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Patterns of Presidential election

- This is spin-off speculation from ER (not backed by research)
- BUT be intentional in your research - see if this going anywhere
- just clarification - what's worth doing, come later ...
- What's really right? When we look for pattern with log-linear
- it can't be "random" - it's hard to default to "random" - the Peter Principle

1) Redundant / party system
   - stable enough to be causal changes
   - doesn't work! - for presidential election
   - at least 60% (yes, clear station, almost not experience)
     but: over, candidates, managed

2) B
   - learn aside what might cause that
     - 25 election in 1960
     - assume through 1932 in R, (i.e. D)
     - 1948 not much better than 1936/19

3) Conventions (or whatever)
   - This is going well - the lead horse
   - It's largely irregular to them, and for good reasons
     (Post, Easter, Truman)

4) We all understand is personal incenitry advantage (Lee, basic item)
   - we do this in CES, but not here
   - (Caesar? learn not about fun named)

I was sensitized by Jerry Weinberg (1971-00-00)
- pooled survey data (weighted means) 5/12 across
  - 7) Voter behavior difficult in certain ways
  - 6) ad (and why no econ results)
  - of a 7 - partial result elsewhere
Doesn't suggest data. Come in ad?

Let me review some data going all the way back to the beginning (1788)

— We've had 54 reps, which is a considerable data set

— Yes, it's unconventional to look back before the 1830s

— Undoubtedly, the early election are treated as if they took place on another planet

— I think that's a mistake for two purposes

— We tend to get too transfixed by major elector returns (1820+)

— Open politics was taking place back then.

— Class data: 1820 (less than 932)

— Last dozen perc (round 1850) = 4.29 perc + 2 inc. loss

— Last dozen re (round in 1850) = 4.29 perc + 2 inc. loss

— Open, occasional voting, always plural voting

1788+ =

30 incumbent electors

24 open seat electors

> 2 universes

I see a couple of differences in the raw data:

1) Incumbent elections tend to be more presided

—not surprising, but then it is.

**TABLE 2**

Measuring of closeness = Pop vote edge (w/1m - TK x 1912)(474)

— 1788-1824

— Decry — Paul wanted to do it — he failed

— We need to know more about how each elected

1812 — a campaign

PA > Pres. Dearl Clinton

1844 or 1960-1968

(They all been done well, this always bad

(Amory, the early years don't match the patterns)
NB

- Open seat - harder to close
- It's intensely to see the outlines
- A seems to take a lot
- CW
- Zware
  (The term 'aggregate' - the meaning goes)

Graph I - a reflection

**Desirable**

Despite incompatibility - pro-factory keep the presidency most often with an incumbent candidate on the ballot?

**Table 1**

- Idea: the data needs to shrink to 52
- Minis 1988 + 1989
- Includes all - *for 2x*

- Answer: 2/3 for

- 1/2 if not - it's about 50-50

- = nice classic even by Reagan, an upset - 6

- Chance fact (regardless of what might be causing it)

- - if a real difference, then it will be over/under predict on the average

So, why if there is a difference? [run a X² test] (meaningfulness or less)

I can think of some a priori or explanation (maybe, they are none)

- Call the A, B, C + D - of which A+B add up, "nearly do it"

- *Summarize Right 1, at C + D = not* = *calculate*

A) reasons that indicate the over candidate

- Rejected (~ cannot account)
- Lowers (CFW)
- Grouping (legality) etc.

B) Reasons that involve in the electorate

- Politically different
- Staying cost (see four weeks)
- Optimal combined - still they were an electorate didn't have any majority for anyone of it
A + B = whatever kind of "inc at"

All our might be anticipated
Inc party slightly more to the red than
- variable output used by Clayfield 13 + 2
- a slight dip, last half century or so anyway

as if because

20 inc election — 4: mode + mode
11 open seat decline — 8: mode + mode
7 = men
10 = mean

And on the other hand, IFF might be reaching inc int

- why not to hand to displaced
- don't dismiss alternative immediately?

I notice that since WW2

4 in legislature edge one seat from


D) Strategic Removal?

— the strategic behavior in the incumbency success of
The incumbent party

(I'd be out only for that I don't think that
for anything else)
The idea is then come a kind of inverse causation

10. Mut inclusive accident causes victim

but: The perceived minimum defect causes non-incompetencies
   a) the last yard a little low
   b) a little low falls on leg only

(a high incidence) not
   which deny the % or % result

But I don’t think that this inverse-causation objection goes very far.

Here’s one way to look at the problem:

let’s see if those do appear in the balance again

when we especially expect that they should

and see why most of not

Table 3

a summary of 29 instances

a) an inc. qte higher case presumably
   (not 204 - the weakest heater, day 11 at 04: 182/46, 3y)
   (not > 1 - the 2/Fea. men).

b) Seemed no worse than 1x year
   - OK: T-265.55
   - AE & TR 88, 117.52

Who didn’t stay out?

- Price

- Hayford

And then: General crmty

- Byke (69 - maybe...)

The survival variable (not tension, relatively)

Costs:

- Not have you
- Not try to run on more - heart attack - 4y

- 105 a mixed case

- The testimony: The febrile man:

- But he also refused to drink much and felt free

- The wog went down - 14 mos, 4yr 2day

LB: The pretty the best case for inverse causation, has a mixed case.

There seem much grant for inverse causation.

- Generally only they may again when PC appears to other chance

- Look then not - then kept, healed, + education.
Yes, the numbers are small, and it doesn't take much to affect the fiction
But of the difference may be real

6) Categories A & B may be right places to look for explanations.

For myself, I kind of like the idea that open seat → 50/50

To go back to the relevant literature:

With this in mind, one of Newre's alleged "paragons" that looks so momentarily solid

1940 - more critically

Only 3 times, say, that a lady had an IHC 20-20
- 1926 - yes, but not last
- 1930-04
- 1936-40-44-48 4X!
- The "Nabob" + the "Naboplan" - almost both different - and finally, in sense
- Notably 1940 - Daphne Mau}

"The Age of Wilshire"