Michael Berman's

WASHINGTON POLITICAL WATCH

No. 151   December 2, 2016

* * * * *

The data below is the latest available as of November 27th.

Any statements in this issue of the Watch which are not sourced are mine.

* * * * *

The Setting

21% of Americans say the country is headed in the right direction while 63% say it is on the wrong track. (Reuters/Ipsos, 11/15)

The NBC/WSJ survey has been asking this question for a very long time. The highest "right track" number was recorded in September 2001 when it was 72% and the "wrong track" number was 11%.

Of the 75 surveys since October 20, 2008, when the "wrong track" number was 78% and the "right track" number was 12%, there has not been a single NBC/WSJ survey in which the "right track" number exceeded the "wrong track" number. The closest it came to a positive number came in April 2009, when the "right track" and "wrong track" numbers were the same at 43%.

The "wrong track" number was in the 40-49% range from February – September 2009. Since then the "wrong track" numbers have been in the 50-59% range or higher. There were four time periods when the "wrong track" number was in the 70% range: August – November 2011, October 2013, August 2014, December 2015 and April – July 2016.

* * * * *

The official BLS seasonally adjusted unemployment rate for October 2016 is 4.9%. Seven years ago the seasonally adjusted unemployment rate was 10%.

If one takes into account the total number of unemployed + those marginally attached to the labor force + those working part-time who want full-time work, the current rate is 9.5%. Seven years ago the rate was 17.1%. [BLS data is based on those 16 years of age and older.]

In the third week of November, Gallup found an unadjusted unemployment rate of 5.1%. It also found an under-employment rate of 12.6% (unemployed +

those working part-time but wanting full-time work). This is based on those 18 years of age and older.

* * * * *

The public's grading of President Obama's job approval, as found by Gallup on 11/22/16 is 55% approval/ 42% disapproval. Seven years ago it was 54% approval/40% disapproval. A year ago it was 44% approval /51% disapproval. Six months ago it was 53% approval /44% disapproval. [Gallup]

The following are President Obama's approval/disapproval scores going back almost 4 years.

Date	NBC/WSJ	WP/ABC	CNN/ORC	NYT/CBS	FOX
Nov 2016	53/44%	56/44-%	57/41%	54/40%	52/47%
Oct 2016	53/44%		55/44%	51/43(CBS)	57/41%
Sept. 2016	52/45%	51/45%	51/48%	xxx	50/48%
Aug. 2016	52/44%	53/45%	xxx	xxx	52/45%
July 2016	51/46%	52/46%	554/45%	53/41%	xxx
June 2016	51/45%	54/43%	52/45%	43/37%(CBS)	42/39%
May 2016	51/46%	47/51%	51/46%	50/43%	48/49%
Apr. 2016	49%/48%	xxx	xxx	46/45%(CBS)	49/47%
Mar. 2016	49/46%	51/43%	51/46%	48/44%	48/46%
Jan. 2016	47/49%	50/46%	47/49%	46/47%	42/53%
Jan. 2015	46/48%	47/48%	xxx	xxx	45/51%
Jan. 2014	43/51%	45/52%	45/51%	46/47(CBS)	42/53%
Jan. 2013	52/44%	55/41%	55/43%	51/41%	

	Approval	Disapproval	(in final year in office)
Eisenhower	59	28	(12/8/60)
Clinton	60	35	(12/4/00)
Reagan	57	35	(11/14/88)
Obama	55	42	(11/22/16)
G W Bush	32	61	(12/7/08)

Obama has an approval/disapproval rating on the economy of 47% to 48% and an approval/disapproval rating on foreign policy of 43% to 50%. [Economist/ YouGov, 11/7]

* * * * *

In the NBC/WSJ survey taken just prior to the election (11/3-5) likely voters were asked whether, if the constitution permitted a president to run for a third term in office, they would consider voting for Obama. The likely voters split, 49% saying yes and 50% saying no. When the same question was asked of registered voters in September of Bill Clinton's 8th year in office 64% said they would not consider voting for him for a third term and 34% said they would consider voting for him.

* * * * *

<u>The Population</u>

U.S. Population – 320,000,000+ people
Voting age population – 251,107, 404
Voting Eligible population – 231, 556,622
Registered to vote – 200,081,377
Ballots counted –135,557,845

78.5% of the U.S. population is of voting age
92.2% of the voting age population is eligible to vote
86.4% of the voting eligible population is registered to vote
67.75% of those registered to vote cast ballots
58.5% of the voting eligible population cast ballots

[United States Election Project, TargetSmart]

* * * * *

2016 ELECTION SCORE CARD

President:

    Electoral vote
2016	Trump 306	Clinton 232
2012	Obama 332	Romney 206
2008	Obama 365	McCain 173

After the 2012 election Chris Cillizza did an interesting piece on the Electoral College in The Washington Post. He noted that in the last six presidential elections, 1992 – 2012, the Democratic nominee has averaged 327 electoral votes, while the Republican nominee has averaged 210 electoral votes.

In the preceding six Presidential elections, 1968 – 1988, the Republican nominees averaged 427 electoral votes, while the Democratic nominee averaged 113 electoral votes.

Clinton's popular vote total has now exceeded President Obama in 2012 but she will not beat Obama's total from 2008. Trump has exceeded the 2012 popular vote earned by Mitt Romney and the 2008 vote achieved by John McCain.

The other thing that changed substantially in this election is the size of the vote for "others". The number of votes cast for third party candidates and their percentage of the total vote was three times higher than in any previous election.

The Libertarian party led by Gary Johnson was on the ballot in all 50 states. The Green Party led by Jill Stein was on the ballot in just over 40 states. There were five candidates who were on fewer than 20 state ballots and there were 21 third party or Independent candidates who were on fewer than 5 state ballots. (The list of write-in candidates without ballot status is too long to count.)

For the fifth time in U.S. history, and the second time this century, a presidential candidate has won the White House while losing the popular vote. Al Gore being the other candidate in this century. (Pew Research)

The Votes

2016	Trump 62,409,389	Clinton 64,637, 505	Others 7,190,133
2012	Obama 64,444,805	Romney 60,265,579	Others 2,154,904
2008	Obama 69,498,215	McCain 59,948,240	Others 1,947,535

Total Vote

2016	134,237,025
2012	129,237,642
2008	131,473,705
2004	122,303,590

The total votes cast in 2016 exceeded the vote total in every other presidential election in history.

% of the total vote

2016	Trump 46.5%	Clinton 48.2%	Others 5.4%
2012	Obama 50.8%	Romney 47.5%	Others 1.7%
2008	Obama 52.9%	McCain 45.7%	Others 1.4%

U.S. Senate

2016	Democrats 46	Republicans 52	Independents 2
2014	Democrats 44	Republicans 54	Independents 2
2012	Democrats 53	Republicans 45	Independents 2

	Dem	Rep	Ind
100th Congress 1987-88	55	45	
101st Congress 1989-90	55	45	
102nd Congress 1991-92	56	44	
103rd Congress 1993-94	57	43	
104th Congress 1995-96	48	52	
105th Congress 1997-98	45	55	
106th Congress 1999-2000	45	55*	
107th Congress 2001-02	50	50*	

	Dem	Rep	Ind
108th Congress 2003-04	48	51	1
109th Congress 2005-06	44	55	1
110th Congress 2007-08	49	49	2
111th Congress 2009-10	56	42	2
112th Congress 2011-12	51	47	2
113th Congress 2013-14	53	45	2
114th Congress 2015-16	44	54	2
115th Congress 2017- 18	46	52	2

U.S. House

2016	Democrats 193	Republicans 237
2014	Democrats 188	Republicans 247
2012	Democrats 201	Republicans 234

	Dem	Rep	Ind	Vac
100th Congress 1987-88	258	177		
101st Congress 1989-90	260	175		
102ndCongress 1991-92	267	167	1	
103rd Congress 1993-94	258	176	1	
104th Congress 1995-96	204	230	1	
105th Congress 1997-98	206	228	1	
106th Congress 1999-2000	211	223	1	
107th Congress 2001-02	212	221	2	
108th Congress 2003-04	204	229	1	1
109th Congress 2005-06	202	232	1	
110th Congress 2007-08	233	202		
111th Congress 2009-10	259	176		
112th Congress 2011-12	193	242		
113th Congress 2013-14	201	234		
114th Congress 2015-16	188	247		
115th Congress 2017-18	193	237		

Governors

2016	Democrats 16	Republicans 33	Independents 1
2014	Democrats 21	Republicans 29	--
2012	Democrats 19	Republicans 30	Independents 1

Governors by Party

Year	Democrats	Republicans	Independents
1990	29	21	0
1995	19	30	1
2000	18	30	2
2003	23	27	0
2004	22	28	0
2005	22	28	0
2006	22	28	0
2007	28	22	0
2008	28	22	0
2009	28	22	0
2010	26	24	0
2011	20	29	1
2012	20	29	1
2013	20	30	1
2014	21	29	0
2015	18	31	1
2016	16	33	1

State Legislatures

House Members

2016	Dem 2345	GOP 3037	Other 29	
2014	Dem 2572	GOP 2802	Ind 20	Open 17
2012	Dem 2592	GOP 2791	Ind 4	Open 24

Senate Members

2016	Dem 790	GOP 1125	Other 57
2014	Dem 818	GOP 1086	Other 55
2012	Dem 886	GOP 1021	Other 16

*Nebraska – Unicameral legislature, 49 Senators included in Senate member count

Same Party Control of Both Houses of a State Legislature
2016   Dem 13   GOP 32   Split 3
2014   Dem 11   GOP 30   Split 8
2012   Dem 19   GOP 26   Split 4

Same Party Control of State Government –Governor and Both Houses of Legislature

2016   Dem 6   GOP 25   Split 13   Other 5
                                       Dem Gov/GOP Leg 6
                                       GOP Gov/Dem Leg 7
2014   Dem 7   GOP 23   Divided 19   Other 1
2012   Dem 14   GOP 24   Split 11

* * * * *

The Money

The following information is based on data collected by The Center for Responsive Politics from the Federal Election Commission reports. The data from the candidate committees is as released on October 28, 2016. The data for the political parties is as released on November 2nd. Therefore, the totals will increase.

The amount raised so far by presidential candidates is $1.3 billion. The amount raised so far by Super PACs supporting them is $594 million.

According to official reports from the Clinton and Trump campaign committees and the Super PACs that supported them, the money available to support the Clinton candidacy was twice the amount that was available to support the Trump candidacy, $687,261,894 to $306,930,980.

	Candidate Committee	Outside Money
Donald Trump	$247,541,449	$ 59,389,531
Hillary Clinton	497,808,791	189,453.103
Gary Johnson	11,410,313	1,383,852
Evan McMullin	1,025,703	0
Jill Stein	3,509,477	0

Selected other candidates who raised more than $10,000,000 in campaign funds:

	Candidate Committee	Outside Money
Bernie Sanders	$228,171,330	$ 922,901
Ted Cruz	89,528,776	53,479,471
Marco Rubio	52,331,502	110,168,551
Jed Bush	34,088,583	121,733,869
Ben Carson	63,336,171	18,700,449
John Kasich	18,897,737	15,597,064
Rand Paul	12,149,234	11,600,497
Carly Fiorina	11,974,161	14,627,477

Amounts raised by various party committees:

Democratic National Committee	$264,178,780
Democratic Congressional Campaign Cmte.	176,207,066
Democratic Senate Campaign Committee	147,229,342
Republican National Committee	$290,634,275
Republican Congressional Campaign Cmte.	146,318,771
Republican Senate Campaign Committee	122,867,512

* * * * *

Leading up to the election

During this campaign, Peter Hart conducted a series of focus groups for the Annenberg Public Policy Center at the University of Pennsylvania.

The following are excerpts from the reports and analysis of a number of these focus groups as prepared by Peter and Corrie Hunt.

The first of these focus groups was held in Aurora, Colorado in January 2015. Hart and Hunt reported:

> "This group harbors an underlying anxiety and sense of frustration: they feel like no one in Washington is looking out for them and they are pessimistic that things will improve. The distrust of career politicians in the group was palpable, with all in agreement that politicians are out for themselves and not the people who elected them. This resentment feeds directly into voters' feelings about and expectations for the legislative session of 2015, and the political season of 2015."

On June 20, 2016 a focus group was held in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

> "These eleven and blue-collar and working class are all living on the edge financially and report that they either make just enough to meet their basic expenses or only have a little left over for extras after meeting basic expenses."

> "The mood is bleak and the outlook pessimistic for these blue-collar workers."

> "Fear and disaffection has turned these blue-collar voters inward, and they have become protective and wary of foreign entanglements in the Middle East."

> "Blue-collar workers see potential strengths for Trump in the same qualities that others criticize as shortcomings or weaknesses."

> "Blue-collar workers are not connecting with Clinton or her agenda."

> "Donald Trump has the highest ever negative feeling thermometer score for a presidential candidate, and he may appear to be taking on more water than

any nominee could carry. But for this moment and with this group of voters, he remains competitive….For now, Hillary Clinton is ahead, but how the blue-collar vote goes will tell us whether election night will be a nail biter…"

On August 25, 2016 a focus group was held in Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

"We went to Milwaukee because it is the frontline of many of the issues and challenges in America this election season….Politically, Wisconsin is at the center of the action, with a contested Senate seat that could swing the overall Senate balance; and the home of Wisconsin's own member of the Republican establishment, Speaker of the House Paul Ryan, who is balancing an uneasy alliance with the Republican nominee, Donald Trump."

"Voters are holding their noses this election season."

"They have strong views, but they are not high-information voters."

"Lack of trust is an important element."

"Behind this election are the questions of who is going to improve the economy, take on the powerful elite, and change the culture in Washington."

The final focus group of the series was held on October 25, 2016 in Charlotte, NC.

"After a historic and tumultuous primary season and general election campaign, little has changed from the perspective of voters. The single unanimous viewpoint that emerged from a session of late deciders…was "I do not like either candidate." It is both sad and dispiriting – yes, there are passionate supporters of both Donald Trump and Hillary, but the truth is that as this focus group and the polls show, people are voting more against rather than for a candidate."

"Trump's "embarrassing" behavior has alienated late-deciding voters."

"While the contrast with Donald Trump has benefited Clinton in the past month, she has a lot of work to do to win over late-deciding voters."

"Many of these late-deciding voters are only considering Clinton because of Trump's deep flaws. Several say that Trump may have lost their vote, but Clinton still has not won it.

* * * * *

The Polling
(and other measurements)

The general perception is that the majority of the polling profession blew the 2016 presidential campaign.

The Real Clear Politics list of surveys taken over the period 11/2-11/7 showed Hillary Clinton with a lead of 3.3% over Donald Trump in the four-way race and 3.2% in the two-way race.

Pollsters note that Clinton won popular vote…so polls showing Clinton ahead by 1 or 2 points, were most accurate.

The Pew Research Center did an article on November 9th that had the following headline, "Why 2016 election polls missed their mark."

The following are a few excerpts from the Pew article.

"How could the polls have been so wrong about the state of the election?"

"There are several possible explanations for the misstep that many in the polling community will be talking about in the coming week."

"One likely culprit is what pollsters refer to as the nonresponse bias. This occurs when certain kinds of people systematically do not respond to surveys despite equal opportunity to reach all parts of the electorate."

"Some have also suggested that many of those who were polled simply were not honest about whom they intended to vote for."

"A third possibility is the way pollsters identify likely voters…This is a notoriously difficult task, and small differences in assumptions can produce sizeable differences in election predictions."

On the other hand, Frank Newport who runs Gallup authored an article on November 23 entitled, "National Polling Accurately Nails Popular Vote."

The following are excerpts from his article.

"This was a complex election since Hillary Clinton won the popular vote and Donald Trump won the Electoral College. In terms of forecasting, being 'right' means two different things, depending on whether you were estimating the former or the latter.

"Many people most likely assume that any poll at the national level is forecasting the electoral outcome, which is actually not the case. National horse race polls predict the national horse race – the popular vote. Given that in two of the last five elections the popular vote winner did not win the Electoral College (and the presidency), the distinction between the national horse race polls and efforts to predict the Electoral College become more significant."

"In terms of predicting the national popular vote outcome, the national polls did remarkably well in 2016. As was the case in 2012, the Democratic candidate's popular vote margin is growing as vote counting continues in the weeks after Election Day. As of this writing, Clinton is ahead of Trump by 1.5 percentage points…The margin could grow to two points. Clinton will therefore win the popular vote by a larger margin than was the case of Al Gore over George Bush in 2000, Richard Nixon over Hubert Humphrey in 1968 and John F. Kennedy over Richard Nixon in 1960."

"The average 'gap' estimate on the national popular vote as calculated by Real Clear Politics prior to the election was 3.3 points…To come within less than two percentage points on the gap is a remarkable polling achievement and should be applauded." (Gallup decided not to poll the 2016 presidential campaign.)

Newport added, "To the degree that organizations want to predict the Electoral College, they are going to have to find ways to finance or encourage larger-sample, higher-quality state polls, rather than relying on the haphazard polls that happen to be conducted in various states."

* * * * *

In the 11/2-11/7 period, CBS News had Clinton up by 2, Bloomberg and Reuters/Ipsos had Clinton up by 3 points. In that same period, Economist/YouGov, ABC/Wash Post Tracking, Fox News, Gravis, NBC/WSJ had Clinton up by 4, and Monmouth had Clinton up by 6.

Only one survey using traditional survey methods, IBD/TIPP, had Trump leading by 2 points.

The bottom line is, if you take the RCP average Clinton lead of 3.3% and Clinton's current popular vote lead of 2% the difference is 1.3%. The margin of error of the relevant surveys is 3.3%. Thus, as Gallup points out, the result of these surveys is well within the margin of error.

* * * * *

If by chance you are looking for other ways to predict presidential elections here are a couple of options.

Well before the November election Allan J. Lichtman, a professor of history at American University in Washington, DC, predicted Donald Trump's victory. He has successfully predicted the presidential election victor in every presidential campaign since 1984. He makes his predictions based on 13 true/false statements that he says indicate whether the incumbent party will retain the White House or lose it in a given election. His list of true/false statements includes such things as:

Q.1. Party Mandate: After the midterm elections, the incumbent party holds more seats in the U.S. House of Representatives than after the previous midterm elections.

Q.13. Challenger charisma: The challenging party candidate is not charismatic or a national hero.

For the remainder of the questions see the May 12, 2016 article in The Washington Posts' *The Fix* by Peter W. Stevenson.

<div align="center">* * * * *</div>

In the last nine presidential elections the golfer has defeated the non-golfer. The last non-golfer to win was Jimmy Carter. Since World War II, golfers have beaten non-golfers in 16 of 18 presidential races. Harry Truman was the only other exception. [Don Van Natta, Jr., ESPN]

<div align="center">* * * * *</div>

THE EXIT POLLS

There have been some changes in the composition of the electorate between 1996 and 2016. There have also been changes since the 2008 election.

- The number of whites has dropped from 83% to 70%
- The number of non-whites has grown from 17% to 30%
  - African-Americans from 10% to 12%
  - Latinos from 5% to 11%
  - Asians from 1% to 4%

- The number of those 18-29 years of age has remained constant at 17-19%
- The number of those 30-44 years of age has dropped from 33% to 25%
- The number of those 45-64 years of age has grown from 34% to 40%

- Those with incomes under $50,000 dropped from 61% to 36%
  (From 2008 – 2016 varied from 38-36%)

- Those with incomes over $50,000 grew from 39% to 64%
  (From 2008 – 2016 varied from 62-64%)

- Those with incomes over $100,000 grew from 9% to 33%
  (From 2008-2016 varied from 26-33%)

- Democrats from 39-37%
- Republicans from 35-33%
- Independents from 26-31%

- Union member households dropped from 23-18%

- From 2008-2016
  - Unmarried men increased from 14-19%
  - Unmarried women were relatively constant at 21-23%

  - Those who think the country is on the right track
    (From 53% in 1996 to 20% in 2008 and 33% in 2016)
  - Those who think the country is on the wrong track
    (From 43% in 1996 to 75% in 2008 to 62% in 2016)

  - The top issue:
    The economy – from 21% in 1996 to 63% in 2008 to 52% in 2016
    Moral values – 22% in 2004

Demographic Changes from the 1996 Election to the 2016 election:

Demographic	1996	2000	2004	2008	2012	2016
Women	52	52	54	53	53	52
Men	48	48	46	47	47	48
White	83	81	77	74	72	70
Non-White	17	20	23	27	28	30
African-American	10	10	11	13	13	12
Latino	5	7	8	9	10	11
Asian	1	2	2	2	3	4
Other	1	1	2	3	2	3
18-29	17	17	17	18	19	19
30-44	33	33	29	29	27*	25
45-64	34	36	38	37	38*	40
Over 65	16	14	16	16	16	15
Income Under $50K	61	47	45	38	41	36
Income Over $50K	39	53	55	62	59	64
Income Over $100K	9	15	18	26	28	33
Democrat	39	39	37	39	38	37
Republican	35	35	37	32	32	33
Independent	26	27	26	29	29	31

Liberal	20	20	21	22	25	26
Conservative	33	29	34	44	35	35
Moderate	47	50	45	34	41	39
High School Graduate	24	21	22	20	21	18
Some College	27	32	32	31	29	32
College Graduate	43	42	42	44	47	50
Catholic	29	26	27	27	25	23
Protestant	54	54	54	54	53	52
Jewish	3	4	3	2	2	3
Other Religion	6	6	7	6	7	7
No Religion	7	9	10	12	12	15
Full Time Workers	64	67	60	65	60	60
Union Member in Household	23	26	24	21	18	18
Married	66	65	63	66	60	58
Unmarried	34	35	37	34	40	42
Married Men	+	+	+	33	29	29
Married Women	+	+	+	32	31	30
Unmarried Men	+	+	+	14	18	19
Unmarried Women	+	+	+	21	23	23
LGBT	5	4	4	4	5	5
Right Direction	53	65	49	20	46	33
Wrong Track	43	31	46	75	52	62
Top Issue	Economy-21%	Economy-18%	Moral Values-22%	Economy-63%	Economy-59%	Economy-52%

The following are selected results from the exit poll

	2016 Dem /Rep	2012 Dem/Rep	2008 Dem/Rep
Males	41/52	45/52	49/48
Female	54/41	57/44	56/43
White	37/57	39/59	43/55
African American	89/8	93/-	95/4
Latino	66/28	71/27	67/31
18-29 years	55/34	60/35	66/32
30-44 years	57/42	---	52/46
45-64 years	44/52	---	50/47
65+ years	44/52	44/56	45/53

	2016	2012	2008
	Dem /Rep	Dem/Rep	Dem/Rep
Income			
Less than $50,000	53/41	60/38	60/38
$50-100,000 income	46/49	46/52	49/49
$100,000 or more	47/47	44/54	49/49

A Portrait of the Parties

The following is the share of each candidate's supporters who belong to various groups and the changes between the 2012 and 2016 elections.

	Democrat	Change	Republican	Change
Men	41%	-1	53%	+2
Women	59	+1	47	-2
High School/less	17	-8	20	-4
Some College	28	no change	35	+6
College Grads	32	+5	30	-1
Advance Degree	22	+3	14	-2
Income				
$50,000 or less	39	-9	32	-1
$50,000-100,000	29	+1	33	-2
$100,000 or more	42	+3	35	+1
Cities >50,000	42	+3	25	+1

* * * * *

What Happened

The following are extensive excerpts from an article written by Peter Hart, founder of Peter D Hart Research Associates and Dan McGinn, CEO of McGinn and Co for the WSJ.

> "Three forces collided to elect Donald Trump president of the United States. First, Hillary Clinton was a deeply flawed candidate. Second, Mr. Trump, a brilliant manipulator of broadcast media outlets, benefited from copious amounts of free air time. Third, is the element of the 2016 election that

pundits consistently underestimated: A large sector of our society is deeply, viscerally angry."

"And what never happened? Hillary Clinton never dealt with the integrity issues that surveys consistently found voters have held about her. She needed to display character–not just of determination or toughness but also something that helped middle America know that she was on the side of the people, not the Wall Street or Washington establishments."

"In the end, this was an election of fear. Mr. Trump's message was the fear of what has been happening to this country, and Mrs. Clinton's message focused on the fear of Donald Trump."

"This election ends where elections always do: with the voters."

"Voters are angry at the failure of elected officials in Washington to listen to them and act. They are angry that the country can't secure its borders. They are angry about a war on terrorism that has dragged on for more than a decade and has shown more signs of defeat than victory. They are angry at the arrogance of the rich and well educated who don't seem to know–much less care–that working people's standard of living has been declining for a generation. They are angry at the media, at journalists they think look and sound too smug, too certain, and too aloof. They are angry at the "new economy" that trumpets apps and functionality and brags about the "costs" (read: jobs) that are being eliminated. They are angry about being mocked and vilified as rubes, racists, and "deplorables." They are white-hot angry that their children don't have reasonable prospects for advancement."

"On Tuesday they didn't vote *for* Donald Trump so much as they voted against every institution that has turned its back on working people."

"This election was about a large segment of the electorate wanting a way to demonstrate deep frustration with the country's direction."

"This election was the clearest possible signal to every institution in the U.S. that the average person expects–and is demanding–a seat at the table. The folks who led this revolution are foreign to Washington, Los Angeles, and New York. They don't go to Starbucks, take their kids on college tours, or watch NPR. They shop at Wal-Mart, dine at McDonald's, and care more about high school sports than pro games. Their incomes are declining and they have no retirement funds. They think their parents and grandparents built this country. And Tuesday night, they screamed that they want their country back."

*****

The Shock Heard Round the World
By Amy Walter

I got it wrong. Really wrong. Trump didn't just win, he crushed it. This is truly the most shocking thing that I have seen in my lifetime.

Here's what I think happened:

1. *Voters did not like Trump, but voted for him anyway.*
2. The "Obama coalition" has only turned out for Obama.
3. There wasn't a GOP split.
4. Clinton never had a message that addressed the mood of the country.
5. There was no women voter surge for Clinton.
6. The polling/data-driven/consultant-driven campaign industry has a big black eye.
7. Trump had no ground/data/analytics.
8. The political disruption that we've seen taking place all across the world is happening on our shores.

*****

What Happened Election Night? Three Things
Posted by Dante Chinni, Director of the American Communities Project
November 14, 2016

As America's pollsters and data mavens sift through the wreckage of the 2016 campaign, there is one question on everyone's lips: what happened?

The results are not all in yet, but looking at the data through the American Communities Project suggests a three-part answer.

One, Donald Trump bumped up the votes and margins from reliably Republican areas, particularly in rural locales, <u>Rural Middle America</u>, <u>Working Class Country</u>, <u>Graying America</u> and <u>Evangelical Hubs</u>, many of which are losing population.

Two, Hillary Clinton did not get the turnout she needed from the urban centers, the <u>Big Cities</u> and <u>Urban Suburbs</u>, even as she improved on Barack Obama's margins.

Three, Trump flipped a lot of Obama voters in the blue-collar <u>Middle Suburbs</u>, based heavily in Pennsylvania, Ohio, Wisconsin and Michigan.

Those three things together explain how the president-elect did what many thought was impossible as he captured the electoral votes he needed to win the election.

＊ ＊ ＊ ＊ ＊

Trump Grasped What Others Missed
By Charlie Cook, November 15, 2016
National Journal.com
(Excerpts below)

"Before assigning blame for why Hillary Clinton lost a race that she was supposed to win, it seems appropriate to first give credit to the victor. Whether you like or agree with President-elect Donald Trump, you have to give him credit for seeing and tapping into something that few others saw. From his gilded 58th floor, three-story apartment in Trump Tower overlooking Central Park, the real estate developer and television personality somehow peered into the American psyche and

22

detected a growing anger and resentment among working- and lower- middle-class whites, particularly those in small towns, far suburbs, and rural areas, who feel left behind in the 21st-century global economy."

"… alone among the presidential candidates, this moneyed, citified man sensed the grievances of country people toward the rich and powerful in New York, Washington, and Los Angeles. He was able to connect with these voters by skillfully manipulating the news media into lavishing on him as much as $2 billion in free airtime. All the while, he professed disdain and if not downright hatred for this very same media, further delighting his supporters.

"The estrangement of these white voters created a backlash—inartfully called a "whitelash" by some commentators—based on the conviction that the country they remembered growing up, made idyllic by the passage of time, had been swept away."

 "Clinton blamed her troubles on FBI Director James Comey, but that was a political cop-out. The original sin was the dumb and dangerous decision to set up and use a personal email server.".

"There certainly seemed to be a bit of hubris in the Clinton campaign, which tried to expand its footprint into long-shot states while not devoting sufficient resources and attention to states that leaned her way and would have provided the necessary 270 Electoral College votes to win the presidency. That the Clinton team spent more money on ads during the last month in Omaha than in Michigan and Wisconsin combined was political malpractice. Flirting with Arizona while Pennsylvania was starting to drift away was just as bad. "

* * * * *

Ruminations

As is so often the case, Dan Balz of the Washington Post hit the nail on the head with his November 20th column. The following are excerpts from that column.

"Viewed through any conventional lens, President-elect Donald Trump's candidacy was improbable from start to finish. Today, two things about his victory seem to be in sharper focus: one, that Trump's victory might best be understood as the success of the country's first independent president, and second that the Trump coalition may be even more uniquely his than President Obama's has turned out to be."

"Trump owes his success in part to the fact that he ran for president in an environment that favored change over the status quo. But his luck or genius goes beyond that. It has long been noted that the conditions have existed for an independent candidate to run a serious campaign for president. The level of dissatisfaction with Washington, the anxiety over the economy and the generally sour mood about the future provided the foundation for a campaign by someone from outside the system, who is tied to neither political party and with a promise to shake things up."

"Trump redrew the map just as he redrew the rules for running a campaign. For those reasons alone, and despite all the controversy of his campaign and the earlier personnel appointments, he ought not to be underestimated and/or seen through conventional lenses."

* * * * *

The Upshot
New York Times, Nov 14, 2016

The following is from an exchange between Nate Cohn and Toni Monkovic.

Toni: Jill Stein is not responsible for the Clinton defeat. People who are suggesting that are wrong, correct?

Nate: Yeah, not on its own. Stein's support did cover the Trump-Clinton margin in Michigan and Wisconsin, but I don't think it is reasonable to say Clinton would have gotten 100 percent of that vote. It wouldn't have been enough anyway: Clinton still would have lost Pennsylvania.

There's a chance that Gary Johnson/Stein combined could have done it, but I don't know about that. I think the Johnson vote could easily be more of a Trump vote.

<div align="center">* * * * *</div>

"You can't win on turnout if you are losing on message." – Glen Bolger, 2014

"The Clinton Campaign was undone by its own neglect and a touch of arrogance, staffers say." (Sam Stein/Huffingtonpost.com)

<div align="center">* * * * *</div>

Final Thoughts

Reports are that Hillary Clinton believes that FBI Director James Comey's two letters to Congress late in the campaign halted her momentum.

Two weeks before the election the announcement was made that the premiums on the Affordable Care Act would go up at least 25% in 2017.

Of 135,000,000 votes cast, it would only take a change in a total of 102,000 votes in three states, Michigan (10,704), Pennsylvania (68,171) and Wisconsin (22,171) and Clinton is elected. A friend to whom I mentioned these numbers reminded me that even 10,000 is a lot to recover in a recount.

The popular vote margin that Clinton has received in California will exceed Clinton's margin over Trump in the national popular vote.

<div align="center">* * * * *</div>

It was only 7 days after the 2016 general election when I received my first fundraising request from a 2018 candidate.

<div align="center">* * * * *</div>

This campaign marks the retirement of a generation of democratic political campaigners and operatives.

<p align="center">* * * * *</p>

During the campaign, Trump said what came to mind and then repeated those things which drew the most attention, whether or not they were actually true.

If you watched the Trump events on TV and then watched the Clinton events you could not help but notice the difference in the size and the level of excitement.

The judgement by the media and pundits was that Donald Trump lost all three debates with Hillary Clinton. But if you listened to his words, in each of the debates he made the same several points that were designed to reach his then and future followers.

<p align="center">* * * * *</p>

This election raises the question of whether the reliance on analytics has caused campaigns to abandon time honored approaches. I believe there is room for both.

<p align="center">* * * * *</p>

Now that the campaign is behind us, the media as well as a variety of lawyers and other public officials have decided to land on the question of potential conflicts of interest resulting from the large and complicated business holdings of the President-Elect and his family.

Everyone agrees that the legal conflict rules for government employees do not apply to the President and Vice-President.

Throughout the campaign there was considerable media angst about the fact that Trump refused to reveal his tax returns. The media was replete with stories that he may not have paid any federal income taxes for up to twenty years. He was elected anyway.

<p align="center">* * * * *</p>

There is no way Trump is going to sell off all of his holdings as some have suggested. They are very much a part of the future of his family. He has proposed that the children will run the Trump empire while he is president. There is little question about whether they will talk to their father along the way.

Yes, he and his family are likely to get wealthier during his term in office.

* * * * *

The questions on which we should all be focusing are:

- What is Trump going to do to resolve the problems facing this country?
- What is he going to do to improve the lives of the people who elected him?

If it turns out, over time, that Trump and his family are doing better than those who put him in office, the public will let him know. That is the time to pay attention.

* * * * *

Given this last election, both major political parties have big problems but more on that in the next issue of the Watch.

* * * * *

Mike