

Mike Berman's

WASHINGTON POLITICAL WATCH

No. 118-122*

November 30, 2012

2012 Election Score Card
President
The Money
U.S. Senate
U.S. House of Representatives
Governors
State Legislatures
Turnout, Decision time & Demography
[Data is latest available as of 11/29/12]

* * * * *

2012 ELECTION SCORE CARD

President:

Electoral votes:	Obama 332	Romney 206
2008	Obama 365	McCain 173

Votes:	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

% of vote:	Obama 50.8%	Romney 47.5%	Others 1.7%
2008	Obama 52.9%	McCain 45.7%	Others 1.4%

U.S. Senate

2012	Democrats 53	Republicans 45	Independents 2
Pre-elec	Democrats 51	Republicans 47	Independents 2

U.S. House

2012	Democrats 201	Republicans 234
Pre-elec	Democrats 193	Republicans 242

Governors

2012	Democrats 19	Republicans 30	Independents 1
Pre-elec	Democrats 20	Republicans 29	Independents 1

State Legislatures

House Members

2012	Dem 2591	GOP 2786	Ind 24	Open 10
Pre-elec	Dem 2420	GOP 2926	Ind 21	Open 44

Senate Members

2012	Dem 886	GOP 1021	Ind 6	Open 10
Pre-elec	Dem 874	GOP 1030	Ind 6	Open 13

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

Same Party Control of Both Houses of a State Legislature

2012	Dem 19	GOP 26	Split 4
Pre-elec	Dem 15	GOP 26	Split 8

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

2012	Dem 14	GOP 24	Split 11
Pre-elec	Dem 12	GOP 22	Split 15

THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

President Obama will likely be the first two-term President in history who received fewer votes in his re-election than he did in his initial election. (It is not likely that this result will change between now and the posting of the final count.)

The 14 who received more votes on re-election than initial election were Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, James Monroe, Andrew Jackson, Abraham Lincoln, Ulysses S Grant, William McKinley, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin

Roosevelt, Dwight Eisenhower, Richard Nixon, Ronald Reagan, Bill Clinton, and George W. Bush.

Nine Presidents ran for re-election and lost. Three of them, John Quincy Adams, Martin van Buren and Grover Cleveland, received more votes in their re-election effort than in their initial election. Six others, John Adams, Benjamin Harrison, William Howard Taft, Herbert Hoover, Jimmy Carter, and George H.W. Bush, received fewer voters in their unsuccessful re-election efforts than in their initial elections.

Four sitting Presidents were re-elected to the office after ascending to the Presidency as the result of the death of the President they served, Teddy Roosevelt, Calvin Coolidge, Harry S Truman, and Lyndon Baines Johnson.

Gerald Ford was nominated to run for re-election, but lost in the general election to Jimmy Carter.

Five sitting Presidents who came to the office when a President died in office failed to receive their Party's nomination for re-election: John Tyler, Millard Fillmore, Franklin Pierce, Andrew Johnson, and Chester A Arthur.

FDR got fewer votes in his 3rd and 4th re-elections than he did for his second.

* * * * *

Much ado was made of the fact that no President had been re-elected since 1940 when the unemployment rate was above 7.7%. In 2012, the September rate was 7.8% and in October it was 7.9%. The average unemployment rate at the time of the last ten Presidential campaigns was 6.43%.

* * * * *

Many things change, but some things never change

I finished law school in June 1964. Going all the way back to junior high school, I had been involved in school elections and campaigns. My first endeavor as a campaign manager was to manage the campaign of Diane Martini, who was running to be the President of the junior high school student council. I continued to work on student council campaigns all the way through undergraduate school.

When I finished law school I decided to get involved in public official campaigns. One of my professors was the 5th Congressional District chairman for the Johnson Presidential campaign. I went to him and told him I wanted to get involved as a volunteer. He responded by saying that he was anointing me as the vice chairman for the District, and that I should report to Arvonne Fraser, who was managing her husband's Congressional campaign.

A few days later I showed up at the campaign office, met Arvonne, and told her of my interest. She was welcoming and told me she had just the assignment for me. For the next few weeks I spent my days in the basement of the Minneapolis City Court House hand-copying voter registration records. By August a totally serendipitous set of circumstances resulted in my having a paid job running the voter registration and turnout program in what was then the 3rd Congressional District. (It happens that then Attorney General Fritz Mondale was the Johnson Chairman for Minnesota, but that is another story.)

Of the many things that I learned during that election the most important was that the person who is likely to be the most persuasive with a potential voter is his or her long-time next door neighbor. That neighbor's suggestion or request was backed up by all of the elements of their personal relationship.

Some 8 years later, when I managed then Senator Mondale's re-election campaign, I installed what was then state-of-the-art data collection and sorting equipment: an IBM punch card sorter. It was about 6 feet long, 4 feet high, and a foot and a half wide. Each "card" had to be created on a special typewriter-like device which contained a maximum of 11 pieces of data. A deck of cards was fed into one end of the machine and out of the other end came a sorted deck of cards by address or town. Those cards were then fed through another device that printed out each card and created lists that were used by volunteers going door to door.

I thought of the above when I read Jim Messina's interview at a Political Playbook Politico breakfast.

He first talked about the "cacophony" of television in the final months of the campaign. He said, "And people got so much of it, a simple door-knock from a trusted neighbor really mattered more than anything else—to say, 'Hey, let me tell you why I'm supporting Barack Obama. I live down the street, let me talk to an issue you care about.' And that, we found, became incredibly important to how people were going to vote."

“We used data for everything, we modeled everything, trying to figure out how to use our time wisely....We had a whole bunch of data points:...your voting history, your giving history. Everything we knew about you allowed us to figure out whether or not you were going to volunteer. We even modeled whether or not people were going to be a better direct mail giver or an online giver.”

Let there be no mistake, Messina and the Obama campaign team he recruited, many of whom had never really been involved in campaign politics, created a mechanism for direct voter contact that far out performed any Presidential campaign we have seen in the past, including the 2004 Republican campaign and the 2008 Obama effort. Of course, 2012 Obama built on 2008 Obama.

One example of the changes they made has to do with lists. Even the 2008 Obama campaign worked off a variety of lists. Volunteers at different calling centers were working off of different lists. The get-out-the-vote list was not merged with the fundraising list. In short, there were a variety of databases that were used separately. The first step for Obama 2012 was to merge all of these lists.

The campaign paid little attention to anything but a group of swing States.

If you need to be convinced of the importance of the decision to focus on swing States by the Obama campaign, consider the following. [The following is based on the exceptional data collection prepared by David Wasserman of the Cook Political Report. Cook uses 12 swing States, Colorado, Florida, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Wisconsin. The Obama campaign designated 11 swing States. Minnesota did not make their list.]

Overall turnout was down by about 3.35 million votes, a 2.55% drop from 2008.

Turnout was down by 3.46 million votes in the non-swing States, a drop of 3.99%.

In the swing States turnout was UP by 109,000 votes, a 0.24% increase from 2008.

* * * * *

In the event you need further convincing of the vitality of the Obama campaign turnout operation, consider the following. A shift of 495,398 votes from Obama to Romney in the following swing States , Florida – 74,310 votes; Nevada – 67,807 votes; New Hampshire – 39,644 votes; Ohio – 164,338 votes; Virginia – 149,299 votes, and Romney would have won in the Electoral College. A shift of 427,591 votes would have resulted in an Electoral College tie, and again Romney would have been selected as President by the House of Representatives. (11/29 numbers).

* * * * *

It is worth noting the design of the Obama campaign internal polling program that was used along with their other diagnostics efforts.

- * There were no national polls conducted in the entire campaign
- * Regular surveys (twice a week for the final two months of the campaign) were done in the 11 battleground States
- * State tracking polls were conducted in each of the battleground States throughout the campaign using a “team” of six Democratic Pollsters

* * * * *

The importance of the non-voter pool to Obama, and presumptively other Democratic candidates, is made vivid by a late October survey by the PEW Research Center.

Among all adults, Obama led Romney by 51% to 39%. Among likely voters the two men were running even, 47% to 47%. Among non-voters Obama was preferred by 59% to 24%.

* * * * *

An Electoral Vote Pattern?

Chris Cillizza did an interesting piece on the electoral college in the “Washington Post.”

He notes 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.

He includes an extended explanation of what seems to have happened, and if you are an electoral vote geek and have not seen the article it is worth pulling it up. (Wash Post 11/12/12)

* * * * *

Mandate/No Mandate?

President Obama and his team claim that his 50.9% victory on November 6th gave him a mandate to do a variety of things. Of course the Republicans say that he does not have a mandate.

House Republicans claim they have a mandate because they control 54% of the House seats, even though they lost 8 seats. By that calculation Senate Democrats have a mandate (they have not claimed one) because they control 55% of the Senate seats.

There is no mandate resulting from this election for the President or for either House of the Congress. If there is anything approaching a mandate it is a mandate to all of the elements of the Federal Government to get together and solve the problems that plague folks every day.

The reality is that

- * the President has extensive executive power that he may have been hesitant to use prior to his re-election and that he now may be less hesitant to exercise.

- * Republicans have solid control over the House of Representatives and can essentially veto any legislative proposal.

* the “my way or the highway” approach to which the country is now being treated by these power centers does not create confidence that the Government will do what needs to be done to the benefit of the country.

* * * * *

The following is a list of the final Presidential election surveys of various polling organizations. The noted date is the last day on which the survey was conducted. All are surveys of likely voters. As of 11/29 the President is leading Romney by 3.2%.

<u>Organization</u>	<u>Last Date</u>	<u>Result</u>
Politics/GWU/Battleground	11/5	Tie
Rasmussen Reports	11/5	Romney +1
CNN/ORC	11/4	Tie
Gallup	11/4	Romney +1
ABC/Washington Post	11/4	Obama +3
NBC/Wall Street Journal	11/3	Obama +1
Pew Research	11/3	Obama +3
FOX News	10/30	Tie
CBS/NYTimes	10/28	Obama +1

Perhaps the “biggest loser” among pollsters in this election is Gallup. Beginning in mid-October it had Romney with an ever-increasing lead, which reached a point where Romney was up by 7 points. During this period most other polls had Obama with a lead. On October 28th, Gallup had Romney up by 5 points. Everyone else had the race tied or Obama with a +1 lead.

Nate Silver, while not a pollster per se, using his computer-driven models of available survey data, predicted that Obama would win with 51% of the vote, about as close as it gets.

* * * * *

Most Americans feel good about the next four years. 54% think the country will be better off four years from now. This is well below the 74% who felt that when Obama was first elected. [Gallup 11/12]

* * * * *

The Money

October 17th is the date when the last pre-general contribution and expenditure period closed. Information about the period October 18 through the end of the election and the aftermath has not yet been filed.

The Obama campaign reported raising \$632,177,423 from the outset of its opening. The Romney campaign reported raising \$389,088,268 during a similar period.

The following compares the two Presidential campaigns and the national Party committees that they effectively controlled. Obama controlled the DNC throughout the campaign period. Romney took control of his national Party mechanism once he became the putative nominee in the spring. There is also a comparison of the two Super PACs specifically organized to support each of the two candidates. (Other Super PACs, as well as non-disclosing 501(c)(4)s, are playing in this space as well.)

	<u>Obama</u>	<u>Romney</u>
Raised	\$632,177,423	\$389,088,268
Spent	540,812,931	336,399,297
Cash net of debt	88,195,650	49,702,010

	<u>DNC</u>	<u>RNC</u>
Total raised	\$292,241,276	\$369,292,545
Total Spent	284,957,255	299,774,884
Cash net of debt	-6,019,814	60,403,924

	<u>Obama+DNC</u>	<u>Romney+RNC</u>
Raised	\$924,418,669	\$758,380,813
Spent	825,770,186	633,174,181
Cash net of debt	79,175,836	110,105,934

The two Super PACs organized to specifically support the two Presidential nominees were:

	<u>Priorities USA Action</u> (Supported Obama)	<u>Restore our Future</u> (Supported Romney)
Raised	\$ 63,897,640	\$131,692,124
Independent Expenditures	53,811,205	107,451,077
Cash net of debt	10,086,434	24,203,768

Communication or coordination between the Super PACs and the candidates they support was not permitted. However given the fact that each of the Super PACs was run by folks loyal to the respective candidates, it is not beyond the pale to combine their revenues with the spending of the candidate and Party committees for the purpose of estimating the financial resource available to each candidate.

	<u>Obama</u>	<u>Romney</u>
Candidate Committee	\$632,177,000	\$389,088,000
National Parties	292,241,000	369,292,000
Priorities USA Action	63,897,000	
Restore our future		131,692,000
Total	\$988,315,000	\$890,072,000

* * * * *

As of 11/29/12 there were 1,123 Super PACs registered with the Federal Election Commission, including those specifically mentioned in these pages. As a group they made independent expenditures of approximately \$661 million.

Approximately 140 of these Super PACs spent more than \$100,000 during this election. More than 900 of the PACs did not make a single expenditure. That being the case, why were these groups organized?

	<u>Majority PAC</u>	<u>American Crossroads</u>
Total raised	\$ 34,920,454	\$80,091,020
Independent Expenditures	27,633,744	74,425,630

Here are five conservative and five liberal Super PACs that were particularly active in addition to those cited above. Most of their spending was directed at Congressional campaigns.

	<u>Liberal</u>	<u>Conservative</u>
	<u>House Majority</u>	<u>Club for Growth Action</u>
Total raised	\$ 27,742,797	\$17,210,349
Independent Expenditures	22,545,915	15,824,103
	<u>AB21C</u>	<u>CLF</u>
Total raised	\$11,437,860	\$10,800,737
Independent Expenditures	8,746,160	2,075,472
	<u>AFL-CIO</u>	<u>Freedomworks</u>
Total raised	\$15,459,583	\$15,417,616
Independent Expenditures	13,323,773	12,799,068
	<u>NEA Advocacy</u>	<u>YGA</u>
Total raised	\$ 8,310,952	\$5,927,470
Independent Expenditures	7,348,878	5,748,750

AB21C – American Bridge 21st Century
 CLF – Congressional Leadership Fund
 YGA – Young Guns Action Fund

None of the above relates to the substantial spending done by a variety of so-called 501(c)(4) social welfare organizations.

* * * * *

ABOUT NEW HAMPSHIRE

The residents of New Hampshire, seeing the future, have elected women to the offices of Governor, both U.S. Senate and both U.S. House seats.

* * * * *

THE U.S. SENATE

Democrats	53
Republicans	45
Independents	2 (caucus Dem)

If there was a surprise on election night 2012 it was in the U.S. Senate elections. I can't think of a non-partisan commentator or pundit who predicted that

the Democrats would pick up seats. Optimistic assessments suggested a status quo Senate or a Senate with one less Democrat.

The Indiana and Missouri Democratic victories, which early on were thought to be in the Republican column, were certainly affected by the insensitive language of the male Republican nominees. Romney won both States with ease, 54% to 44%.

The two surprise victories were in North Dakota and Montana. Even Nate Silver got it wrong.

In Montana, Jon Tester was the Democratic incumbent, but the race was touch and go from the outset. Romney won the State 55% to 42%.

The biggest surprise was North Dakota. Rick Berg led throughout the campaign. His average lead in the polls from mid-October was 8.5% points. But Heidi Heitkamp pulled it off, winning a 1% point victory.

* * * * *

Five of the 33 Senate seats that were up in 2012 changed their “political complexion.” One Democratic seat (Nebraska) flipped to Republican. One Independent seat (Conn) flipped to Democratic. One Republican seat (Maine) flipped to Independent. Two Republican seats (Indiana & Mass) flipped to Democratic.

* * * * *

	<u>Dem</u>	<u>Rep</u>	<u>Ind</u>
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*	
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
112 th Congress 2111-12	51	47	2
113 th Congress 2113-14	53	45	

* * * * *

There are 33 Senate seats up in 2014, and again the Democrats have a substantially larger number of seats to defend (20) than do the Republicans (13).

Of the 13 seats held by Republicans, 12 of them are in Republican States, in none of which did Obama garner more than 45.5% of the vote. The 13th is Maine, a state that Obama won.

The most important question for Republicans now is whether they can pull together to nominate candidates who are more in tune with the broader electorate than the candidates they selected for Missouri and Indiana. At least at this time, a quick look suggests there are a number of States in which nomination challenges from the right could materialize.

Finally, Romney won 7 of the States which have current Democratic Senators who will be on the ballot in 2014.

* * * * *

Senator Dianne Feinstein (D-CA) is now the Senator who has received the most votes in a single election. At last count – with some ballots yet to be counted, her total reached 7,297,972 in this most recent election. The previous record holder was Barbara Boxer (D-CA).

* * * * *

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Democratic Congressional candidates as a group received 5.29% of the votes cast for that office, 675,000 more votes than Republican Congressional candidates as a group. Democrats received 58,268,527 votes, while Republicans garnered 57,593,519 votes. Yet the Republicans retained a 33-member margin in that body.

52.8% of eligible voters cast votes for Congress compared to 58.4% who cast votes for President.

27 incumbent Members of the House were defeated in 2012; 10 Democrats and 17 Republicans.

	<u>Dem</u>	<u>Rep</u>	<u>Ind</u>	<u>Vac</u>
100th Congress 1987-88	258	177		
101st Congress 1989-90	260	175		
102nd Congress 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		
112 th Congress 2011-12	193	242		
113 th Congress 2013-14	201	234		

* * * * *

2014

Democrats would have to pick up 17 seats in the 2014 election in order to become the majority Party. That is not a huge number, but it is a pretty high hill.

The first hurdle is finding the seats, given the redistricting that took place after the 2010 census.

While history does not have to be determinative, other than in 1998, the Party controlling the White House has lost seats in the mid-term election of a President's second term in office in every election since 1918.

To pursue this question in greater detail bring up Nate Silver's FiveThirtyEight article of November 16, 2012.

* * * * *

GOVERNORS AND STATE LEGISLATURES

After the 1992 election there were 28 Democratic Governors, 20 Republican Governors, and 1 Independent. Following the 2012 election there are 30 Republican Governors, 19 Democratic Governors and 1 Independent. A major shift came in 1996 when, post-election, there were 31 Republican Governors. Democrats rebounded briefly in the 2008 election, at the end of which there were 28 Democrats and 22 Republicans in State chief executive chairs.

Governors by Party

Year	Democrats	Republicans	Independents
1992	28	20	2
1994	29	19	2
1996	18	31	1
1998	17	32	1
2000	18	30	2
2002	21	27	2
2004	22	28	0
2006	22	28	0
2008	28	22	0
2010	26	24	0
2012	20	29	1

In 21 of the last 29 Presidential elections the number of State legislators of the Party that wins the Presidency has increased. That was the case in 2012.

* * * * *

TURNOUT, DECISION TIME, AND DEMOGRAPHY OF THE 2012 ELECTORATE

Going into the 2012 election the voting age population of the United States was 240, 926, 957. The voting eligible population was 219,296,589. Based on votes cast as counted through November 29, 2012, (127,866,731 votes) turnout was 58.4%. This is the lowest since the 2000 election. Turnout of eligibles in 2008 was 63% and in 2004 it was 60.6%.

The most striking change in the timing of when voters decided for whom to vote between 2008 and 2012 came from the number who decided before Labor Day. In 2008, 52% of the ultimate electorate made their decision as to whom they would support prior to Labor Day. In 2012, that number was 69%. This change was likely driven by the fact that there was an incumbent in 2012.

Those who decided in September 2008 (14%) picked Obama by 9 % points. However, those who decided in September 2012 (9%) went for Romney by 8% points. (It may be that those who remember deciding in September include the 1st debate in their memory of September. It was on October 3rd.)

General belief has been that late deciders go against the incumbent. That did not happen in 2012. Obama won among that 9% of the voters who decided in the last week, and among the 3% of that number who decided on election day.

In 2008, 10% of the voters decided during the last week. Among the 6% who decided in the last week, but before election day, McCain won by 3 points. Obama won by 5 points among those who decided on election day.

* * * * *

LIMITING THE VOTE

While most efforts leading up to elections are designed to increase the size of the vote, there is always some effort made through devices, legal and otherwise, to limit the vote.

In this particular election, as in most elections, most of the voter limitation efforts were aimed at reducing turnout among minorities, the elderly, and voters from the lower economic strata of the community.

While there were the usual odd groups that attempted to limit the vote by publicizing the wrong times and locations for voting, most of the organized efforts came in the form of the passage of various laws.

The Brennan Center for Justice at New York University School of Law reported that 25 new laws and two executive actions were adopted in 19 States. Most of these efforts were led by Republican Governors and legislatures.

Law suits were brought against the majority of the most onerous of these laws, and generally the courts ordered that the laws not be implemented. However,

in any number of cases, judicial action appears to have been premised on the passage of these laws too close to the election; i.e., there was not enough time for potential voters to take the actions necessary to avoid disqualification of their votes. These laws are still on the books and there is no reason to assume that efforts will not be made to enforce them in 2014 and going forward.

Other efforts involved making all voting more difficult. 29 States now have early voting. Something approaching 35% of the vote nationwide may well have occurred before the actual election day, if one includes absentee voting in early voting. But here too there were efforts made to make it more difficult to vote early than in the past. In Florida, the Governor limited the number of early voting dates, with particular emphasis on Sunday voting, a day of which many minority voters and working class voters have taken advantage in the past.

Yet another problem is the quantity and quality of the voting facilities. Voting line waits of up to seven hours were reported. Again, Florida seemed to be ground zero. This problem too makes life more difficult for the average working person.

In 2012 enough clamor was raised about various efforts to limit voting that it appears to have become a tool used by those trying to increase the vote. That is, the argument was made that efforts were being made to deny them the vote as a device to get them to wait the extra hour to take the extra action to make sure their vote was counted.

Taken as a whole, experts say that the problem nationwide does not appear to have been worse in 2012 than in past years. That does not mean that it is not a problem with which the country needs to deal.

* * * * *

THE EXIT POLL

Selected data from the 1992 through 2012 Presidential national exit polls is set out in the chart below.

The percentage of men (47%) and of women (53%) in America is the same today as it was in 1992. 55% of the women voted for Obama, while 52% of the men voted for Romney.

Obama lost to Romney among those 40 years of age and older, but he won those between the ages of 18 and 39 years, including 60% of those between 18 and 29 years of age.

In 1992, 87% of the electorate was white and 13% was non-white. Today the white portion of the electorate is 72% and the non-white portion is 28%. The increase in Latino participation has grown from 2% to 10%; African-American participation grew from 8% to 13%.

Romney won 59% of the white vote, while Obama won 93% of the African-American vote, 71% of the Latino vote, and 73% of the Asian vote.

While income data suggests a substantial change in the economic status of the electorate, these changes are, to some extent, misleading. \$1 in 1992 is worth \$1.65 in 2012. Thus \$50,000 in 1992 is the equivalent of \$82,000 in 2012.

Throughout the election season there was considerable angst from Republicans because most national surveys had a sample which included 4-7% more Democrats than Republicans. Most pollsters do not weight for political affiliation, so the spread they were reporting is what they found. The exit poll showed a +6 spread for Democrats. As recently as 2004 the election day sample showed equal numbers of Democrats and Republicans.

Married people (60% of the electorate) supported Romney by 56%, while those who are unmarried gave 62% of their vote to Obama. Unmarried women (23% of the electorate) gave 67% of their vote to Obama, as did unmarried men who gave him 56% of their vote.

Demographic Changes from the 1992 Election to the 2012 election:

Demographic	1992	1996	2000	2004	2008	2012
Women	53	52	52	54	53	53
Men	47	48	48	46	47	47
White	87	83	81	77	74	72
Non-White	13	17	20	23	27	28
African-American	8	10	10	11	13	13
Latino	2	5	7	8	9	10
Asian	1	1	2	2	2	3
Other	2	1	1	2	3	2
18-29	21	17	17	17	18	19
30-44	+	33	33	29	29	27*
45-64	+	34	36	38	37	38*
Over 65	13	16	14	16	16	16
Income Under \$50K [#]	68	61	47	45	38	41
Income Over \$50K [#]	32	39	53	55	62	59
Income Over \$100K [#]	+	9	15	18	26	28
Democrat	38	39	39	37	39	38
Republican	35	35	35	37	32	32
Independent	27	26	27	26	29	29
Liberal	21	20	20	21	22	25
Conservative	30	33	29	34	44	35
Moderate	49	47	50	45	34	41
High School Graduate	+	24	21	22	20	21
Some College	+	27	32	32	31	29
College Graduate	+	43	42	42	44	47
Catholic	+	29	26	27	27	25
Protestant	+	54	54	54	54	53
Jewish	+	3	4	3	2	2
Other Religion	+	6	6	7	6	7
No Religion	+	7	9	10	12	12
Legal Abortion-All Cases	+	25	23	21	+	29
Legal Abortion-Most Cases	+	35	33	34	+	30
Legal Abortion-Few Cases	+	25	27	26	+	23
Legal Abortion- Never	+	12	13	16	+	13
Full Time Workers	+	64	67	60	65	60
Union Member in Household	+	23	26	24	21	18
Married	+	66	65	63	66	60
Unmarried	+	34	35	37	34	40
Married Men	+	+	+	+	33	29
Married Women	+	+	+	+	32	31
Unmarried Men	+	+	+	+	14	18
Unmarried Women	+	+	+	+	21	23
LGBT	+	5	4	4	4	5
Right Direction	22 [^]	53	65	49	20	46
Wrong Track	76 [^]	43	31	46	75	52
Top Issue	Economy-61%	Economy-21%	Economy-18%	Moral Values-22%	Economy-63%	Economy-59%

* * * * *

* A review of editions of the Washington Watch going back to the beginning revealed that four issues were not included in the overall count. The count is being brought up to date with this edition.

* * * * *

Mike

Suite 500
2100 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20037
202- 728-1100

mberman@dubersteingroup.com