Winston Group ran a test explaining the following four key provisions of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act:

- Lower rates,
- Increasing the standard deduction,
- Retaining retirement savings options, and
- Increasing the child tax credit.

As a result, support for the bill dramatically jumped from 39-33 in favor of the bill to 58-24. People literally did not know what was included in the provisions of the bill, and of course, the liberal media did nothing to educate them.

The Congressional Budget Office reported in April that the economy over the next decade would be \$6 trillion bigger than what was initially projected before the tax cuts. They projected that tax revenue would be over \$1 trillion higher because of economic growth (wiping out most of the so-called “costs” of the tax cuts). In the last four months, the economy has grown even faster than the CBO projected.

All of this led to the lowest Black unemployment recorded in history, the lowest Asian-American unemployment rate, and the lowest Latino unemployment rate in history.

New unemployment claims have achieved their lowest level in nearly half a century

Almost 3.9 million Americans have been able to get off of food stamps in an improved economy.

Where the Obama eight years saw 200,000 American manufacturing jobs disappear, 400,000 manufacturing jobs - twice the amount *eliminated* under the Obama Administration - have been *added* in the last two years, and the number is accelerating.

APPENDIX 2

THE GROWING POTENTIAL FOR A DEMOCRATIC SENATE DISASTER BASED ON IMMIGRATION THIS FALL

*by Newt Gingrich
July 3, 2018*

I. PROPOSITION

The victory of the radical wing of the Democratic Party over the progressive wing is creating a policy environment which, if thoroughly understood by most Americans, would lead to a catastrophic Senate election this fall for Democrats.

II. CAMPAIGNS MATTER

Campaigns matter. In July 1994 you could not have predicted that the Democratic Speaker from Spokane, Ways and Means Chairman from downtown Chicago, and the Judiciary Committee chairman from the Houston suburbs, would all be defeated along with a loss of 50 other seats.

In January 2016, you could not have predicted that Trump would defeat 16 more experienced Republican candidates for the nomination, and then win the general election by carrying Pennsylvania, Michigan and Wisconsin. In fact, those two steps seemed so unlikely you would have made a fortune betting on them.

The elite media is so biased that it is artificially propping up an increasingly radical Democratic Party while artificially suppressing the issue popularity of the Trump team.

The key purpose of the fall 2018 Republican Senate campaign is to communicate how totally unacceptable the radical views are and how radically they would change America if they could.

III. POPULAR VIEWS: REVIEWING CURRENT POLLS

It is easy to forget how big the gap is between the elite media's increasingly radical views and the American people. The emotional intensity and the pervasiveness of their repetitive coverage create an echo chamber which Republicans can safely ignore. That echo chamber is a trap for radicals to go further and further away from the American people.

After all of the media's effort to redefine immigration on their radical terms, consider the views of the American people.

ON VIRTUALLY EVERY ASPECT OF IMMIGRATION POLICY THE AMERICAN PEOPLE ARE MUCH CLOSER TO TRUMP THAN TO THE RADICALS

Only the news media bias and unending focus on their warped version of reality keeps this from becoming overwhelming.

Byron York's *Washington Examiner* article, "[Donald Trump's mainstream immigration policy](#)," makes clear how deep of a minority the radicals are. Remember, media noise and popularity are not the same thing.

York focuses on the Harvard-Harris Poll conducted by Mark Penn (hardly a Republican) on June 24-25.

"Penn began... 'Do you think that people who make it across our border illegally should be allowed to stay in the country or sent home?' Sixty-four percent (83 percent of Republicans, 47 percent of Democrats, and 66 percent of independents) said they should be sent home. Thirty-six percent said they should be allowed to stay."

"Then, Penn asked: 'Do you think that parents with children who make it across our border illegally should be allowed to stay in the country or sent home?' The presence of children made little different in the result: 61 percent (81 percent of Republicans, 40 percent of Democrats, and 66 percent of independents) said they should be sent home, while 39 percent said they should be allowed to stay."

Penn wrote in an email to York, "[T]hey want people who cross the border illegally to be turned around and returned home efficiently."

Citing the poll, York writes in the article, "The end result was that a substantial majority said illegal border crossers, and the children they brought, should be returned to their home countries. To that end, 80 percent (84 percent of Republicans, 79 percent of Democrats, and 78 percent of independents) favored hiring more immigration judges 'to process people in custody faster.'"

To illustrate how wrong the radical Democrats are, at a time when President Trump is demanding more enforcement and they are calling for the abolition of ICE, "Penn asked, 'Do you think we need stricter or looser enforcement of our immigration laws?' Seventy percent (92 percent of Republicans, 51 percent of Democrats, and 69 percent of independents) said stricter, while 30 percent said looser." A 70-30 percent split should be enough for a Republican landslide if pushed hard enough.

Penn's survey helps unlock the language of "the wall". The wall as such does not score well partially because it is President Trump's issue and partially because the inflexibility sounds expensive and wrong to many people.

However, President Trump's underlying instinct that Americans want the border secured is more than validated by Penn's data, that concluded, "Sixty-one percent (73 percent of Republicans, 49 percent of Democrats, and 60 percent of independents) said current border security is inadequate."

However, the language people support is more nuanced than just "the wall."

“Penn asked whether respondents ‘support or oppose building a combination of physical and electronic barriers across the U.S.-Mexico border.’ Sixty percent (92 percent of Republicans, 39 percent of Democrats, and 54 percent of independents) supported the barriers, while 40 percent did not.”

Simply describing the combination of physical and electronic barriers moves controlling the border to a 60-40 winning issue.

THE SANCTUARY CITY OPPORTUNITY

Radical Democrats support for sanctuary cities (and any Democrat who supports sanctuary cities is a radical) is deeply unpopular.

Byron York writes in the Washington Examiner article, “Penn's polling also found overwhelming opposition to sanctuary cities. He asked: ‘Should cities that arrest illegal immigrants for crimes be required to notify immigration authorities they are in custody or be prohibited from notifying immigration authorities?’ Eight-four percent — a huge number comprised of 94 percent of Republicans, 76 percent of Democrats, and 83 percent of independents — said that cities should be required to notify immigration authorities. Just 16 percent said cities should be prohibited from doing that.”

Ending sanctuary cities is an 84-16 issue. This is something that the House and Senate should vote on as often as possible.

“Penn also tested the Democratic talking point that eliminating sanctuaries would actually increase crime. He asked the question this way: ‘Do you think notifying immigration authorities when people are arrested for crimes increases crime because it makes immigrants less likely to report crimes or it decreases crime because it takes criminals off the streets?’ Sixty-four percent (65 percent of Republicans, 62 percent of Democrats, and 64 percent of independents) said it would decrease crime, while just 36 percent said it would increase crime.”

So, by 64-36, Americans believe sanctuary cities increase crime. Again, an example of why this should have hearings and be voted on over and over this fall.

“ABOLISH ICE” IS A TRAP FOR DEMOCRATS

The "Abolish ICE" campaign to disband U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement is a trap for Democrats. Citing Mark Penn's Harvard-Harris poll, Byron York wrote, “Sixty-nine percent of those surveyed (78 percent of Republicans, 59 percent of Democrats, and 73 percent of independents) said ICE should not be abolished, while 31 percent said it should.”

Here is the [White House](#) case for ICE:

“REMOVING CRIMINALS: ICE protects public safety by removing dangerous criminal aliens from our communities.

- During fiscal year (FY) 2017, ICE Enforcement and Removal Operations (ERO) arrested more than 127,000 aliens with criminal convictions or charges.
- Criminal aliens arrested by ICE ERO in FY 2017 were responsible for:
 - More than 76,000 dangerous drug offenses;
 - More than 48,000 assault offenses;
 - More than 11,000 weapon offenses;
 - More than 5,000 sexual assault offenses;
 - More than 2,000 kidnapping offenses; and
 - More than 1,800 homicide offenses.
- ICE Homeland Security Investigations (HSI) made 4,818 gang-related arrests related in FY 2017.
- Abolishing ICE would mean that countless illegal aliens who pose a threat to public safety would be allowed to roam free – killing, injuring, and threatening Americans - instead of being removed from the country.

SEIZING DEADLY DRUGS: Abolishing ICE would mean more dangerous illegal drugs flowing into our communities, causing more Americans to needlessly suffer.

- ICE plays a critical role in combatting the drug crisis facing our Nation.
- ICE HSI seized more than 980,000 pounds of narcotics in FY 2017, including thousands of pounds of the deadly drugs fueling the opioid crisis.
 - ICE HSI seized 2,370 pounds of fentanyl and 6,967 pounds of heroin.
 - ICE HSI logged nearly 630,000 investigative hours directed toward fentanyl.
- Abolishing ICE would leave these drugs in our communities to cause more devastation.”

THE TRUMP PLAN IS ACCEPTABLE TO MOST AMERICANS

As Byron York reported, “Penn found widespread support for the fundamental provisions of the immigration bills, based on Trump’s ‘four pillars,’ that were recently rejected by the House of Representatives. ‘Would you favor or oppose a congressional deal that gives undocumented immigrants brought here by their parents work permits and a path to citizenship in exchange for increasing merit preference over preference for relatives, eliminating the diversity visa lottery, and funding barrier security on the U.S.-Mexico border?’ Penn asked. Sixty-three percent (66 percent of Republicans, 63 percent of Democrats, and 59 percent of independents) supported the plan, while 37 percent opposed.”

”Overall, Americans want to show compassion for those that are here, but want much tougher enforcement of immigration laws,’ Penn told [York]. ‘They want to solve the problem of illegal immigration, not keep kicking the can down the road.’”

THE CONSISTENT SCALE OF THE IMMIGRATION MAJORITY

Just to drive home how clear the American people are, and how great the opportunity to expose and defeat radical Democrats is, here are the numbers with the Republican side on the left, and the radical Democrats on the right:

Harvard-Harris Poll Question	Democratic Stance		Republican Stance	
<i>Do you think that people who make it across our border illegally should be allowed to stay in the country or sent home?</i>	Stay	36%	Sent Home	64%
<i>Do you think that parents with children who make it across our border illegally should be allowed to stay in the country or sent home?</i>	Stay	39%	Sent Home	61%
<i>Do you think we need stricter or looser enforcement of our immigration laws?</i>	Looser Enforcement	30%	Stricter Enforcement	70%
<i>Do you think current border security is adequate or inadequate?</i>	Adequate	39%	Inadequate	61%
<i>Do you support or oppose building a combination of physical and electronic barriers across the U.S.-Mexico border?</i>	Oppose	40%	Support	60%
<i>Should cities that arrest illegal immigrants for crimes be required notify immigration authorities they are in custody or be prohibited from notifying immigration authorities?</i>	Pro-Sanctuary Cities (Prohibit Notification)	16%	End Sanctuary Cities (Support Notification)	84%
<i>Do you think notifying immigration authorities when people are arrested for crimes increases crime because it makes immigrants less likely to report crimes or it decreases crime because it takes criminals off the streets?</i>	Notifying ICE Increases Crime	36%	Notifying ICE Decreases Crime	64%
<i>Do you think that the Immigration and Customs Enforcement officers, known as ICE, should be disbanded or not?</i>	Favor abolishing ICE	31%	Oppose abolishing ICE	69%
<i>Would you favor or oppose a Congressional deal that gives undocumented immigrants brought here by their parents work permits and a path to citizenship in exchange for increasing merit preference over preference for relatives, eliminating the diversity visa lottery, and funding barrier security on the U.S.-Mexico border?</i>	Oppose	37%	Favor	63%

TO SUMMARIZE, WE RANGE FROM A HIGH OF 84 TO LOW OF 60 PERCENT FOR OUR IMMIGRATION POSITIONS.

IV. THE FEINSTEIN OPEN BORDER BILL DISASTER: CREATING THE OPPORTUNITY FOR DISASTROUS DEMOCRATIC SENATE LOSSES

Given the overwhelming views of the American people, it is amazing that Senator Feinstein could have introduced an open borders bill and gotten every Democrat in the Senate to cosponsor it. Given the numbers in the Mark Penn survey, there is probably no state in the United States, not even California, where anything close to a majority would favor an open borders bill.

In all likelihood one or more radical staffers probably drafted this bill in the hysteria of the media assault on the children detention issue. They wrote to their radical friends and allies that this was a clever bill.

If Senate Republicans are prepared to drive home this bill, they may put into play seats which would normally seem out of reach. Just as 1994 involved challenging Democrats who had seemed unbeatable, the 2018 immigration choice between security and radical open borders may endanger members who would normally seem unbeatable.

Every Republican challenger should get a copy of the Feinstein bill and carry it to every event, every press conference, and every debate. The Democrat should be forced to explain why they agreed to cosponsor such a disastrous bill.

A number of them went out of their way to indicate their support for the Feinstein bill:

[Senator Baldwin \(WI\), 6/8/18](#): “This legislation restores a humane approach that respects individuals seeking asylum in our country and ensures children and parents are not separated at our border.”

[Senator Brown \(OH\), 6/17/18](#): “ I joined @SenFeinstein’s bill last week to keep children and parents together.”

[Senator Donnelly \(IN\), 6/17/18](#): “I’ll be cosponsoring the Keeping Families Together Act.”

[Senator Heitkamp \(ND\), 6/17/18](#): “I’m cosponsoring the Keep Families Together Act.”

[Senator Manchin \(WV\), 6/18/18](#): “ today I am signing onto the Keep Families Together Act”.

[Senator Smith \(MN\), 6/14/18](#): “I am a proud cosponsor of Senator Dianne Feinstein's Keep Families Together Act”.

[Senator Debbie Stabenow \(MI\), 6/14/18 Tweet](#): “The situation on the border is cruel and heartbreaking. I am a cosponsor of @SenFeinstein’s must-pass bill.”

[Senator Claire McCaskill \(MO\), 6/18/18](#): “[she] has announced her support for the Keep Families Together Act.”

[Senator Tester \(MT\), 6/17/18](#): “ I’m cosponsoring the *Keeping Families Together Act*.”

[Senator Nelson \(FL\), 6/8/18](#): ““We must return to our true American values by treating those seeking asylum with dignity and respect and keeping families together.”

[Senator Bob Menendez \(NJ\), 6/8/2018](#): “[Senator Menendez] joined Sen. Dianne Feinstein (D-Calif.) and 29 other Senate Democrats in announcing introduction of legislation.”

If the Republicans are prepared to slow the campaign down and focus on this issue, they have the facts to back them up.

Attorney Gabriel Malor wrote a stunning analysis of the Feinstein bill for [The Federalist](#).

The essence of the Malor analysis is simple: “Democrats’ proposed legislation to prohibit so-called border separations would actually prevent federal law enforcement agencies almost anywhere inside the United States from arresting and detaining criminals who are parents having nothing to do with unlawfully crossing the border and seeking asylum.”

Malor writes, “Every Senate Democrat has now signed on to cosponsor a bill written so carelessly that it does not distinguish between migrant children at the border and U.S. citizen children already within the United States. The bill further does not distinguish between federal officers handling the border crisis and federal law enforcement pursuing the ordinary course of their duties.”

Virtually every state is directly affected. Note Malor’s destruction of the “limited” nature of the bill as he asserts, “[A]t or near the port of entry or within 100 miles of the border’ does not meaningfully limit the geographic scope of this bill. That area includes almost the entirety of the geographical territory of the United States and the vast majority of people living in it. Two hundred million people live within 100 miles of the border. That’s roughly two-thirds of the U.S. population. Even more live near ports of entry, including in places far from the border crisis, like Salt Lake City, Utah (nearly 700 miles from the nearest border crossing), Tulsa, Oklahoma (more than 600 miles from the nearest border crossing), and Nashville, Tennessee (nearly 600 miles from the nearest border crossing). All major U.S. metropolitan areas fall within either 100 miles of the border or are near a port of entry or both.”

With the permission of Gabriel Malor, Ben Domenech, and *The Federalist*, I have added Malor’s entire article at the end of Appendix 2.

Malor’s analysis provides all of the ammunition that any candidate needs to win a debate with a Democrat who cosponsored the open borders Feinstein bill without having analyzed how bad it really is and how opposed the American people will be.

We also need a media campaign to drive home that every single Senate Democrat came out for an open borders bill. Remember by 70-30 Americans want stricter, not looser enforcement. A true open borders bill might be in the low 20s in support.

V. OPEN BORDERS AND THE RADICAL DEMOCRATS

Congressman Keith Ellison, Deputy Chair of the Democratic National Committee and candidate for Attorney General of Minnesota last month had a nice picture of him wearing a T-shirt that said “I don’t believe in borders.” Let him try to explain that outside downtown Minneapolis

Mark Penn’s Harvard-Harris poll found that 36 percent of Democrats say they want open borders.

The abolish ICE campaign will rapidly become an open border issue, because without enforcement, there will inevitably be open-ended illegal migration.

The Democrats cannot win on these issues if Republicans have the courage to ignore the elite media and focus on the American people.

Open borders is a big loser with Hispanic Americans. In Zogby Analytics 2016 [exit polling](#), twice as many Hispanics believe immigration enforcement is too lax versus too stringent. On border issues in a recent Economist/YouGov [poll](#) only 20 percent of Hispanics support “catch and release. 64 percent of Hispanics support either detaining the whole family together, or detaining parents and children separately. Hispanics simply do not support open borders.

VI. DEMOCRATS’ BORDER SEPARATION BILL WOULD LET NEARLY ALL PARENTS WHO COMMIT FEDERAL CRIMES GET OFF SCOT-FREE

Gabriel Malor

The Federalist

June 19, 2018

Every Senate Democrat has signed on to cosponsor a bill written so carelessly that it does not distinguish between foreign children at the border and U.S. citizen children.

Democrats’ proposed legislation to prohibit so-called border separations would actually prevent federal law enforcement agencies almost anywhere inside the United States from arresting and detaining criminals who are parents having nothing to do with unlawfully crossing the border and seeking asylum.

Every Senate Democrat has [now signed on to cosponsor](#) a bill written so carelessly that it does not distinguish between migrant children at the border and U.S. citizen children already within the United States. The bill further does not distinguish between federal officers handling the border crisis and federal law enforcement pursuing the ordinary course of their duties.

Let’s break down Sen. Dianne Feinstein’s proposed “[Keep Families Together Act](#)” to see where Democrats went wrong. The bill provides that “[a]n agent or officer of a designated agency shall be prohibited from removing a child from his or her parent or legal guardian at or near the port of entry or within 100 miles of the border of the United States” (with three exceptions to be discussed later). Four immediate warning signs in this provision should put the reader on notice that this bill is not what Democrats claim.

First, “designated agency” here is defined as the entirety of the federal departments of Homeland Security, Justice, and Health and Human Services. The scope of the bill is not limited to those portions of these departments involved with the border crisis, and there is no other limiting factor in the bill that would cabin the prohibition on family separation to immigration-related matters. In other words, this bill is going to regulate conduct across a great many federal offices that have nothing to do with separating children from families arriving unlawfully in the United States.

Second, “agent or officer” is not defined by the legislation, except to say that it includes contractors. Federal law, however, already defines “officer” to include (with exceptions not relevant here) every federal employee appointed to the civil service by the head of an executive agency and ultimately overseen by the head of an executive agency.

Here again, this bill is not limited to controlling the behavior of the DHS, DOJ, or HHS officers involved in the border crisis. The proposed law would apply with equal force to, say, FBI agents (part of DOJ), Secret Service agents (part of DHS), and Centers for Disease Control officers (part of HHS) in the exercise of their everyday duties.

Third, “at or near the port of entry or within 100 miles of the border” does not meaningfully limit the geographic scope of this bill. That area includes almost the entirety of the geographical territory of the United States and the vast majority of people living in it. Two hundred million people live within 100 miles of the border. That’s roughly two-thirds of the U.S. population. Even more live near ports of entry, including in places far from the border crisis, like Salt Lake City, Utah (nearly 700 miles from the nearest border crossing), Tulsa, Oklahoma (more than 600 miles from the nearest border crossing), and Nashville, Tennessee (nearly 600 miles from the nearest border crossing). All major U.S. metropolitan areas fall within either 100 miles of the border or are near a port of entry or both.

Finally, “child” is defined in this legislation as any individual who has not reached 18 years old who has no permanent immigration status. This astonishing definition includes U.S. citizens under the age of 18. Citizen children by definition have no immigration status, permanent or otherwise. (Even if the Democrats belatedly amended this provision to restrict the definition to *alien* children without a permanent immigration status, that amended definition would still include non-migrant aliens, like tourist children, Deferred Action for Child Arrivals recipients under the age of 18, and children whose parents have had their immigration status revoked.)

Thus, far from addressing the border crisis, the Democrats’ Keep Families Together Act applies almost everywhere in the country to prohibit any DHS, DOJ, or HHS officer from removing almost any child from a parent. The listed exceptions to the prohibition—a state court authorizes separation, a state child welfare agency determines that the child is in danger, or certain DHS officials establish that the child is a victim of trafficking or is in danger from the parent, or that the parent is not the actual parent of the child—are completely unrelated to the vast majority of DHS, DOJ, and HHS enforcement activity.

Two groups would not benefit from the prohibition on family separation in this bill. First, parents who have children *with* a permanent immigration status go unprotected. Additionally, the childless would obviously find no shelter from this legislation. This disparity in treatment for the childless and lawful permanent residents borders on the farcical.

The ridiculous consequences of passing the Democrats’ hastily written mess are easily demonstrated. Let’s say FBI agents hear about a drug trafficker and murderer in Buffalo, New York. The agents get a warrant to raid the drug trafficker’s house and arrest him. While they do so, they discover the drug trafficker’s minor daughter is home with him. Feinstein’s bill would prohibit the FBI agents, while arresting a drug trafficker, from separating this child from her father.

This is not a farfetched hypothetical. FBI agents are agents of DOJ (a designated agency) and Buffalo is within 100 miles of the border. So long as the daughter is either a U.S. citizen or an alien without permanent status, the FBI agents would be unable to proceed with normal law

enforcement activities. The agents would be forced to choose between booking the drug trafficking murderer into jail *with his daughter* or not booking him into jail at all.

Panicky lawmaking often produces absurd results, and this one presents law enforcement with the choice between keeping children with their criminal parents while prosecuting them almost anywhere in the United States and for any crime whatsoever, or not prosecuting criminal parents at all. The legislation is not limited to unlawful entry prosecutions, to migrants, or (absent amendment) even to alien children.

A more honest method of ending unlawful entry prosecutions—and the family separations that ensue—would be to repeal 8 U.S.C. § 1325, which criminalizes unlawful entry in the first place. That would at least have the benefit of not curtailing federal enforcement of every other criminal law on the books for parents who keep their children close.

At a minimum, Democrats' proposed legislation is the consequence of extremely careless and hurried drafting. If this is actually what Democrats intend to do—and every Democratic senator has now signed on—it is a monstrous attack on law and order. If enacted, this bill would turn federal law enforcement upside down in the name of protecting relatively few unlawful border crossers from being prosecuted. This sloppiness is a prime example of why Democrats are unserious about outcomes and unfit to govern when the emotional stakes get high.

APPENDIX 3

WINNING THE HEALTH DEBATE

The American people are pretty clear about what they want.

Ninety-two percent want pre-existing conditions covered.

Seventy-nine percent want children to be able to stay on their parents health insurance until the age of 26.

Seventy-eight percent want the plans to be portable to have the flexibility to change jobs and not be trapped into one job in order to receive healthcare.

Seventy-five percent want the system to be patient-centered.

Seventy percent want a lower-cost system.

Secretary of Health and Human Services Alex Azar and Commissioner of Food and Drugs Dr. Scott Gottlieb have both been working methodically to achieve these goals.

While Republicans have to demolish the concept of a government run universal health system as a risky scheme that would endanger the millions of Americans who rely on our current healthcare system, they also have to communicate that they have a practical plan that builds on what works in both the public and private sector. This plan has to focus on the development of a more accessible, more innovative, less expensive health system using innovations and new entrepreneurship to improve outcomes and increase convenience, that ultimately would lead to longer, healthier lives at a lower cost. This approach has worked in a wide number of areas in American life, and if the government encourages innovation, instead of blocking it, it can happen in health as well.

Republicans believe every American should have the longest life, with the best health, at the greatest convenience, and the lowest cost.

Republicans believe we are entering an age of innovation that will dramatically improve health outcomes, while offering numerous opportunities for dramatic reductions in cost.

We oppose government run healthcare as unaffordable and ultimately, bureaucratically hostile to innovation, and guaranteed to be politicized by powerful interest groups.

However, we also believe that the current system of public and private bureaucracies, each optimizing their power or profit, is guaranteed to underperform, while costing far too much.

Republicans are committed to working with people and institutions on the following challenges:

1. Republicans will maximize the rate of innovation and implementation of innovations to both save lives and save money;
2. Republicans will recenter the system on the patient so they have access to knowledge about their own health and their healthcare options, including costs, so they can make informed decisions about their own lives;
3. Republicans will shift decision power from bureaucracies to health professionals and their patients;
4. Republicans will encourage market forces so patients as customers, rather than bureaucrats and politicians, make decisions that reshape the health system;
5. Republicans are committed to rebuilding citizen awareness of costs so that they make informed decisions in a system in which they have a financial interest in costs, as well as a personal interest in outcomes;
6. As the American health system extends its advantages as the most innovative, highest value added health system in the world, we can maximize American sales worldwide to create more American jobs, and to maximize the incentive for innovation, by maximizing the potential revenue on a global basis;
7. The shift to a more dynamic, more innovative, more patient-centered system has to be thought through and implemented carefully to minimize damage to existing institutions and systems that have provided the best health outcomes in the world—destroying the productive and successful present is not an acceptable first step to a better future; and
8. As specific reforms and innovations develop, Republicans will work to communicate both the larger vision of a dramatically better future, and the specific reforms that will accelerate getting to that future.