

## **You Might Be Right - 2024 Election Preview - Transcript**

**Carly Fiorina:** The worst thing for our democracy is for people to just check out and way too many people have checked out. There's something you could do. It may be on a small scale in your own neighborhood, but there's something every single one of us can do.

**Marianne Wanamaker:** Welcome to "You Might Be Right," a place for civil conversations about tough topics brought to you by the Baker School of Public Policy and Public Affairs at the University of Tennessee with funding support for members of our Producers Circle. To learn more about how you can support our work visit, [youmightberight.org](http://youmightberight.org).

In this episode, our hosts, former Tennessee Governors Phil Bredesen and Bill Haslam speak to Carly Fiorina, former CEO of Hewlett-Packard and a presidential candidate in 2016, about what it takes to be a leader in divisive times and how civic education can create a more informed and engaged electorate. This episode was released on November 7th, 2023, one year in advance of the 2024 presidential election.

**Phil Bredesen:** Bill, it's good to be back with you and I think we have a good cast today.

**Bill Haslam:** I think it's fun. Carly Fiorina has literally covered the waterfront from running a major tech business to running for senate, running for president, to now being involved in doing some of the things that our listeners care about – how do we make this democracy that's so precious to us, how do we make it not just sustainable but thrive.

**Phil Bredesen:** I'll be interested to hear what she has to say. Certainly for president, we have not brought forward people out of the business community, particularly that even though there's a lot of very capable people, and just seeing her experience and coming from that background I think will be really interesting. And she's a very bright lady and I think will have a lot to say.

**Bill Haslam:** Let's get to it.

**Phil Bredesen:** Okay.

**Bill Haslam:** Well Phil, I'm excited to have our guest with us today. Most Americans know the name Carly Fiorina. She's been a business leader. She's been very involved in our political process. She's highly involved in some things now looking at democracy in America and how we can improve it. So Carly Fiorina is our guest. She is, a lot of folks know, had a great career with AT&T and then Lucent Technology became the CEO and later chairman of Hewlett-Packard guiding them through pretty transformational period in the technology sector. And then in 2015, she ran for the Republican nomination for president of the United States, which is another interesting experience that we'll talk about.

But Carly, thank you so much, Phil and I have both been looking forward to this discussion.

**Carly Fiorina:** Well, it is great to be with you both. Thank you so much for having me.

**Phil Bredezen:** Thank you. We really appreciate having you. And I guess the first question I have for you to just start is you had a notion of what it would be like to run for president. You've been involved in John McCain's campaign and made the decision to do it. And then by the time it was over, I'm wondering how the reality differed from what you saw to going in? It's sort of a what were you thinking question.

**Carly Fiorina:** Yes and no. Nothing like starting with a softball, gentlemen. I'll tell you what was the same as I expected and what was different. What was the same as what I expected was the interactions with voters. That was, of course, the best part of the process. Voters ask very relevant, important and insightful questions. For me, it was inspiring to see citizens so engaged in the process that they would spend time on a Saturday or an evening to come and see a candidate that they didn't know much about and spend a great deal of time. In my experience, the questions that voters focused on were around the real issues. In other words, the campaigning part with people was kind of the best of democracy.

What wasn't what I expected? Trump wasn't what I expected. The entrance of Donald Trump changed the contest fundamentally. It changed the contest fundamentally because all the media attention went to him. It changed the contest fundamentally because the more outrageous things he said and the more outrageous things he did, the more traction he seemed to gain. It was very disorienting. I remember when he made his unbelievably crass and completely unacceptable comments about John McCain. I, of course, rushed to his defense as everyone else did, but at the time, of course, I thought this is completely disqualifying. And it wasn't. And so that was very disorienting, honestly. To be in the middle of a process where suddenly everything you thought you knew about what was acceptable and what was not acceptable was turned on its head juxtaposed against my interactions with voters, which were generally speaking very uplifting. So it was hard to put those two sides of the picture together. And honestly speaking, gentlemen, it remains hard to this day.

**Bill Haslam:** You were talking about when then candidate Trump made those comments about John McCain. Without making this all about Donald Trump, you said historically those would've been disqualifying statements. What changed in the electorate to make it so that those were no longer disqualifying statements. I'm like you. I remember reading that and thinking, "Okay, well, I don't think you can say that and get the Republican nomination." But, obviously, he went on to do that easily. So again, zooming out, we're not just talking about Donald Trump, but what changed to make that no longer true?

**Carly Fiorina:** So, of course, I'm no smarter than anyone else, so like you and all your listeners, I'm not sure I have a good answer for that, but I have a couple of theories. I think number one, that when people are very frustrated, they tend to lash out, and I think there is a lot of frustration with how politics has worked or isn't working. I think beyond that, however, I think there is a lot of breakdown and dislocation in communities and I think technology has a lot to do with that, by the way.

I think technology is wonderful in many respects. It's a great tool, but there's no question that the rise of social media has built this new habit where we can just talk to our own tribe and where people have learned to be incredibly nasty from afar and get away with it. You never have to engage in conversation with somebody who doesn't agree with you a thousand percent of the time. And so I think we're losing the ability to be empathetic, to be polite, to be respectful of one another. All of the things that have caused the two of you to put this podcast together, honestly.

**Bill Haslam:** Let me ask you a two part question. You've run for the United States Senate as a Republican in California, difficult to do. You've run for president of the United States, difficult to do. Two questions. What made you do that? Why'd you care enough to do that? And then second, what advice would you have to other people who might be thinking about running for office in today's political climate?

**Carly Fiorina:** All of my adult life –I didn't see it clearly when I was younger, but I see it clearly now in retrospect – I've always run to the toughest problems. I like problem solving. I understand what problem solving takes. I like producing results. I understand what that takes. And big challenges are interesting to me because a lot of people run away from them. So it's not that I didn't understand that running as a Republican in California wasn't going to be a tough challenge, but there was a path. Obviously, I did not win. It's not as though I didn't understand running for president as a complete outsider was– I understood it was a difficult challenge, but there was a path. Obviously, it didn't work out. So I don't tilt at windmills, I don't run at fool's errands, but I'm not afraid of a challenge. And in fact, I'm interested by challenges.

I think what made me care enough to run, because it is, as you gentlemen both know through your service as governors, what made me care enough to try to tackle that big challenge is because I, like so many others, was utterly frustrated by the lack of responsiveness of key elected officials, the lack of problem-solving ability in so many of our public servants. In fact, I have come to believe that the incentive system in our political process anymore isn't about problem solving at all. It's about running and winning and raising money. And so I felt like maybe I could do something about that.

**Phil Bredezen:** Following up on that. I mean, because certainly what you were saying resonates, I think to be fair with both of us, very much, one of the things in the time that I've spent in politics, which was 16 years as mayor and governor, was that there seemed to be different people running for office today than there was a generation ago. That people who are less tied to their communities, people who don't have a substantial track record or world outside of what they're doing in politics. And that of course just leads you to the notion of that's such an important part of your identity then and your whole livelihood that you probably naturally think mostly about reelection. Does that ring a bell or strike a responsive cord with what you've seen? And how do you get people who are embedded in their communities in that way, which I think was the founder's idea of who these representatives, for example, were. How do you get them back into the political system?

**Carly Fiorina:** So it's such a great question and I want to connect it to the previous question, which I did not answer. That is, what advice would you give? Because I think they're connected. I was actually with a group of government students recently at a university, James Madison University, and they asked, "Well, what advice would you have if we want to run for office?" And I said, "Do something else first. Do something else first."

**Phil Bredeesen:** Same advice I give.

**Carly Fiorina:** Because doing something else first to the point of both of your questions, first of all, it gives you experience that's valuable. Secondly, it gives you perspective that's valuable. Thirdly, you learn something about yourself and something about your community to the point. And I think when people, when their whole persona is about I am a politician, then what we end up with are people who like to speechify, they like to tweet, they like to get on TV, they like to raise money, but they don't necessarily focus on doing the people's work, tackling the tough problems, making the compromises necessary to solve those problems and producing results.

**Phil Bredeesen:** Bill, you and I have talked about this. I mean, I think both of us have thought that one of the things that really helped us in holding office was we're both somebody who had a real career in life outside of that process. So just as you say, you're not so tied up with your ego in terms of your life is worthless if you don't get reelected, and if you're not worried about that, it frees you up to do things and take some risks.

**Bill Haslam:** You're working a lot now on focusing on civic engagement, trying to help address some of the issues that we all feel around our democracy today. What are the things that you're specifically advocating or pushing toward this? I mean, listen, you can ask every American, "Are you frustrated and exhausted by politics?" And everybody says yes. Few people have any ideas. Well, what can we actually do about that? So do you have some thoughts for us?

**Carly Fiorina:** So, yes. First, I'm very engaged in— through the commemoration of our 250th, which will occur in 2026, and my service as chairman of the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. Williamsburg is where most— so many of our important revolutionary moments occurred. Virginia's in many ways sort of the crucible of the nation for revolutionary history. And I start with that because I actually think reeducating, reconnecting, reinspiring Americans with who we actually are and what and where we come from matters a lot. The truth is that most Americans really could never pass the citizenship test. They don't understand how our government is structured. They don't understand the circumstances, experiences, good, bad, and ugly, that led to the Declaration of Independence. They don't understand why the constitution is written the way it is, why our system of government is designed the way it is.

Here's an analogy maybe that will connect. When we sit down at Sunday dinner, any of our families or our communities, inevitably we end up talking about the past. We end up talking about the people of the past, the stories of the past. And the reason we inevitably do that is because we know we cannot understand our present unless we know who and what we came

from. It's intuitive, it's human, we all get it. And ultimately, of course, families don't heal unless they reconnect with their past. Well, the same is true of nations. And as a nation, we no longer even know our past, much less connect with it.

I'm very engaged in connecting Americans with our past in a truthful way, in a complete way, in a compelling way. But nevertheless, to say it actually matters how this nation was formed and for all of our faults, this is the most successful republican human history and we remain an inspiring ideal for so many. And while there is much that is very difficult about our story as a nation, it ultimately is a redemptive story, because the words that were written all those many years ago not only designed a government that is self-correcting – Alex de Tocqueville said, "It's not that Americans are more enlightened than anyone else, it's just they can repair their faults."

And it's not just that we designed a system of government that can be one functioning, self-correcting, it also is that the words that were written have inspired every movement for dignity, equality, liberty, sovereignty, everywhere ever since. So we need to reconnect with that and educate people about that, because I do not think we can be a fully functioning democracy, and I do not think we can remain a successful republic, unless we understand like any family, like any community, who we are, where we come from, who we come from, and what we come from.

**Phil Bredeesen:** All right, Carly, but you've talked about some grand ideas, slightly abstract, but what it comes down to in the end it seems is there are candidates for public office and you go into the polls and you decide which one of two or several you're going to actually vote for. I mean, that's the core transaction that leads at least to all the rest. So the question I have for you is, when you do that, when you go into the voting booth to elect a senator or president or congressman or city council person, what do you look for in a candidate? Surely for someone like you, it's more than just some ideological agreement or something like that. What are the characteristics you look for?

**Carly Fiorina:** So the first and most important thing, and I've learned this the hard way, is character. I have come to believe that character trumps, no pun intended, everything. I think character trumps everything. I think it trumps policy, politics, everything, because fundamentally, and I know it's very hard to test someone's character, but I think you know someone's character from how they've lived their life, how they've lived their life, how they've behaved in public, in private, what we know about them, all those things matter. I think character matters more than anything else.

And by the way, to not be perhaps quite so abstract, although our history is very real and on the ground when told in the right way, one of the things that I believe communities need to do now, heading into this next election, is communities need to rally around the people who work at our polls. Communities need to rally around understanding the voting process and reassuring their fellow community members and citizens. "Yes, this voting process was secured."

I think character matters more than anything else, because here's the thing, the decisions that

matter most that a public servant makes are the ones we don't get to see. So we better have some sense of who this person is, are they honest and forthright, and have they lived their life in a way that we say, "Yeah, I would invite them to Sunday dinner, or not."

**Bill Haslam:** You touched on, and part of that are on the whole election integrity issue, and I know you've been involved with the task force. As people become more and more distrustful of institutions and processes of all types, what would you tell people about, "Hey, here's how confident you can be in the security of your election."?

**Carly Fiorina:** Well, first, let me say on the subject of character – because it's related to election security – of course, anyone is entitled to contest an election and there are processes that are time-honored and tested to challenge elections, whether it's in the courtroom or whether it's an audit of votes. And once all of those processes have been exhausted and an election is declared secure over and over and over and over by members of both parties and officials from the local polling booth all the way up to the federal government, once that happens, any politician who denies the results of an election, I believe that is disqualifying. It is disqualifying to me as a matter of character because what it is doing is sowing seeds of doubt in the integrity of the electoral process where no such doubt should exist. And so anyone who says an election wasn't valid, that's been demonstrated to be valid, for me, that's disqualifying. And honestly, I think it should be disqualifying for other voters, if you're asked, if they would ask me for my advice.

But I do think all the way back to the original question, just as Americans are very unaware or uneducated or ignorant about the processes of our democracy, most Americans don't actually understand how elections work. Many Americans truly don't understand that, for example, elections are managed by states, not the federal government. I mean, the three of us would say everybody understands that. Actually, everybody doesn't understand that. Everybody doesn't understand the incredibly important role that people within the community play to actually show up at the polls, to register people to vote, to check people's voter ID. So helping people get in touch on the ground with what is actually happening on the ground in your neighborhood, in your community, around an election, I think is incredibly important. Because now, it's not some abstract, nefarious plot that somebody has cooked up far away. No, actually it's your neighbors and it's the teacher you run into in the cafeteria. These are neighbors and community members who are engaged in the election process. Having more Americans understand that I actually think is really important.

**Phil Bredesen:** Let me switch to a little different facet of this issue of revitalizing democracy. There's been a lot of discussion recently about the role that corporations ought to play in this, think Disney for example, and what their obligations are or are not to involve themselves in public affairs. You've been CEO of a Fortune 50 corporation. How would you advise a fellow CEO to think through that process? What really is their obligation there?

**Carly Fiorina:** So let me begin by saying that I have long believed that a chief executive's job is to balance the requirements and the demands of customers, employees, shareholders, and the

communities in which they live and work. Now, that's not the answer you'll get from every CEO, but it has always been my answer. I do not believe that a company exists only to serve shareholders, particularly when shareholders, the average holding of a share today is in some cases minutes or nanoseconds as opposed to years. Yes, of course shareholders are very important, but it is employees who produce products and profits. It is customers who buy a company's products, and it is communities that either accept or reject a company's roots and employees in their midst. And so I think CEOs have to balance those requirements. My specific answer to your question about how and when should companies get involved is I would back up first and say, have a process that's well understood and transparent about how you get involved, when you get involved, and what points of view you contemplate before you get involved.

I start with process because I think a lot of companies get themselves into trouble because they weigh in on some things and not on others, or a CEO or a president will make a decision about one issue but not follow through on a similar issue. Why did the president of Harvard get into such trouble this week? Because, while they made a statement about Ukraine and George Floyd, they issued no statement about the unconscionable terrorist attack against the Jewish nation of Israel. So have a process that's understood and transparent and well thought through, and then exercise that process when an issue comes up within the boardroom. In other words, this should not be a CEO's lone decision. It should be a collective decision taken after thoughtful consideration and a process that's been put in place ahead of time.

**Bill Haslam:** I want to circle back to a little bit where we started with the whole thought of running for president. Like I said, that's such a different concept for most people to wrap their arms around like making—

**Carly Fiorina:** Yes. What was I thinking?

**Bill Haslam:** Believe me, there's nobody that's ever run for office that at some point in time has sat and thought, "What in the world was I thinking? What—

**Phil Bredezen:** It is almost guaranteed somewhere in the middle of the thing I'm thinking, "Well, let's see if I had a little minor stroke or something I could get out of this."

**Bill Haslam:** Exactly.

**Phil Bredezen:** Nothing too serious, but a good excuse.

**Bill Haslam:** Exactly. What's it look like to run for president? I mean, if somebody said, "Give me a 30-second description of here's what it's like to run for president of the United States."

**Carly Fiorina:** I've been asked a version of that question, is it the hardest thing I've ever done? And the answer is no. I'm sure being president would be the hardest thing I would've ever done, but running wasn't the hardest thing I've ever done. It's a lot of, yes, you have to put an

organization together. I had to put it together from the ground up. It's a lot of activity with a lot of different people. You're doing so many different activities and events in a day. Sometimes it tends to become a blur. But I quite enjoyed running for president. I mean, meaning the interactions with people on the ground, at events, at the Iowa State Fair or whatever it was, I mean, interactions with people I quite enjoyed.

**Phil Bredeesen:** So Bill, we have with us today somebody who has run one of the largest technology companies in the world, and I'd like to maybe harken back to another conversation we had another one of these and ask Carly, I mean, the world is all talking about AI right now and what is it going to mean in every known sphere. Do you have any thoughts on what it's going to do to the democratic process, the political process, and things we might be doing to make it better?

**Carly Fiorina:** Yes. I have a lot of thoughts, actually. So first, let's start with the good news about AI, because when I get to the bad news, it's quite scary. So let's start with the good news. Artificial intelligence can make many things more engaging. It can make education more engaging. It can make history more engaging. It can make learning anything new more engaging. Those are good things. It can make solving previously insoluble problems possible, actually. We can answer questions with AI that we really couldn't answer before. That's great. It will, I think, dramatically accelerate progress in certain fields, medicine, for example. The dark side of artificial intelligence is it can destroy history, rewrite history, recreate history. It can present, to the point of our political process, it can present an absolutely compelling narrative in the mouths of someone that you just absolutely know is the real deal. And all of it's false and all of it's fake and all of it is designed to divide and to destroy. And what's more frightening about it, honestly, and I'm saying all this because I think we have to be very clear-eyed about this. What's more frightening about it is that bad actors – Russia, China, Iran, Northern Korea, bad actors in our own country – bad actors will guaranteed, one hundred percent use AI in this upcoming election for their own purposes.

Why am I a hundred percent certain of that? Because they can, because it's in their interests, and because the technology will allow them to do so. So, the first and most important thing I think for us to understand is this is real and it can be really destructive, and we have to be clear-eyed about it. We have to sound the alarm. We have to call it out when we see it. It is why all the way back to the first thing, it's why character matters so much. But I also think it's one of the reasons we have to spend time educating people about how things actually work so that they can begin to make their own distinctions and decisions and discern differences. We have to begin to train, retrain people about how do you know when something is real, how do you know when something is fake, how do you check?

Now, I know that doesn't happen overnight, but here's what I do know. People listen to the leaders in their lives. So who are the leaders in people's lives? Employers are the leaders in people's lives. The boss they trust is a leader in their life. Their pastor is a leader in their lives. You and your podcast, you are trying to educate and make people aware. You're playing a leadership and a problem solving role. I think the leaders in people's lives have to talk about this



and say, "Hey, when you get something on this that you think, 'My gosh must be true, it's so compelling,' check your work, ask questions, try and figure out where it came from." If we don't start training people to do that, I truly am concerned.

**Phil Bredeesen:** I certainly think that if you had a population who was attuned to doing that and willing to take the time, that'd be great. I'm not sure that's the real world, however, and plus the fact that, I mean, I think of if I were in politics now, you could easily have some video out there of me doing something outrageous or saying something outrageous.

**Bill Haslam:** So you're telling us that's not true?

**Phil Bredeesen:** In advance, none of that is true. But with all the fact checking and stuff in the world, I mean you create images that are just not going to disappear from people's minds. I mean, they're there. They're priming the way they think about things. So the question comes down to, is there something that should be done in the way of regulation to at least put some costs associated with somebody using it, using AI in this way. That doesn't address Russian AI, but it might address some of the ones here. I'm trying to think about, I don't know what that might be and a Congress that wasn't quite sure as to what the business model of Facebook was, is probably not going to come up with the right answer there. But do you have any thoughts about, I mean, if you were president and you had an opportunity to address this legislatively or in a regulatory fashion, how might you go about it?

**Carly Fiorina:** So I do think there is a real role for government legislation and regulation here. I think there has been a role for the government in regulation legislation of social media, and unfortunately, none of that happened for a really long time. I have been calling publicly for quite a long time, and tried to practice this when I led Hewlett-Packard, for collaboration between the high-tech community and the legislative and regulatory community. That does not come naturally for either side, but it is absolutely vital. Silicon Valley has grown up thinking that all regulation is bad. We are upstart startups, just please leave us alone. But that world was a long time ago, and now what we have are massive concentrations of power in a very few companies that impact every single one of our lives. I mean, big tech, honestly, has more power than the railroads, the oil companies, the big banks have ever had, and yet they are basically completely unregulated and unlegislated, and it has been to our detriment, and I don't think we can make that mistake again with AI.

And so I am encouraged, I must say, that there is some collaboration going on between the tech community and Washington right now. I encourage more of it. I am engaged in some of that already, because this is bigger than everybody. And Silicon Valley's attitude of just hands off please isn't going to continue to work. Washington D.C. is equally at fault because politicians on both sides of the aisle wanted Silicon Valley's political contributions, and so everybody was hands off. That's just a fact. Now, there needs to be real collaboration. And so I actually think President Biden, Chuck Schumer are on the right track when they are bringing people together from the regulatory, the political side, the technology community to say, what is it that we can agree on?

By the way, that's the fundamental of problem solving. The fundamental of problem solving is to get people together who come from different spheres and different points of view to agree on a goal. We have to have some common sense regulation and guardrails up around AI. And by the way, social media as well. Let us work together to solve that problem. That's the essence of problem solving. And so that's how I would do it. And I think they're on the right track. I just hope they're not too distracted by a presidential election and dysfunction in Congress that they just don't actually ever get anything done.

**Bill Haslam:** I think that's a good hope in terms of not being distracted by the politics. We agree with you. This podcast takes its name from former Tennessee Senator Howard Baker's statement that to always remember the other person might be right. Can you think of a time when you can look back and say, "I didn't get that right. The other side or the other person, the other folks had that right, and I didn't." Can you think of an example for us?

**Carly Fiorina:** Yes. There's so many, actually.

**Phil Bredeesen:** That's a good answer.

**Carly Fiorina:** There's so many. But I think of one that's related to the conversation we just had about how these companies are massive centers of power. And I remember being an active CEO at the time and having a conversation with my sister. My sister has very different politics than I do. She is a Democrat living in Berkeley, California, and has been most of her life. And I remember her talking to me about the power of big companies and how dangerous the unchecked power of big companies was. And because I was a CEO and I knew myself and Hewlett-Packard was a big company, I was taking it kind of personally, sort of defending big business and all this. And I remember her saying to me, "You know, Carly, if a company gets big enough, it's almost like its own weather system." And that phrase really stuck with me, and it took me a while, but she was actually right. She was actually right. That concentrations of power, whether it's in business or government, concentrations of power get to be problems in and of themselves, as our founders knew, which is why they disperse power.

**Phil Bredeesen:** This has been a great conversation and I think we both thank you very much for making your time to do this. I love reading about the work you're doing now to try to help improve our democracy from a different perspective perhaps than public office. And we appreciate you being here with us.

**Bill Haslam:** Thank you, Carly.

**Carly Fiorina:** Well, thank you both very much. And, if you'll indulge me for one more minute because something that one of you said about, "Well, that's not the real world." One of the things that I worry about the most and it's why I was privileged to join you today, and thank you for doing what you do with this podcast, the thing that worries me the most is too many people are becoming passive and deciding there's nothing they can do. The problems are too big,

they're too entrenched. It's not the real world. There's nothing I can do. And the worst thing for our democracy is for people to just check out and way too many people have checked out. And if you go all the way back to the beginning of our nation when the problems were huge and the risks were large, people didn't check out. So my message to your listeners would be, there's something you can do. It may be on a small scale in your own neighborhood, but there's something every single one of us can do to make something better. So we should do it.

**Bill Haslam:** Well said. I think we'll end right there. Thank you so much, Carly.

**Carly Fiorina:** Thank you both.

**Phil Bredesen:** Goodbye.

She's good. But as an example, I mean, the question I was asking about, how do you get real people to run for office? I mean, as we've talked about, I think you have to be a little weird to run for a major public office. I mean, this is a fundraising and all the public humiliation, all that kind of stuff that goes with it. But she's an example of somebody who's had a real life, has got real experience, has a track record of performance.

**Bill Haslam:** I mean, I do think her emphasis on character is exact right place to start. I love her emphasis on when people, and I think you and I give the same answer when people come see us about running and we say, first go do something else, it's not a great place to start your career because you have a whole different perspective.

**Phil Bredesen:** Yeah. I talk to people who they're just out of college and they want a career in politics, and they're asking, how do I run for state representative or something like that. I always say to them, "Go out and get some economic independence. Get some real experience out there. Otherwise, you get in these offices and they don't pay anything and you're just chasing around all the time. And I think the time to do it is a little further on in life." And it's not to say there's not other routes. I mean, Thomas Jefferson was in politics his whole life, but—

**Bill Haslam:** My favorite thing she said is where she ended. And that's one of the reasons I hope people that are engaged with this podcast, one of the things they take away is don't give up. Don't give up on the process. The problem is too many caring people said, "I'm over it." And particularly when people say, "I'm just not going to play in the primary process anymore." Because in most states, in most places, elections are decided in primaries. So if you check yourself out of that process, then you're saying those folks that are making me frustrated and mad that they win.

**Marianne Wanamaker:** Thanks for listening to "You Might Be Right." Be sure to follow on Apple Podcasts, Spotify, or wherever you listen to your favorite shows. And please help spread the word by sharing, rating and reviewing the show.

Thank you, Governors Bredesen and Haslam, for hosting these conversations. "You Might Be

Right" is brought to you by the Baker School of Public Policy and Public Affairs at the University of Tennessee with support from the Boyd Fund for Leadership and Civil Discourse. To learn more about the show and our work, go to [youmightberight.org](http://youmightberight.org) and follow the show on social media @YMBRpodcast.

This episode was produced in partnership with Relational Marketing and Stones River Group.