

This election was a rejection of many aspects of Washington’s status quo

Key takeaways from Charlie Cook's *day after the election recap* event

	Cook’s Remarks
<p>What this election meant</p>	<p>This was an unprecedented rejection of many people and things</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was a rejection of Hillary Clinton and Bill Clinton • It was a rejection of the Republican establishment • It was a rejection of the Washington establishment—none of the five living presidents endorsed Donald Trump, of the Forbes top 100 CEOs not one of them made a contribution to the Trump campaign, only two major newspapers endorsed Trump
<p>Relevant presidential election history</p>	<hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Donald Trump won the Electoral College while Hillary Clinton is projected to win the popular vote <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We had three EC/popular vote splits during the 19th century, none during the 20th century and now we’ve had two in the first 16 years of the 21st century • We knew this would be a change election <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Since the end of WWII whenever a party held the presidency for eight years, five times out of six the American people voted for change ○ The only exception was after eight years under President Reagan when his vice-president, George H.W. Bush, was elected ○ The NBC/WSJ poll released Nov. 6th showed 31% of participants thought the country was going in the right direction and 62% thought it was on the wrong track ○ The last time that right direction was higher than wrong track was back in January of 2004, more than 12 years ago, so we knew there had been sustained anger ○ Cook referenced this focus group run by Peter Hart at the Annenberg Public Policy Center as evidence of a desire for change, but also an uncertainty about whether Trump was the right vehicle for that change <hr/>

Source: Charlie Cook, *Day after the election event*, National Journal, November 10, 2016

Working-class white voters have moved away from the Democratic Party

Key takeaways from Charlie Cook's *day after the election recap* event

	Cook's Remarks
<p>Trump's victory as a pushback on the progressive movement</p>	<p>Many voters do not think the political system is working, some think not enough change is happening, while others think too much change is happening too quickly</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elizabeth Warren and Bernie Sanders tried to bring the progressive movement into the Democratic Party, but many supporters may have been restless and dissatisfied with social norms and our economic system • There was a significant group of voters who thought things were changing too quickly <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Social issues like the debate on transgender access to bathrooms may have made voters feel this way ○ Another factor could have been changes in economic norms like globalization and international trade agreements that put people out of work to some extent—though Cook notes in many cases jobs were replaced by robots and machines, but those people tend to feel like they were replaced by cheaper options abroad, when it really may have been increases in productivity and new technology • Debate discourse has changed over the last 30 years to become the bare knuckle brawling it was this cycle
<p>Working-class whites venting their economic and cultural frustration</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We've heard a lot about non-college whites for Trump against everyone else <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A lot of Trump's support actually came from a divide between urban and rural voters ○ The first sign that things were taking an unexpected turn came from David Wasserman reporting unprecedented turnout numbers in rural counties • The divide between middle America and the coastal states was more significant than political analysts realized <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It seems to be a rebellion against people from the east and west coasts "telling us how to live our lives" ○ Ron Brownstein calls this a political inversion where working-class whites were once a fundamental part of the "New Deal Democrats" and have now left the Democratic Party ○ Reagan won working-class whites by 32% and Donald Trump won them by 39%. This is significant because Reagan won in a landslide while Trump's victory depended heavily on this coalition

Source: Charlie Cook, *Day after the election event*, National Journal, November 10, 2016.

Exit poll data initially appeared to confirm what analysts and pollsters predicted

Key takeaways from Charlie Cook's *day after the election recap* event

	Cook's Remarks
Cook's key exit poll data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Age <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Voters under 45 years old were 44% of the electorate and Clinton won them by 12 points, 52% to 40% ○ Those 45 and older were 56% of the electorate and Trump won them by 9 points, 53% to 44% • Gender <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Women made up 52% of the electorate and Clinton won them by 12 points ○ Men made up 48% of the electorate and Trump won them by 12 points ○ These numbers would seem to suggest a Clinton victory • Race <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In 1992 Bill Clinton beat H.W. Bush when 87% of the electorate was white ○ In 2012 this share had dropped 15 points to 72% ○ This electorate was 70% white, but of the whites that voted, they voted for Trump by a 21-point margin, 58% to 37% ○ Non-whites (30% of the electorate) in 2016 voted for Clinton by a 53-point margin, 73% to 21% • Race, education and gender splits <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ White female college graduates: 20% of the electorate; voted for Clinton by 6 points, 51%-45% ○ White female non-college graduates: 17% of the electorate; voted for Trump by 28 points ○ White male college graduates: Trump won by 15 points ○ White male non-college graduates: Trump won by 49 points, 72% to 23%

Source: Charlie Cook, *Day after the election event*, National Journal, November 10, 2016.

Some exit poll data showed counterintuitive voter tendencies

Key takeaways from Charlie Cook's *day after the election recap event*

	Cook's Remarks
Cook's key exit poll data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Party <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Clinton won Democrats 89% to 9%; Obama had 91% of the party in 2012 ○ Trump won 90% of Republicans; Romney had 92% of the Republican vote in 2012 ○ Romney won Independents by 5 points in 2012 and Trump won Independents by 6 points in 2016 ○ There are more Democrats than there are Republicans—usually there are about 5% or 6% more Democrats, but this year it was 4% more, suggesting Democrats may have had some turnout issues • Military <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 13% of the electorate served in the military ○ They voted for Trump by a 27-point margin, 61% to 34% ○ Of the 87% that had never served in the military, they voted for Clinton by a 5-point margin, 50% to 45% • Made their mind up before the last month of the election <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This group made up 73% of the electorate ○ Clinton won them by 5 points 51% to 46% ○ 26% of the electorate made up their mind in the last month and Trump won this group by a 10-point margin, 49% to 39% ○ This adds to the conversation about whether the Comey FBI investigation headlines impacted the election—we don't know and this does not prove anything, but it is a theory • Questions of how the next president should govern <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Continue Barack Obama's policies: (28% of voters) Clinton won this group by 91% to 5% ○ Change to more conservative policies: (48% of voters) Trump won this group by 83% to 13% ○ Change to more liberal policies: (17% of voters) Trump won 23% of this group (23% to Clinton's 73%)

Source: Charlie Cook, *Day after the election event*, National Journal, November 10, 2016.

We are in uncharted territory in terms of predicting where the Republican and Democratic parties go from here

Key takeaways from Charlie Cook's day after the election recap event

	Cook's Remarks
How does all this effect Congress	<p>The future for Paul Ryan and the Republicans</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does he want the speaker position? If he wants it is he allowed to keep it? Will the Freedom Caucus feel emboldened by this or will they keep Ryan as a negotiator? • We don't yet know, but these are the questions to watch going forward • Mitch McConnell is not in as vulnerable of a position as he was before the election • Another thing to watch will be how Ryan, McConnell and Pence interact and work with Trump • From this point forward we are all in uncharted territory <p>Where does the Democratic Party go?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cook might argue the center of gravity is closer to Elizabeth Warren and Bernie Sanders than Hillary Clinton and Joe Biden • Chuck Schumer will probably have a better relationship with Mitch McConnell than the highly contentious relationship between Harry Reid and McConnell
Audience questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is Trump's success in the <i>Rust Belt</i> a trend? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes, probably ○ Democrats have been banking on a rise in the Latino vote and the Asian-American vote and the states with booming numbers of highly educated young voters all moving toward the Democratic Party—the thing with that is it's not happening evenly in all 50 states and as a result Clinton did fine in VA and CO, but in states that skew more rural and less educated she did worse than Democrats anticipated

Source: Charlie Cook, Day after the election event, National Journal, November 10, 2016.

Trump’s compelling message made up for his lack of ground game

Key takeaways from Charlie Cook's *day after the election recap event*

	Cook’s Remarks
Audience questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trump spent significantly less than Clinton. Did he have a better technology strategy? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “Good field can’t make up for bad messaging” ○ The power of Trump’s messages trumped his lack of spending ○ The Clinton campaign did goof up in some respects—the fact that they didn’t send her into Wisconsin, that Minnesota and Wisconsin were left essentially exposed ○ Trump has not found some new strategy, he just had a powerful message that resonated with voters really well—he had the right message in the right year ○ “If I were a Republican consultant I would not tell candidates, ‘Don’t worry about field, do it the way Trump did” • What impact does this election have on the role of media in politics? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Particularly with younger voters the distinction between traditional journalism and opinion, that wall has broken down ○ A lot of cable networks realized their ratings went up when they played full Trump speeches, which had never really happened before, eventually they also started playing some from Clinton and Sanders as well ○ There were also some newspapers that went a little far the other way and got really aggressive with calling Trump a liar ○ “It was like watching a badly refereed basketball game with a lot of makeup calls at the end”

Source: Charlie Cook, *Day after the election event*, National Journal, November 10, 2016.

Democrats may have relied too heavily on a surge in Hispanic and Latino turnout benefiting their party

Key takeaways from Charlie Cook's *day after the election recap* event

	Cook's Remarks
Audience questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why was the pre-election polling so off? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ National polling averages showed Clinton up by 3-4 points in the final days before the election, in reality, she was up by approximately 1/2 a point (as of the publication of this deck, all final popular vote numbers yet to be calculated) ○ That's off, but not wildly wrong (within a standard margin of error for polling). The problem is partially related to overall answer rate, due to caller ID and cell phones; this can then affect the ability to get a large enough sample of responses to a poll, and large samples make for better, more accurate numbers overall. Some key states like Michigan and Minnesota did not have enough polling going on

Other information

- You can watch the event in full at <https://www.c-span.org/video/?417532-1/charlie-cook-discusses-election-2016-results>

Source: Charlie Cook, *Day after the election event*, National Journal, November 10, 2016.