**AMERICA'S
CHANGING
DEMOGRAPHICS**

The Rhodes Cook Letter

April 2006

The Rhodes Cook Letter

APRIL 2006 / VOL. 7, NO. 2
(ISSN 1552-8189)

Contents

America's Changing Demographics..... 3

Chart & Graph: U.S. Population Fast Growing from the Start 4

Map: U.S. Population Growth, 2000-05 5

Chart: Bush I to Bush II: Changing Electorate, Tenuous Republican Majority . . 6

Chart & Graph: Republican Share of the Vote by Age Groups Since 1988 . . . 7

Map: U.S. Minority Population: 2004 8

Chart & Graph: Hurdles to Minority Participation: Citizenship, Registration . . 9

Chart & Graph: Republican Share of the Vote by Race Since 1988 10

Maps: The 1968 Election; 2004 Election; States that Switched Parties 11

Chart & Map: The Current Electoral Map: The 3 Parts of America 12

Maps: The Evolving Map: Where Major Counties Switched Parties in 2004 . . 13

Appendix

Chart: Major Counties that Switched Party Hands in 2004 14

Chart: U.S. Population Growth, 2000-05: Fastest Growth in South and West . . 15

Chart: U.S. Minority Population: 2004 16

'06 Primary Season Under Way: Voters Offer Early Feedback on Big Issues..... 17

Chart: Gubernatorial & Congressional Incumbents: Breaking a Sweat in '06 . . 18

Chart: For the Record: 2006 Gubernatorial, Senate Primary Results. 20

Chart & Map: Wisconsin: Town Referendums on the Iraq War 22

Chart: Expanding the 'Kingmakers': Democrats Audition States to Join Iowa,
New Hampshire in Early 2008. 23

Chart & Map: 2006 Primary Calendar: Two Big Months of Voting Ahead . . 24

Chart: The Changing Composition of the 109th Congress 26

Chart: Special House Elections in 2005-06 26

The Rhodes Cook Letter is published by Rhodes Cook. Web: rhodescook.com. E-mail: rhodescook@aol.com. Design by Landslide Design, Rockville, MD. "The Rhodes Cook Letter" is published on a bimonthly basis. An individual subscrip-

tion for six issues is \$99. Make check payable to "The Rhodes Cook Letter" and send it, along with your e-mail address, to P.O. Box 574, Annandale, VA. 22003. See the last page of this newsletter for a subscription form.

All contents are copyrighted ©2006 Rhodes Cook. Use of the material is welcome with attribution, although the author retains full copyright over the material contained herein.

Through the Prism of Demographics: America's Political Scene

From its inception in 1789 as a new nation of less than 4 million people, the United States has never stopped growing.

By 1850, the population approached 25 million; by 1900, it had surpassed 75 million; and by 2000, it exceeded 280 million, with the total ballooning to nearly 300 million in the half dozen years since then.

America has never really stopped to catch its breath. Assimilation of new groups has come on the fly, and inclusiveness in the political process has often come grudgingly.

In the early years of the Republic, voting was largely limited to the landed gentry. Suffrage was not widely extended to non-property-owning adult white males until the early 1800s. Women were not given the right to vote until 1920. As for blacks, their road to full political participation has come in fits and starts, beginning after the Civil War but not fully realized until the 1960s. And it was not until 1971, in the midst of the Vietnam War, that the voting age was lowered from 21 to 18, giving many young soldiers who were fighting and dying in Southeast Asia a vote in the democracy that they were defending.

In short, the American electorate includes some groups at a slower pace than others. But nonetheless, it is constantly evolving and expanding.

Just since George W. Bush's father was elected president in 1988, the electorate – at least the portion that votes in presidential elections – has grown older, better educated, more racially diverse and much larger. Turnout jumped from barely 90 million in 1988 to more than 120 million in 2004, with a majority of the vote shifting from the states of the Frost Belt (the Northeast and Midwest) to those of the Sun Belt (the South and West).

Geographically, Republican strength is concentrated these days in the American heartland, a large swath of the country that includes the fast-growing South and Mountain West, as well as the slower-growing Great Plains. Democrats dominate in the populous Northeast and the Pacific West, generally not as fast-growing but the locale of many of the nation's largest states.

As for voting groups, Republicans have scored perceptible gains since 1988 among Hispanics, the less educated, and the elderly. Democrats have gained ground among the well educated, the young, and self-described independents.

Upcoming changes in the American electorate will probably be even more profound than in the recent past – certainly altering the demographic composition, possibly even the partisan advantage.

In the short run, politics will be affected by the demographics of aging, with the maturing mass of "baby boomers" poised for their last hurrah. The advance guard of this hefty post-World War II generation turns 60 this year, with the tail end turning 42. Roughly 75 million strong, the boomers will have the numbers to push the nation toward one party or the other. Or just maybe, they will exhibit an independence of thought and action and steer the nation's politics on a new course that places neither the Democrats nor Republican in the lead role.

In the long run, however, nothing will shape the American political scene more than the demographics of race. The nation's minority population has been growing so quickly of late, especially among Hispanics, that it is not hard to imagine an American electorate a generation or so from now where whites comprise a tenuous majority, at most.

If the changing demographics of age represent quiet evolution, the changing demographics of race could produce nothing less than a political revolution. It has already unleashed plenty of passion, on full display over the issue of immigration. Neither party knows quite how to handle this issue, in large part because the stakes are so high – both for them and for the nation as a whole.

The Demographics of Age: “Baby Boomers” and the Politics of the Present

While the demographics of race are apt to drive the politics of the future, the demographics of age are molding the politics of the present, as the American electorate grows steadily grayer.

When Bill Clinton was elected president in 1992, more than 55% of voters were under age 45. When George W. Bush was reelected in 2004, nearly 55% were age 45 or older, with roughly one-third of all voters aging “baby boomers,” the huge mass of Americans born in a span of nearly two decades after World War II.

Voters at either end of the age spectrum – the young and the old – tend to get the most attention. The young are a curiosity; they are new to the political process, with partisan preferences that are largely unknown. So, too, is even their interest in the political process, as it is always in question how many in the highly mobile 18-to-29 year old age group will even register to vote.

U.S. Population: Fast Growing from the Start

America’s population growth has been explosive since the founding of the Republic in 1789. The population grew by at least 25% in each decade of the nation’s first century, and by at least 10% in all but two decades since then (the 1930s and the 1980s being the exceptions). In the 1990s, the U.S. population swelled by more than 32 million, a growth rate of 13%.

Below, the population is tracked at 50-year intervals, starting with 1800. The nation’s first census 10 years earlier counted a population of 3.9 million. The total of states is the number at the time in the year that the census was taken, a date that has varied from January to August but has been April 1 since 1930.

Year	States	Population	Increase for 50-year Interval
1800	16	5,308,483	
			17,883,393
1850	30	23,191,876	
			53,020,292
1900	45	76,212,168	
			75,113,630
1950	48	151,325,798	
			130,096,628
2000	50	281,422,426	

Source: *Statistical Abstract of the United States: 2002* (U.S. Census Bureau)

The elderly (those 60 and older) are another matter. They tend to vote at a higher rate than any other age group in the electorate, at least up to age 75. Living longer each generation, those age 60 and over cast nearly one-quarter of all the votes in the 2004 presidential election.

It is assumed that a commonality of interests at least loosely binds the youngest and the oldest with their chronological peers. But that has not been the case as yet with the boomers, the largest generation of voters in American history.

Born between 1946 and 1964, they came of age at vastly different times. Older boomers can recall the dawn of television and the threat of nuclear war in the 1950s; the Kennedy assassinations, the civil rights struggle and the Vietnam War in the 1960s; all capped by the tumultuous 1968 Democratic convention in Chicago, where the forces unleashed in the previous decade seemed to come to a head.

Younger boomers do not remember any of this. They have a different frame of reference, with early memories that start with Richard Nixon and Watergate, and a coming of age that coincided with the Ronald Reagan years.

But as the boomers age, there is the chance that for the next decade or so they will not only be a hugely influential group in numbers but an increasingly homogenous one, as they focus more and more on common issues such as economic security, health care and the legacy they wish to leave their children, the country, and the planet.

Politically, the boomers have been free agents of a sort, not firmly committed to one party or the other. If anything, they have been a national barometer in their voting behavior. As young voters in 1976, they leaned slightly to Democrat Jimmy Carter in an election that Carter narrowly won. As the vanguard of boomers reached early middle-age in the 1980s, they voted decisively like the rest of the country for Republicans Reagan and George Bush, before switching in the 1990s – as the nation did – to Democrat Bill Clinton.

U.S. Population Growth, 2000-05: Fastest Growth Continues to be in South and West

As the leading edge of the boomers approached late middle age with the new millennium, they have reflected almost exactly the national result of the last two presidential elections – splitting nearly evenly between George W. Bush and Al Gore in 2000 and favoring Bush by the same 51%-to-48% margin that he won nationally in 2004.

What is next for this largest, if not greatest, of American generations? To be sure, boomers are part of a generation blessed like no other. Generally better educated and more affluent than their parents, they often project themselves as independent thinkers with a healthy dose of skepticism about politicians and the major parties. This

is a group that is not apt to exit the national stage quickly or quietly.

The last two presidents, Clinton and George W. Bush, are in the advance guard of boomers (both born in 1946), and the country is likely to be led for years to come by others in this generation.

All the while, rank-and-file baby boomers stand ready to flex their political muscle. They can be found almost everywhere in large numbers, comprising (according to the 2000 census) at least 25% of the total population in every state except Utah, where they constituted 23%.

If nothing else, boomers are apt to be a tough sell – as they were for President Bush's plan to privatize Social Security last year, and President Clinton's complex program to overhaul the nation's health care system more than a decade earlier.

As for their partisanship, they have given few hints as to how they might vote in the future. A Gallup Poll survey on party identification this April

From Bush I to Bush II: A Changing Electorate, a Tenuous Republican Majority

The American electorate is always evolving. From 1988, when George Bush was first elected president, to 2004, when his son was reelected, the basic composition of the presidential vote has changed. Unlike 1988, the majority of ballots in 2004 were cast in the states of the Sun Belt (the South and West), by voters over age 45, and by a growing minority population - up from 15% of the vote in 1988 to more than 20% in the last election. Republicans have done particularly well of late in the South and among older voters. But they continue to draw a minority share of the minority vote.

	% of Votes Cast			% Voting Republican		
	1988	2004	Change, 88-'04	1988	2004	Change, 88-'04
NATIONAL	100%	100%	-	53%	51%	- 2%
By Gender						
Men	48%	46%	- 2%	57%	55%	- 2%
Women	52%	54%	+ 2%	50%	48%	- 2%
By Race						
White	85%	77%	- 8%	59%	58%	- 1%
Black	10%	11%	+ 1%	12%	11%	- 1%
Hispanic	3%	8% *	+ 5%	30%	40% *	+ 10%
Asian	-	2%	-	-	44%	-
By Age						
Under 30	20%	17%	- 3%	52%	45%	- 7%
30-44	35%	29%	- 6%	54%	53%	- 1%
45-59	22%	30%	+ 8%	57%	51%	- 6%
60 and older	22%	24%	+ 2%	50%	54%	+ 4%
By Education						
No high school degree	8%	4%	- 4%	43%	49%	+ 6%
High school graduate	27%	22%	- 5%	50%	52%	+ 2%
College incomplete	30%	32%	+ 2%	57%	54%	- 3%
College degree	35%	42%	+ 7%	56%	49%	- 7%
By Religion						
White Protestant	40%	41%	+ 1%	66%	67%	+ 1%
Catholic	28%	27%	- 1%	52%	52%	-
Jewish	4%	3%	- 1%	35%	25%	- 10%
By Party						
Republican	35%	37%	+ 2%	91%	93%	+ 2%
Independent	26%	26%	-	55%	48%	- 7%
Democratic	37%	37%	-	17%	11%	- 6%
By Ideology						
Conservative	35%	34%	- 1%	80%	84%	+ 4%
Moderate	47%	45%	- 2%	49%	45%	- 4%
Liberal	18%	21%	+ 3%	18%	13%	- 5%
By Region						
Northeast	25%	22%	- 3%	50%	43%	- 7%
Midwest	27%	25%	- 2%	52%	51%	- 1%
South	28%	31%	+ 3%	58%	57%	- 1%
West	20%	21%	+ 1%	52%	49%	- 3%

Source: *Vital Statistics on American Politics 2005-2006* (CQ Press) for all data except the Asian vote, which is taken from *The New York Times*, Nov. 7, 2004, and the vote by region, which is based on official returns. An asterisk (*) indicates that the Republican share of the Hispanic vote in 2004 was a matter of dispute. The 40% listed is lower than the 44% share computed by an Election Day exit poll taken for a national media consortium and published in *Vital Statistics*. But 40% is more in line with what the actual figure is suspected to be. Also, the Hispanic share of the votes cast in 2004 is listed as 8% in *Vital Statistics*, but as 6% in a survey of the 2004 vote by the Census Bureau, which increases the share cast by non-Hispanic whites in the Census survey to 79%.

found that Republicans have a 2-point edge among 30-49 year-olds (which includes younger boomers), while Democrats have a 5-point edge among 50-64 year-olds (which includes older boomers). Yet one-third of the respondents in both age groups labeled themselves as independents.

If the boomers finally come down firmly in favor of one party or do something really unusual and mount a challenge to the two-party system itself, they could transform their political legacy from a national barometer that reflects public opinion to a national trend-setter that leads it.

The Demographics of Race: Hispanics and the Politics of the Future

On first glance, it would seem that the nation's growing minority population would be a bonanza for the Democrats. On second glance, it may not be that simple.

For the last half century or so, Democrats have dominated the minority vote – up from 15% of the total vote cast in 1988 to more than 20% in 2004. But the Democrats have done better with some

Republican Share of the Vote by Age Groups Since 1988

When it comes to recent presidential elections, the voters at either end of the age spectrum have been most apt to follow their own drummers. Young voters (under age 30) have voted Democratic in the last four presidential elections, two of which the Democrats have lost. The oldest voters (age 60 and older) stayed with the Democrats for three straight elections, including the party's unsuccessful effort in 2000. Meanwhile, voters of intermediate age have consistently gone with the winners since 1988, regardless of party. In bold are the elections where Republicans won more votes than the Democrats nationally or among a particular age group. No age group has voted exclusively for one party in the last five presidential contests

Republican share of presidential vote:					
	1988	1992	1996	2000	2004
NATIONAL	53%	37%	41%	48%	51%
Under 30	52%	34%	34%	46%	45%
30-44	54%	38%	41%	49%	53%
45-59	57%	40%	41%	49%	51%
60 and older	50%	38%	44%	47%	54%

Source: "How Americans Voted: A Political Portrait," *The New York Times*, November 7, 2004.

racial groups than others. With blacks they are golden, consistently drawing upwards of 90% of their votes in presidential elections since the Republican Party took a sharp turn to the south in the mid-1960s. Hispanics and Asians have been more competitive, as Democrats took between 55% and 60% of their ballots in 2004.

In the last presidential election, blacks cast an estimated 11% of the nationwide vote, Hispanics 6% to 8% (depending on the source), and Asians 2%. But the focus of late has been on the role of Hispanics, who have emerged in the early 21st century as the nation's largest and fastest-growing minority group. They are not only found in swelling numbers in vote-rich states along America's southern border. But they are also emerging as the leading minority in far-flung states to the north, such as Idaho, Kansas and New Hampshire.

In short, Hispanics are a group that both Democrats and Republicans covet as they plot their long-range strategies. But the battle for the Hispanic vote is a fight for the future. Currently, they represent future potential rather than present political power. More than half of the Hispanic vote in 2004 was cast in just three states – California, Florida and Texas – only one of which (Florida) was an actual battleground state.

Nationally, there were more than 41 million Hispanics living in the United States in 2004. But according to a Census Bureau survey, just 16 million were eligible to vote, less than 10 million reported being registered to vote, and barely 7.5 million Hispanics actually reported voting. By comparison, blacks registered and voted in the last election at a much higher rate. Of America's estimated 39 million blacks in 2004, 23 million were eligible to vote, 16 million reported being registered, and 14 million reported voting. In short, the number of ballots cast by blacks was nearly twice as large as Hispanics.

America's 25 million Hispanics not eligible to vote are split between those who are citizens but too young to vote and adults of voting age who are non-citizens. The latter comprise a majority of the 11 million or so illegal immigrants presently living in the country. They may or may not ever be eligible to vote. But young Hispanic citizens will, and are certain to be a growing force in American politics.

Yet the present is marked more by passion than solutions, more by questions than answers when it comes to how best to assimilate Hispanics into the American electorate. Three questions come immediately to mind.

With their increased visibility, as seen in recent demonstrations and work boycotts, will Hispanics now register to vote in larger numbers than they have in the past?

Answer: It appears as though Hispanics are energized and organized as they have never been before.

U.S. Minority Population: 2004

(Full chart in Appendix, page 16)

Expect to see an increased rate of voter registration among Hispanics, which after citizenship is the biggest hurdle to voting.

Could increased Hispanic involvement in American politics spur a shift in the partisan voting behavior of whites, blacks and Asians?

Answer: It could. It is not unusual for the inclusion of a large racial or ethnic group to have a ripple effect that brings changes in the partisan voting behavior of other groups, who seek to maintain their own place in the political sun.

Does either party have an immediate advantage in wooing Hispanics?

Answer: Democrats start with the inside track. Not only have they won a clear majority of the Hispanic vote in every presidential election in the past generation, but the Democrats

Hurdles to Minority Participation in 2004: Citizenship, Registration

While virtually all voting-age whites and blacks in the United States are citizens, that is not the case with Hispanics and Asians. Roughly one-third of the Asians of voting age and 40% of Hispanics were not citizens at the time of the 2004 presidential election and were not eligible to vote. And for those Asians and Hispanics who were voting-age citizens, the rate of voter registration and turnout was well below that of whites and blacks.

The data here is based on a Census Bureau survey of voter registration and turnout for the 2004 presidential election. Census numbers on registration and voting are estimates that can be slightly higher than exit polls or actual vote tallies have found, since the Census Bureau survey is based on respondents' descriptions of their own voting behavior. For instance, there were 122.3 million ballots actually cast and counted in the 2004 presidential election, while the Census Bureau survey lists an estimated turnout of 125.7 million.

The survey results for blacks and Asians are based on the totals for that race alone (not in combination with any others), and results for whites represent non-Hispanic whites alone. Hispanics can be of any race.

Race	Persons of Voting Age (in thousands)				% of Adults that are Eligible Citizens	% of Eligible Citizens Registered	% of Eligible Citizens that Voted
	Total	Citizens	Registered	Voted			
NATIONAL	215,694	197,005	142,070	125,736	91%	72%	64%
White	151,410	148,158	111,318	99,567	98%	75%	67%
Black	24,910	23,346	16,035	14,016	94%	69%	60%
Hispanic	27,129	16,088	9,308	7,587	59%	58%	47%
Asian	9,291	6,270	3,247	2,768	67%	52%	44%

Source: "Voting and Registration in the Election of November 2004," U.S. Census Bureau.

appear less divided in their sympathies than the Republicans. The GOP is split between a Hispanic-friendly White House and “cheap labor” business community on one hand and a conservative rank and file upset about the legal and cultural implications of a massive Hispanic influx on the other.

In addition, Republicans have their fingerprints all over House-passed legislation last December which emphasized border security and criminal punishments to reduce illegal immigration. To many Hispanics, it was a reminder of California Proposition 187, passed in 1994 with considerable Republican help, which denied public services to the children of illegal immigrants. The question now is whether President Bush, who speaks Spanish and has featured outreach to Hispanics throughout his political career, can mute any widespread Hispanic antipathy to the GOP.

As a public official, Bush has worn well among Hispanics. When he ran for reelection as governor of Texas in 1998, he won roughly 50% of the Hispanic vote. In 2004, President Bush drew roughly 40%, the best showing by any Republican presidential candidate among Hispanics in more than a quarter century. But promoting his own candidacy is one matter. Defending his party from a possible Hispanic backlash is another.

One thing is certain – immigration and by extension, the role of Hispanics in America’s future – is now a hot button political issue. Like the content of Pandora’s box, once out in the open it is likely

Republican Share of the Vote by Race Since 1988

Even in years when they did not win the White House, Republicans throughout the last generation have consistently carried the majority of the white vote in presidential elections. But minority groups are another matter. In bold are the elections since 1988 where Republicans won more votes than the Democrats nationally or among a particular racial group. An asterisk (*) indicates that the Republican share of the Hispanic vote in 2004 was a matter of dispute. The 40% listed is lower than the 44% share posted in the Election Day exit poll taken for a national media consortium. But 40% is more in line with what the actual figure is suspected to be.

Republican Share:	1988	1992	1996	2000	2004
NATIONAL	53%	37%	41%	48%	51%
White	59%	40%	46%	54%	58%
Asian	-	55%	48%	41%	44%
Hispanic	30%	25%	21%	31%	40% *
Black	12%	10%	12%	8%	11%

Source: “How Americans Voted: A Political Portrait,” *The New York Times*, November 7, 2004.

1968 Election: The Emerging Republican Majority

2004 Election: Almost Even

States that Switched, 1968-2004: GOP Solidifies the South, Democrats Gain on Two Coasts

to remain there. For at the core of the debate for many voters are two quite elemental and as yet unanswered questions: What will the country look like demographically and culturally a generation from now, and who will be running it?

Clues from the Map

Arguably the last realignment in American politics came in 1968, when Republicans brought down the curtain on the long-running Democratic New Deal era and launched a Republican era of their own. It has seen them win seven of the last 10 presidential elections, as well as take control of both houses of Congress in 1994.

The outline of the current GOP dominance was presciently outlined by political author Kevin Phillips in his book, *The Emerging Republican Majority* (published in 1969). He correctly foresaw a GOP majority anchored in America's heartland and burgeoning Sun Belt. But the Republican majority that Phillips envisioned also included California and suburbia, and did not take into account a growing minority population that Democrats have a long head start in wooing.

As a result, Republicans do not have a muscular majority, but a tenuous one. They have consolidated the South, but have been consistently beaten of late in the Northeast and the Pacific West, as well as major Midwestern battleground states such as Illinois and Michigan.

The national electoral map has stayed virtually the same the last two presidential elections, giving the sense that the famous red and blue shadings are in semi-permanent balance. But below the state level, in the 3,100 or so counties across the country, there is an ongoing movement of voters between the two parties that hints at the emerging shape of American politics.

More than 200 counties switched party hands in 2004. Most of these moved from the Democrats in 2000 to George W. Bush and the Republicans in 2004. But more than 60 counties moved the other way – to John Kerry

and the Democrats. To be sure, many of the counties that changed parties were small, rural ones. And in many cases, only a few votes were needed to tip a county from one party to the other.

But nearly three dozen of the counties that switched party hands in 2004 were populous ones, each with a population of more than 100,000. And their movement from one party to the other represents the seeds of change in American politics that when reaching full flower can bring historic shifts.

Many of the counties that Bush gained in 2004 had not voted for a Republican presidential candidate since voting for his father in 1988. On the other hand, many of the counties that Kerry picked up from the GOP had voted Democratic as recently as 1996, taking a one-election sabbatical from the party in 2000 when defections to Ralph Nader temporarily reduced the Democratic vote.

In 2004, Republicans picked up a number of retirement-oriented counties on the Florida Gulf Coast, a heavily Hispanic county on Texas' southern border with Mexico, and the Indiana county that contains America's most famous Catholic university, Notre Dame.

Democrats also made cross-country gains at the county level in 2004, from one in central Maine that includes the state university to a pair of mountain counties in California that had not voted for a Democratic presidential candidate since Franklin D. Roosevelt.

But probably most intriguing for the future were the inroads that Republicans scored in "blue" America and that Democrats managed in "red" America.

Republicans registered breakthroughs in a number of blue-collar counties across the industrial Frost Belt in 2004. In Michigan, they picked up Macomb County, the fabled home of ethnic, working-class "Reagan Democrats" just outside Detroit. In Pennsylvania, they gained Lawrence County, in the old iron and steel country outside Pitts-

The Current Electoral Map: The 3 Parts of America

All of America is divided into three parts, at least that has been the case of late in electoral politics. The Republican majorities at both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue have been fashioned in the Republican 'L' - the GOP heartland that includes the South, the Mountain West and the Plains states. Democrats have dominated on the two coasts - the Northeast and the Pacific West - while the two parties have battled on roughly equal terms across the industrial Midwest. The chart is based on results from the 2004 presidential election, and also reflects the composition of the House and Senate after that election. Bold type represents Republican majorities.

	'04 Electoral Vote		Republican Percentage of:		
	Reps.	Dems.	Electoral Vote	House Seats	Senate Seats
Republican 'L'	232	0	100%	66%	77%
Democratic Coasts	5	194	3%	37%	25%
Midwest Battleground	49	57	46%	59%	44%
NATIONAL TOTAL	286	251	53%	53%	55%

Note: A Democratic elector in Minnesota voted for John Edwards rather than John Kerry.

burgh. And in New York, Bush brought into the Republican column the borough of Staten Island, home to many of New York City's police and firemen that is located just across the harbor from the site of the World Trade Center.

But if there was one county that exemplified the Republican trend in "blue" America, it was Cambria in mountainous, southwest Pennsylvania. The county is the gateway to industrial western Pennsylvania, a region known for its ethnic diversity, intense patriotism, and longtime loyalty to organized labor and the Democratic Party. The Cambria County seat of Johnstown is home to John Murtha, the pro-military Democratic congressman who has become a vocal critic of the Bush administration's Iraq War policy. Yet in 2004, Cambria County voted for Bush, the first time in 32 years that it supported the Republican presidential candidate.

Democratic inroads in "red" America in the last election were of a different sort. They made gains in generally affluent counties, including a number of ski resorts in Colorado's "granola belt." And they won Teton County, the Wyoming home of Vice President Richard Cheney that includes the tony resort town of Jackson. But the Democrats' most notable gains were in populous cosmopolitan areas in the South – such as the counties that contain Savannah, Ga., Charlotte, N.C., and Austin, Texas – as well as Indiana's capital city of Indianapolis, which had not voted for a Democratic presidential candidate since 1964.

Yet if there is one county that personified the Democratic trend in "red" America, it is Fairfax in suburban Northern Virginia. Situated a few miles west of the nation's capital, it is the most populous jurisdiction in the Washington, D.C., area, with more than 1 million residents. It is fast-growing, having more than doubled its population since 1970, and is one of the most affluent counties in the country. It also has a substantial minority population, an estimated one-third of the population and growing. And until recently, it was reliably Republican in presidential voting. But in 2004, Fairfax County voted for Kerry, the first time in 40 years that it supported the Democratic presidential candidate. And in 2005, it overwhelmingly backed the party's candidate for governor, enabling the Democrats to retain the state's executive mansion.

A blue-collar trend to the Republicans; a white-collar trend to the Democrats; an electorate that in the short run will be dominated by older voters, and in the long run dramatically impacted by a growing minority population – all these factors portend change, maybe big change, in America's electoral map. Enjoy the familiar red and blue shadings while you can. They may not last much longer.

The Ever-Evolving Map: Where Major Counties Switched Parties in 2004

States with at least one county of population 100,000 or more that switched party hands in the 2004 presidential election.

Appendix

Major Counties that Switched Party Hands in 2004

While only three states changed party hands in the 2004 presidential election (Iowa and New Mexico switching to the Republicans, New Hampshire to the Democrats), more than 200 counties across the country were won by the opposite party from 2000. Nearly three dozen of these counties that switched partisan hands had populations of at least 100,000 - including 24 that went from Democratic to Republican in 2004, and 11 that went the other way.

(Related maps on page 13)

Counties that switched to Bush:

(2000 population of at least 100,000)

County (Major City)	Type	'00 Pop.	Last Election voted Rep.	'04 Rep. %	Change in Rep. Share, '00-'04
Litchfield Co., Conn.	Small-town New England	182,193	1992	51.9%	+ 7.0%
Hernando Co., Fla.	Gulf Coast retirees	130,802	1988	52.9%	+ 5.9%
Osceola Co., Fla.	Growing Hispanic	172,493	1992	52.5%	+ 5.4%
Pasco Co., Fla.	Gulf Coast retirees	344,765	1988	54.1%	+ 6.1%
Pinellas Co., Fla. (St. Petersburg)	Gulf Coast retirees	921,482	1988	49.6%	+ 3.2%
LaSalle Co., Ill.	Agricultural heritage	111,509	1984	51.5%	+ 5.3%
Macon Co., Ill. (Decatur)	Industrial heritage	114,706	1984	54.3%	+ 6.2%
St. Joseph Co., Ind. (South Bend)	Industrial heritage/ Academic (Catholic)	265,559	1988	50.9%	+ 2.1%
Caddo Parish, La. (Shreveport)	Urban Center	252,161	1988	50.9%	+ 2.0%
Calhoun Co., Mich. (Battle Creek)	Industrial heritage	137,985	1988	51.2%	+ 3.5%
Macomb Co., Mich.	Suburbs (outside Detroit)	788,149	1992	50.2%	+ 2.7%
Monroe Co., Mich.	Industrial heritage	145,945	1988	50.5%	+ 3.7%
Boone Co., Mo. (Columbia)	Academic	135,454	1984	49.7%	+ 2.0%
Clay Co., Mo.	Suburbs (outside Kansas City)	184,006	1988	53.1%	+ 4.4%
Jefferson Co., Mo.	Suburbs (outside St. Louis)	198,099	1988	50.0%	+ 2.4%
Monmouth Co., N.J.	Suburbs (outside New York City)	615,301	1992	54.6%	+ 9.1%
Richmond Co., N.Y. (Staten Island)	New York City's outer borough	443,728	1992	56.4%	+ 11.4%
Rockland Co., N.Y.	Suburbs (outside New York City)	286,753	1988	49.6%	+ 10.1%
Cumberland Co., N.C. (Fayetteville)	Military Influence	302,963	1988	51.6%	+ 2.2%
Clark Co., Ohio (Springfield)	Small Urban	144,742	1988	50.8%	+ 2.7%
Cambria Co., Pa. (Johnstown)	Industrial heritage (John Murtha's home)	152,598	1972	50.8%	+ 4.4%
Mercer Co., Pa.	Industrial heritage	120,293	1980	51.0%	+ 3.5%
Cameron Co., Texas (Brownsville)	On Mexican border/ heavily Hispanic	335,227	1984	50.3%	+ 5.5%
Kanawha Co., W.Va. (Charleston)	Urban/State capital	200,073	1984	50.5%	+ 2.5%

Counties that switched to Kerry:

(2000 population of at least 100,000)

County	Type	'00 Pop.	Last Election voted Dem.	'04 Dem. %	Change in Dem. Share, '00-'04
Chatham Co., Ga (Savannah)	Historic Urban	232,048	1996	49.8%	+ 0.6%
Marion Co., Ind. (Indianapolis)	Major Urban/ State capital	860,454	1964	50.6%	+ 2.7%
Monroe Co., Ind. (Bloomington)	Academic	120,563	1996	53.4%	+ 9.8%
Penobscot Co., Maine (Bangor)	Small Urban/Academic	144,919	1996	49.2%	+ 4.3%
Guilford Co., N.C. (Greensboro)	Urban	421,048	1996	50.2%	+ 1.6%
Mecklenburg Co., N.C. (Charlotte)	Major Urban	695,454	1996	51.6%	+ 3.4%
Stark Co., Ohio (Canton)	Urban (President McKinley's home)	378,098	1996	50.6%	+ 3.5%
Sumter Co., S.C.	Nearly 50% black	104,646	1996	50.5%	+ 3.7%
Travis Co., Texas (Austin)	Major Urban/ State capital/Academic	812,280	1996	56.0%	+ 14.3%
Fairfax Co., Va.	Suburbs (outside Washington D.C.)	969,749	1964	53.2%	+ 5.7%
Whatcom Co., Wash. (Bellingham)	On Canadian border	166,814	1996	53.4%	+ 7.3%

U.S. Population Growth, 2000-05: Fastest Growth Continues to be in South and West

Population growth in the United States has followed the same trend in the early 21st century that it did in the late 20th, with most of the fastest-growing states concentrated in the South and West, and most of the slowest-growing states found in the Northeast and the Midwest. While the high-growth states are primarily Republican, the slow-growth states are mixed in their partisan preferences. There are major battleground states among both, including Arizona, Colorado, Florida and Nevada in the Sun Belt, and Michigan, Ohio and Pennsylvania in the Frost Belt. The chart below reflects estimated state-by-state population growth from April 2000 to July 2005, a period when the total U.S. population grew almost 15 million, or 5.3%.

Rank	State (and top 10 in pop.)	Region	'05 Pop. Estimate (in thousands)	Rate of Change, '00-'05	04 Presidential Winner	Rank	State (and top 10 in pop.)	Region	'05 Pop. Estimate (in thousands)	Rate of Change, '00-'05	04 Presidential Winner
NATIONAL			-	296,410	+ 5.3%	Bush					
1	Nevada	West	2,415	+ 20.8%	Bush	26	Missouri	Midwest	5,800	+ 3.6%	Bush
2	Arizona	West	5,939	+ 15.8%	Bush		New Jersey (#10)	Northeast	8,718	+ 3.6%	Kerry
3	Florida (# 4)	South	17,790	+ 11.3%	Bush	28	Kentucky	South	4,173	+ 3.2%	Bush
4	Georgia (# 9)	South	9,073	+ 10.8%	Bush		Wisconsin	Midwest	5,536	+ 3.2%	Kerry
5	Utah	West	2,470	+ 10.6%	Bush	30	Connecticut	Northeast	3,510	+ 3.1%	Kerry
6	Idaho	West	1,429	+ 10.4%	Bush		Indiana	Midwest	6,272	+ 3.1%	Bush
7	Texas (# 2)	South	22,860	+ 9.6%	Bush		Wyoming	West	509	+ 3.1%	Bush
8	Colorado	West	4,665	+ 8.4%	Bush	33	Illinois (#5)	Midwest	12,763	+ 2.8%	Kerry
9	North Carolina	South	8,683	+ 7.9%	Bush		Nebraska	Midwest	1,759	+ 2.8%	Bush
10	Delaware	Northeast	844	+ 7.6%	Kerry		Oklahoma	South	3,548	+ 2.8%	Bush
11	Virginia	South	7,567	+ 6.9%	Bush		South Dakota	Midwest	776	+ 2.8%	Bush
12	California (# 1)	West	36,132	+ 6.7%	Kerry	37	Mississippi	South	2,921	+ 2.7%	Bush
	Washington	West	6,288	+ 6.7%	Kerry		Rhode Island	Northeast	1,076	+ 2.7%	Kerry
14	Oregon	West	3,641	+ 6.4%	Kerry	39	Alabama	South	4,558	+ 2.5%	Bush
15	South Carolina	South	4,255	+ 6.1%	Bush	40	Vermont	Northeast	623	+ 2.3%	Kerry
16	New Hampshire	Northeast	1,310	+ 6.0%	Kerry	41	Kansas	Midwest	2,745	+ 2.1%	Bush
	New Mexico	West	1,928	+ 6.0%	Bush	42	Michigan (# 8)	Midwest	10,121	+ 1.8%	Kerry
18	Alaska	West	664	+ 5.9%	Bush	43	New York (#3)	Northeast	19,255	+ 1.5%	Kerry
19	Maryland	Northeast	5,600	+ 5.7%	Kerry	44	Iowa	Midwest	2,966	+ 1.4%	Bush
20	Hawaii	West	1,275	+ 5.3%	Kerry	45	Louisiana	South	4,524	+ 1.2%	Bush
21	Tennessee	South	5,963	+ 4.8%	Bush		Pennsylvania (#6)	Northeast	12,430	+ 1.2%	Kerry
22	Minnesota	Midwest	5,133	+ 4.3%	Kerry	47	Ohio (# 7)	Midwest	11,464	+ 1.0%	Bush
23	Arkansas	South	2,779	+ 4.0%	Bush	48	Massachusetts	Northeast	6,399	+ 0.8%	Kerry
24	Maine	Northeast	1,322	+ 3.7%	Kerry	49	West Virginia	Northeast	1,817	+ 0.5%	Bush
	Montana	West	936	+ 3.7%	Bush	50	North Dakota	Midwest	637	- 0.9%	Bush

Source: "Cumulative Estimates of Population Change for the United States and States, and for Puerto Rico and State Rankings: April 1, 2000 to July 1, 2005 (U.S. Census Bureau).

U.S. Minority Population: 2004

According to 2004 estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau, the nation's population is almost one-third minority, and is steadily trending more so. Four states already have majority-minority populations (including the two most populous, California and Texas). And a half dozen states are in the 40%-minority range - Arizona, Georgia, Maryland, Mississippi, Nevada and New York. The minority population includes all people except non-Hispanic single-race whites. The racial data was based on individuals reporting their specified race, whether they reported it in combination with any other races. "Native" indicates American Indians and Alaska natives. The percentages are based on the estimated population of the nation and the states as of July 1, 2004.

State	Region	Minority Population	Leading Minority	Electoral Vote	'04 Presidential Winner	State	Region	Minority Population	Leading Minority	Electoral Vote	'04 Presidential Winner
NATIONAL						-		33%	Hispanic	538	Bush
<i>Majority-Minority States (at least 50% minority):</i>						Michigan	Midwest	22%	Black	17	Kerry
Hawaii	West	77%	Asian	4	Kerry	Tennessee	South	22%	Black	11	Bush
New Mexico	West	57%	Hispanic	5	Bush	Washington	West	22%	Hispanic	11	Kerry
California	West	55%	Hispanic	55	Kerry	<i>Strong White Majority (less than 20% minority)</i>					
Texas	South	50%	Hispanic	34	Bush	Massachusetts	Northeast	19%	Hispanic	12	Kerry
<i>Nearing the Cusp (35% - 49% minority)</i>						Rhode Island	Northeast	19%	Hispanic	4	Kerry
Georgia	South	40%	Black	15	Bush	Kansas	Midwest	18%	Hispanic	6	Bush
Maryland	Northeast	40%	Black	10	Kerry	Oregon	West	18%	Hispanic	7	Kerry
Mississippi	South	40%	Black	6	Bush	Missouri	Midwest	17%	Black	11	Bush
Arizona	West	39%	Hispanic	10	Bush	Ohio	Midwest	17%	Black	20	Bush
Nevada	West	39%	Hispanic	5	Bush	Pennsylvania	Northeast	17%	Black	21	Kerry
New York	Northeast	39%	Black	31	Kerry	Utah	West	16%	Hispanic	5	Bush
Louisiana	South	38%	Black	9	Bush	Indiana	Midwest	15%	Black	11	Bush
Florida	South	37%	Hispanic	27	Bush	Nebraska	Midwest	14%	Hispanic	5	Bush
New Jersey	Northeast	36%	Black	15	Kerry	Wisconsin	Midwest	14%	Black	10	Kerry
<i>Significant Minority Population (20% - 34% minority)</i>						Idaho	West	13%	Hispanic	4	Bush
Illinois	Midwest	34%	Black	21	Kerry	Minnesota	Midwest	13%	Black	10	Kerry
South Carolina	South	34%	Black	8	Bush	South Dakota	Midwest	13%	Native	3	Bush
Alaska	West	33%	Native	3	Bush	Kentucky	South	11%	Black	8	Bush
Alabama	South	31%	Black	9	Bush	Montana	West	11%	Native	3	Bush
North Carolina	South	31%	Black	15	Bush	Wyoming	West	11%	Hispanic	3	Bush
Virginia	South	31%	Black	13	Bush	North Dakota	Midwest	9%	Native	3	Bush
Delaware	Northeast	30%	Black	3	Kerry	Iowa	Midwest	8%	Hispanic	7	Bush
Colorado	West	28%	Hispanic	9	Bush	New Hampshire	Northeast	6%	Hispanic	4	Kerry
Oklahoma	South	27%	Native	7	Bush	West Virginia	Northeast	6%	Black	5	Bush
Connecticut	Northeast	24%	Black	7	Kerry	Maine	Northeast	4%	Asian	4	Kerry
Arkansas	South	23%	Black	6	Bush	Vermont	Northeast	4%	Asian	3	Kerry

Source: "Texas Becomes Nation's Newest "Majority-Minority" State, Census Bureau Announces" (U.S. Census Bureau press release and chart issued Aug. 11, 2005).

'06 Primary Season Under Way: Voters Offer Early Feedback on Big Issues

From the Upper Midwest to Southern California, voters have begun to weigh in on some of the top issues of 2006 – including the ongoing war in Iraq, the highly combustible issue of immigration, and the congressional ethics scandal, most notably exemplified by former House Majority Leader Tom DeLay.

In Texas, DeLay's rather modest victory over a trio of challengers in early March headlined results from the first-in-the nation Texas primary. In early April, the legally beleaguered former GOP House leader drew national headlines again, announcing that he was not only abandoning his reelection bid in the Houston-area Texas 22nd but was planning to resign his House seat in June.

In the Upper Midwest, Democratic primary voters in Illinois March 21 gave their party's nomination in the competitive suburban Chicago 6th District to Iraq War veteran Tammy Duckworth. Two weeks later, 32 Wisconsin cities and towns voted directly on the war, with 24 communities passing non-binding referendums favoring the withdrawal of troops from Iraq; eight communities voted "no."

And in Southern California, the second special congressional election in the state since last fall has featured heated discussion on illegal immigration, particularly among Republicans hoping to keep the seat of the recently sentenced Randy "Duke" Cunningham in Republican hands. A runoff June 6 between Democrat Francine Busby and former Republican Rep. Brian Bilbray will fill the vacancy in the San Diego-area California 50th.

Texas: Setting the Tone for a Turbulent '06?

Signs of DeLay's political vulnerability had been evident since 2004, when he won an 11th term in Congress with a modest 55% of the vote. Both his legal and political situation had grown more perilous since then. He was indicted last fall for money laundering in relationship to the controversial 2003 GOP-orchestrated congressional redistricting of Texas. And with several of his political associates facing their own day in court, DeLay cited his dwindling electability as a reason to step aside.

DeLay had a positive view of his prospects after his March 7 primary victory. His campaign touted his 62% vote share against a field of little-known and under-funded rivals as an "old fashioned Texas whoopin'." But as he withdrew from the race just weeks later, DeLay gave a more modest assessment of his primary showing, saying: "A 21-year (House) veteran should have done better than 62%."

In truth, his primary vote share was far lower than any other Republican House incumbent posted in the opening round of primaries this year in Texas and Illinois, and was lower than all but a dozen House incumbents garnered in the entire 2004 primary season. Even more sobering was DeLay's comparatively weak showing in his home base, suburban Fort Bend County, where he drew just 56% of the Republican primary vote.

DeLay's struggle to survive politically overshadowed the Democratic primary rematch in the south Texas 28th District between freshman Rep. Henry Cuellar and former Rep. Ciro Rodriguez. Two

years ago, their roles were reversed – Rodriguez was the incumbent as well as the well-connected chair of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus; Cuellar was the ambitious challenger, who drew criticism from some quarters of the party for his tenure as secretary of state in the administration of Republican Gov. Rick Perry. Their first contest was so close that it required months of legal bickering to resolve.

This year's primary was not so close, as Cuellar prevailed by a margin of 53%-to-40%. The rest of the votes went to Victor Morales, who burst onto the Texas political scene a decade ago, crisscrossing the state in a pickup truck while mounting a populist campaign for the U.S. Senate that drew nearly 2.5 million votes. But Morales, who moved to the 28th District, was not a factor this year.

The Cuellar-Rodriguez rematch had some of the same overtones as their first race. Rodriguez drew support from institutional elements of the party, including the AFL-CIO and a slew of his former House colleagues. Cuellar was backed by more conservative organizations, including the National Rifle Association and the Club for Growth, which made Cuellar their first Democratic endorsement.

As two years ago, their contest came down to a battle of the bases. Cuellar won all or portions of six counties in the district; Rodriguez carried five. But Cuellar won his home base of Webb County (Laredo) on the

Mexican border by nearly 11,000 votes, while Rodriguez's margin on his home turf of Bexar County (San Antonio) at the opposite end of the district was barely 7,500 votes.

The hotly contested congressional contests overshadowed Texas' gubernatorial and U.S. Senate primaries. Republican Gov. Rick Perry and GOP Sen. Kay Bailey Hutchison are heavy favorites for reelection and the Texas Democratic Party lacks a deep bench of potential challengers to seriously challenge them.

Former one-term House member Chris Bell, one of only two congressional primary casualties in 2004, won the Democratic gubernatorial nomination. Barbara Ann Radnofsky, a Houston lawyer

Gubernatorial and Congressional Incumbents: Breaking a Sweat in the '06 Primaries

No congressional or gubernatorial incumbent lost in the first round of primaries held in Texas and Illinois last month. And just four others - three House members and one governor - were held to less than 75% of their party's primary vote. Of this group, only embattled Republican Rep. Tom DeLay of Texas was not a first-term governor or House member. The primary vote percentages below are based on nearly complete, but unofficial returns.

Gubernatorial and congressional incumbents who have received less than 75% of their party's primary vote:

GOVERNORS

	Terms	'06 Primary %	'04 Pres. Winner in State
Rod Blagojevich, D-Ill.	1	70.1%	Kerry by 10%

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

	Terms	'06 Primary %	'04 Pres. Winner in District
Henry Cuellar, D-Texas 28	1	53.0%	Bush by 6%
Daniel Lipinski, D-Ill. 3	1	54.6%	Kerry by 18%
Tom DeLay, R-Texas 22	11	62.0%	Bush by 28%

Source: *The Almanac of American Politics 2006* (National Journal) for congressional terms served as well as the 2004 presidential winners by district and their margin of victory.

making her first bid for elective office, won the Democratic Senate nomination in a runoff April 11 against Gene Kelly, a perennial candidate whose campaign biography noted that he “shares a name with the movie actor and dancer.” At age 80, the Texas Kelly was nearly as old as his better known and now-deceased namesake.

The almost total eclipse of the long-dominant Texas Democratic Party has been evident in recent years in the party’s sharply declining primary turnouts. In 1990, the last year that Texas Democrats won the governorship (or any other major statewide contest, for that matter), nearly 1.5 million voters participated in the primary that nominated Ann Richards. In 2002, the party’s gubernatorial primary turnout was down to 1 million. This year, barely 500,000 voters cast Democratic primary ballots for governor. And the Senate runoff this month drew barely 200,000 Texas voters to the polls.

In Illinois, the situation is basically reversed. It is the Democrats that are dominant, while Republicans have not won a major statewide race since 1998. But the GOP has consistently run well in gubernatorial contests and in March nominated state Treasurer Judy Baar Topinka to take on Democratic Gov. Rod Blagojevich. Popular former Republican Gov. Jim Edgar considered mounting a comeback bid, but in the end threw his support to Topinka, who outlasted two more socially conservative opponents to win the primary with 38% of the vote.

Meanwhile, Blagojevich, whose administration has been the target of several corruption probes, showed hints of vulnerability by losing 30% of the Democratic primary vote to former Chicago alderman Edwin Eisendrath. According to nearly complete but unofficial returns, Eisendrath actually defeated the governor among Democratic primary voters in about a half dozen downstate counties.

The Midwest and the War

But national headlines in the Illinois primary went to the successful launch of the Democratic strategy to field as many Iraq and Afghanistan war veterans this year as they can credibly muster. Arguably the highest profile member of this group, Tammy Duckworth, narrowly won the Democratic primary in the open 6th District, where Republican Henry Hyde is stepping down after 16 terms in office. Duckworth defeated Christine Cegelis, a computer consultant, by a vote of 44%-to-40%.

Cegelis had held Hyde to 56% of the vote in 2004, his lowest share since he first won the seat in 1974. But figuring the party’s chance of capturing the Republican-leaning seat were best with Duckworth, a decorated Iraq War veteran who lost both legs in a grenade attack, the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee drafted her to make the race. Big-name Democrats from Hillary Rodham Clinton to Barack Obama lent their support. In November, she will face state Sen. Peter Roskam, who ran unopposed in the Republican primary.

Two weeks after Duckworth was nominated, voters in 32 Wisconsin communities were able to vote directly on antiwar ballot measures that urged some variation of “bring the troops home now.” The non-binding referendums were sponsored by the Wisconsin Green Party and the Wisconsin Network for Peace and Justice, and were approved by voters in 24 communities.

Altogether, the 32 communities that offered the ballot measure April 4 comprised about 6% of the state’s population. Turnout ranged from 22 in the rural northwest Wisconsin community of Couderay to more than 35,000 in the capital city of Madison. In the aggregate, 61% of the 65,000 or so who cast ballots supported a quick troop withdrawal. Yet take away the 13,000-vote plurality for the “end the war” position in liberal Madison, and the two sides ran about even in the rest of the state.

There was a correlation between how communities voted in 2004 and their vote on the Iraq War referendum. Three-fourths of the communities that approved the “end the war” position (18 of 24) had voted for Democrat John Kerry in 2004, while three-fourths of the communities that opposed it (6 of 8) had voted for President George W. Bush.

FOR THE RECORD: 2006 Gubernatorial, Senate Primary Results

March primaries determined party nominations for governor in Illinois and Texas, but the Democratic Senate contest in Texas to oppose Republican incumbent Kay Bailey Hutchison required an April runoff to settle. A pound sign (#) indicates candidates who qualified for that runoff. Results are included for all candidates who received at least 10% of their party's primary vote, and are based on nearly complete but unofficial returns. Incumbents are listed in bold. Percentages do not always add to 100 due to rounding.

TEXAS (Primary March 7; Runoff April 11)

GOVERNOR							
DEMOCRATIC				REPUBLICAN			
Candidates	Occupation	Votes	%	Candidates	Occupation	Votes	%
Chris Bell	Ex-U.S. Representative	324,869	64%	Rick Perry	Incumbent	552,545	84%
Bob Gammage	Ex-U.S. Representative	145,081	29%	Others	-	103,374	16%
Other	-	38,652	8%				
Total Vote		508,602		Total Vote		655,919	
SENATE							
DEMOCRATIC				REPUBLICAN			
Candidates	Occupation	Votes	%	Candidates	Occupation	Votes	%
Barbara Radnofsky#	Lawyer	215,776	43%	Kay Bailey Hutchison	Incumbent	627,163	100%
Gene Kelly#	Lawyer	191,400	38%				
Darrel Hunter	Ex-basketball referee	93,609	19%				
Total Vote		500,785					
RUNOFF							
Barbara Radnofsky	Lawyer	124,052	60%				
Gene Kelly	Lawyer	83,398	40%				
Total Vote		207,450					

ILLINOIS (Primary March 21)

GOVERNOR							
DEMOCRATIC				REPUBLICAN			
Candidates	Occupation	Votes	%	Candidates	Occupation	Votes	%
Rod Blagojevich	Incumbent	585,525	70%	Judy Baar Topinka	IL State Treasurer	269,565	38%
Edwin Eisendrath	Ex-Chicago alderman	<u>249,868</u>	30%	Jim Oberweis	Dairy owner	225,395	32%
				Bill Brady	State Senator	132,446	19%
				Ron Gidwitz	Businessman	76,559	11%
				Other	-	<u>5,826</u>	1%
Total Vote		835,393		Total Vote		709,791	

In Democratic Madison, the “end the war” position passed with 68% of the vote. In Republican Watertown, it was rejected by 75% of the voters. Yet in most places the vote was very close, with the “pro” or “con” position winning with less than 55% of the vote in 20 of the 32 communities that participated. The issue will continue to resonate in Wisconsin, as the city of Milwaukee and suburban Ozaukee County are expected to hold their own votes on troop withdrawal in November.

The West and Immigration

While the Iraq War is a ‘hot button’ issue in Wisconsin – a state with a heritage of isolationism - the volatile immigration issue has continued to burn bright in Southern California, where the second special congressional election in the last few months is in progress a short drive from the Mexican border.

Last fall, the race to fill the Orange County seat vacated by Republican Christopher Cox required two rounds of voting, each of which was headlined by Jim Gilchrist. The co-founder of the controversial Minuteman Project, which seeks to curtail illegal immigration across the Mexican border, Gilchrist ran on the ballot line of the miniscule American Independent Party. He took 15% of the vote in the first round in the Republican-oriented California 48th and more than 25% in the decisive second round.

A bit to the south, even closer to the Mexican border, voters in the San Diego-area 50th District are picking a replacement this spring for former Republican Rep. Randy “Duke” Cunningham. He resigned from Congress late last fall and was sentenced in March to more than eight years in prison for accepting bribes and tax evasion.

The immigration issue has entered hot and heavy into the campaign for Cunningham’s seat. Democrat Francine Busby, who led the first-round voting April 11 with 44% of the vote, has endorsed increased spending for the Border Patrol and a guest worker program based on the needs of employers.

The four leading Republican candidates, who in the aggregate nearly matched Busby’s total, all took tougher positions on the issue, voicing support for the Minutemen and advocating limitations on the granting of automatic citizenship to children born to illegal immigrants in the United States. The top GOP vote-getter with 15% of the vote, former Rep. Brian Bilbray, boasted that he has been a consultant for an anti-illegal immigration group.

Because no candidate won a majority in the April voting, a runoff featuring Busby and Bilbray will be held in the Republican-oriented district on June 6. It is a contest that could provide voter feedback from the front lines of the immigration battle, as well as offer an early test of the “culture of corruption” theme that Democrats are accenting this year by pointing to Cunningham (and his Republican colleague, Tom DeLay).

Wisconsin: Town Referendums on the Iraq War April 4, 2006

Majority of communities in county participating in Iraq War referendum voted in favor of U.S. troop withdrawal

Majority of communities in county participating in Iraq War referendum voted against U.S. troop withdrawal

Vote on non-binding referendums on Iraq troop withdrawal:

	Aggregate Vote	Percentage	Communities Carried
Yes	39,979	60.9%	24
No	25,703	39.1%	8
Total	65,682		

Note: Results based on nearly complete but unofficial results published in the *Wisconsin State Journal*, April 5, 2006.

Communities in 13 of Wisconsin's 72 counties voted on non-binding referendums in early April on the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Iraq. The "bring the troops home" position passed in three-fourths of the 32 communities that took part, although the aggregate vote between the two sides was nearly even outside Wisconsin's liberal capital city of Madison, where immediate troop withdrawal was approved by a plurality of more than 13,000 votes.

Communities that voted for withdrawing troops from Iraq:

Community	County	Turnout	Yes %	Community	County	Turnout	Yes %
Couderay	Sawyer	22	81.8%	Mount Horeb	Dane	1,124	52.8%
Shorewood	Milwaukee	2,387	69.7%	Casco	Kewaunee	105	52.4%
Madison	Dane	35,596	68.4%	Baraboo	Sauk	3,332	52.2%
Vermont	Dane	291	65.3%	Edgewater	Sawyer	73	52.1%
Draper	Sawyer	63	65.1%	Algoma	Kewaunee	808	52.0%
Winter	Sawyer	77	64.9%	Evansville	Rock	869	51.1%
Ojibwa	Sawyer	41	61.0%	Luxemburg	Kewaunee	299	50.8%
Monona	Dane	1,864	59.1%	Communities that voted against withdrawing troops from Iraq:			
Sturgeon Bay	Door	1,253	57.6%	Community	County	Turnout	No %
La Crosse	La Crosse	6,597	54.8%	Watertown	Dodge/Jefferson	3,566	74.8%
Perry	Dane	256	54.3%	Kewaunee	Kewaunee	440	57.3%
Whitefish Bay	Milwaukee	2,428	54.1%	Osceola	Polk	359	56.5%
Ephraim	Door	102	53.9%	Egg Harbor	Door	85	52.9%
Amery	Polk	419	53.2%	Hayward	Sawyer	241	52.7%
Ladysmith	Rusk	1,023	53.2%	Newport	Columbia	122	52.5%
Exeland	Sawyer	34	52.9%	Sister Bay	Door	222	50.9%
Frederic	Polk	174	52.9%	Forestville	Door	120	50.8%

Expanding the 'Kingmakers'

Democrats Audition States to Join Iowa, New Hampshire in Early 2008

In January 2004, less than 350,000 voters participated in the opening Democratic events in Iowa and New Hampshire. But they were arguably more important in deciding the party's presidential nomination than the more than 16 million voters that took part in primaries and caucuses in the rest of the country.

John Kerry's victory in the Iowa caucuses established him as the front-runner for the Democratic nomination. His victory in the New Hampshire primary eight days later ratified that judgment, leaving the other 48 states and the District of Columbia as little more than bit players in the party's nominating process.

In January 2008, however, Democratic leaders are planning for several of these "bit players" to join the two "kingmakers" at the start of the party's delegate-selection calendar.

Last December, the Democratic Commission on Presidential Nomination and Timing approved a set of recommendations to change the nominating rules in 2008. None drew more interest than a proposal to insert one to two caucus states between the lead-off caucuses in Iowa and the first-in-the nation primary in New Hampshire, and to add one to two primary states in the week after New Hampshire.

In March, the Rules and Bylaws Committee of the Democratic National Committee (DNC) approved the commission's recommendations as a framework to begin their own look at the party's presidential nominating rules.

And this month at a DNC meeting in New Orleans, the panel heard presentations from states desiring those coveted early slots on the calendar – a total of 11 in all, plus the District of Columbia. In making their choices, the committee is to take into account racial, ethnic, regional and economic diversity, as well as the strength of organized labor in the state. The committee could announce its choices as early as June.

One thing for certain is that at least in a formal sense, the 2008 presidential nominating season will be longer than ever. The Democrats and Republicans have scheduled their conventions for back to back weeks in late summer. The Democrats have scheduled their conclave for the last week in August. The Republicans will follow in the first week in September. In 2004, the Democrats convened in late July.

States Bidding to Join Iowa and New Hampshire at the Start of the Democratic Presidential Nominating Process in 2008

State	Region	Minority % of Pop.	'04 Dem. Date and Type of Contest	Electoral Vote	04 Pres. Winner (and margin)
Iowa	Midwest	8%	Jan. 19 Caucus	7	Bush by 0.7%
New Hampshire	Northeast	6%	Jan. 27 Primary	4	Kerry by 1%
... and those bidding to join them					
Alabama	South	31%	June 1 Primary	9	Bush by 26%
Arizona	West	39%	Feb. 3 Primary	10	Bush by 10%
Arkansas	South	23%	May 18 Primary	6	Bush by 10%
Colorado	West	28%	April 13 Caucus	9	Bush by 5%
Dist. of Columbia	Northeast	70%	Feb. 14 Caucus*	3	Kerry by 80%
Hawaii	West	77%	Feb. 24 Caucus	4	Kerry by 9%
Michigan	Midwest	22%	Feb. 7 Caucus#	17	Kerry by 3%
Mississippi	South	40%	March 9 Primary	6	Bush by 20%
Nebraska	Midwest	14%	May 11 Primary	5	Bush by 33%
Nevada	West	39%	Feb. 14 Caucus	5	Bush by 3%
South Carolina	South	34%	Feb. 3 Primary#	8	Bush by 17%
West Virginia	Northeast	6%	May 11 Primary	5	Bush by 13%

Note: Minority population percentages are based on 2004 population estimates from the Census Bureau. An asterisk (*) indicates that the District of Columbia also held a non-binding Democratic presidential primary on Jan. 13, 2004. A pound sign (#) indicates that Michigan and South Carolina held party-run primaries in 2004, although Michigan Democrats termed their event a caucus.

Governorships Up

Senate Seats Up

2006 Primary Calendar: Two Big Months of Voting Directly Ahead

Between the beginning of May and the end of June, Democrats and Republicans in nearly half the states will settle their congressional and gubernatorial nominations for the fall. The list of 23 states that will be holding primaries in the next two months encompasses states from all parts of the country and includes California, Ohio and Pennsylvania. The following chart lists this year's dates for primaries and runoff elections, the latter required in several Southern states when the leading primary finisher does not win a certain percentage of the vote (usually 50%). In a few states, parties hold pre-primary conventions to winnow the field of candidates. In Virginia, parties may hold conventions to nominate their candidates. An asterisk (*) notes the unique situation in Louisiana, where there is no primary per se. Candidates from all parties run together on the Nov. 7 ballot with a runoff Dec. 9 if necessary. A pound sign (#) indicates incumbents who assumed their office since the last election. Republicans are indicated in **BOLD**. Incumbents not seeking reelection are indicated in italics.

	'06 Primary Date	House Seats			Seats Up		Sub-55% House Winners in Nov. '04
		Rep.	Dem.	Ind.	Governors	Senators	
Texas	March 7/April 11 (Runoff)	21	11		Rick Perry (R)	Kay Bailey Hutchison (R)	TX 17 - Edwards (D) 51%; TX 32 - Sessions (R) 54%
Illinois	March 21	9	10		Rod Blagojevich (D)		IL 8 - Bean (D) 52%
Indiana	May 2	7	2			Richard Lugar (R)	IN 2 - Chocoma (R) 54%; IN 7 - Carson (D) 54%; IN 8 - Hostettler (R) 53%; IN 9 - Sodrel (R) 49%
North Carolina	May 2/May 30 (Runoff)	7	6				NC 11 - Taylor (R) 55%
Ohio	May 2	12	6		Bob Taft (R)	Mike DeWine (R)	OH 2 - Schmidt (R) 52%#
Nebraska	May 9	3			Dave Heineman (R)#	Ben Nelson (D)	NE 1 - Fortenberry (R) 54%
West Virginia	May 9	1	2			Robert Byrd (D)	
Kentucky	May 16	5	1				KY 4 - G. Davis (R) 54%
Oregon	May 16	1	4		Ted Kulongoski (D)		OR 5 - Hooley (D) 53%
Pennsylvania	May 16	12	7		Ed Rendell (D)	Rick Santorum (R)	PA 6 - Gerlach (R) 51%
Arkansas	May 23/June 13 (Runoff)	1	3		Mike Huckabee (R)		
Idaho	May 23	2			Dirk Kempthorne (R)		
Alabama	June 6/June 27 (Runoff)	5	2		Bob Riley (R)		
California	June 6	20	33		Arnold Schwarzenegger (R)	Dianne Feinstein (D)	CA 20 - Costa (D) 53%; CA 26 - Dreier (R) 54%
Iowa	June 6	4	1		<i>Tom Vilsack (D)</i>		
Mississippi	June 6/June 27 (Runoff)	2	2			Trent Lott (R)	
Montana	June 6	1				Conrad Burns (R)	
New Jersey	June 6	6	7			Robert Menendez (D)#	
New Mexico	June 6	2	1		Bill Richardson (D)	Jeff Bingaman (D)	NM 1 - Wilson (R) 54%
South Dakota	June 6/June 20 (Runoff)		1		Mike Rounds (R)		SD AL - Herseth (D) 53%

	'06 Primary Date	House Seats			Seats Up		Sub-55% House Winners in Nov. '04
		Rep.	Dem.	Ind.	Governors	Senators	
Maine	June 13		2		John Baldacci (D)	Olympia Snowe (R)	
North Dakota	June 13		1			Kent Conrad (D)	
South Carolina	June 13/June 27 (Runoff)	4	2		Mark Sanford (R)		
Virginia	June 13	8	3			George Allen (R)	
Utah	June 27	2	1			Orrin Hatch (R)	UT 2 - Matheson (D) 55%
Georgia	July 18/Aug. 8 (Runoff)	7	6		Sonny Perdue (R)		GA 12 - Barrow (D) 52%
Oklahoma	July 25/Aug. 22 (Runoff)	4	1		Brad Henry (D)		
Kansas	Aug. 1	3	1		Kathleen Sebelius (D)		KS 3 - Moore (D) 55%
Tennessee	Aug. 3	4	5		Phil Bredesen (D)	Bill Frist (R)	TN 4 - L. Davis (D) 55%
Colorado	Aug. 8	4	3		Bill Owens (R)		CO 3 - Salazar (D) 51%; CO 4 - Musgrave (R) 51%; CO 7 - Beauprez (R) 55%
Connecticut	Aug. 8	3	2		M. Jodi Rell (R)#	Joe Lieberman (D)	CT 2 - Simmons (R) 54%; CT 4 - Shays (R) 52%
Michigan	Aug. 8	9	6		Jennifer Granholm (D)	Debbie Stabenow (D)	
Missouri	Aug. 8	5	4			Jim Talent (R)	MO 3 - Carnahan (D) 53%
Nevada	Aug. 15	2	1		Kenny Guinn (R)	John Ensign (R)	NV 3 - Porter (R) 54%
Alaska	Aug. 22	1			Frank Murkowski (R)		
Wyoming	Aug. 22	1			Dave Freudenthal (D)	Craig Thomas (R)	
Florida	Sept. 5	18	7		Jeb Bush (R)	Bill Nelson (D)	
Arizona	Sept. 12	6	2		Jane Napolitano (D)	Jon Kyl (R)	
Delaware	Sept. 12	1				Thomas Carper (D)	
Maryland	Sept. 12	2	6		Robert Ehrlich (R)	<i>Paul Sarbanes (D)</i>	
Minnesota	Sept. 12	4	4		Tim Pawlenty (R)	<i>Mark Dayton (D)</i>	MN 6 - Kennedy (R) 54%
New Hampshire	Sept. 12	2			John Lynch (D)		
New York	Sept. 12	9	20		George Pataki (R)	Hillary Rodham Clinton (D)	NY 27 - Higgins (D) 51%; NY 29 - Kuhl (R) 51%
Rhode Island	Sept. 12		2		Donald Carcieri (R)	Lincoln Chafee (R)	
Vermont	Sept. 12			1	Jim Douglas (R)	<i>James Jeffords (Ind.)</i>	
Wisconsin	Sept. 12	4	4		James Doyle (D)	Herb Kohl (D)	
Massachusetts	Sept. 19		10		Mitt Romney (R)	Edward Kennedy (D)	
Washington	Sept. 19	3	6			Maria Cantwell (D)	WA 8 - Reichert (R) 52%
Hawaii	Sept. 23		2		Linda Lingle (R)	Daniel Akaka (D)	
Louisiana*	Nov. 7/Dec. 9 (Runoff)	5	2				LA 3 - Melancon (D) 50%
At Stake in 2006		232	202	1	36 Up (22 R, 14 D)	33 Up (15 R, 17 D, 1 Ind.)	

Source: Federal Election Commission (for the calendar); *America Votes 26* (for the breakdown of House seats and the results of 2004 House races); The Cook Political Report (for retiring governors and members of Congress).

Note: The partisan House totals include a Republican vacancy in California and a Democratic vacancy in New Jersey that are attributed to the party that held the seat at the beginning of the 109th Congress.

The Changing Composition of the 109th Congress

The upcoming June 6 special election runoff in California's 50th District is shaping up as the last congressional vacancy to be filled before the November general election. A special election in the New Jersey 13th to fill the seat of Democrat Robert Menendez (who left the House in January when he was appointed to the Senate) will be held in conjunction with the Nov. 7 general election. Similarly, the seat of Republican Rep. Tom DeLay in the Texas 22nd is not expected to be filled until November.

Date and Event	House of Representatives				Senate		
	Reps.	Dems.	Ind.	Vac.	Reps.	Dems.	Ind.
2004 ELECTION	232	202	1		55	44	1
Jan. 1, 2005 - Rep. Robert Matsui (D-Calif. 5) dies of pneumonia complicated by a rare blood disorder.	232	201	1	1			
March 8, 2005 - Special election in Calif. 5th won by his widow, Doris Matsui (D).	232	202	1				
April 29, 2005 - Rep. Rob Portman (R-Ohio 2) resigns to become U.S. trade representative.	231	202	1	1			
Aug. 2, 2005 - Special election in Ohio 2nd won by Jean Schmidt (R).	232	202	1				
Aug. 2, 2005 - Rep. Christopher Cox (R-Calif. 48) resigns to become chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC).	231	202	1	1			
Dec. 1, 2005 - Rep. Randy "Duke" Cunningham (R-Calif. 50) formally resigns after pleading guilty to accepting bribes and tax evasion.	230	202	1	2			
Dec. 6, 2005 - Special election in Calif. 48th won by John Campbell (R).	231	202	1	1			
Jan. 17, 2006 - Sen. Jon Corzine (D-N.J.) resigns to become governor of New Jersey. Rep. Robert Menendez (D-N.J. 13), appointed by Corzine to be his successor, is sworn in Jan. 18.	231	201	1	2	55	44	1

... AND THE GOVERNORSHIPS

	Reps.	Dems.
2004 ELECTION	28	22
Jan. 20, 2005 - Gov. Mike Johanns (R-Neb.) resigns to become secretary of agriculture. Lt. Gov. Dave Heineman is sworn in Jan. 21 to succeed him.	28	22
Nov 8, 2005 - U.S. Sen. Jon Corzine (D) elected governor of New Jersey to succeed Acting Gov. Richard Codey (D), who is retiring. Lt. Gov. Tim Kaine (D) elected governor of Virginia to succeed Gov. Mark Warner (D), who could not seek reelection.	28	22

Special House Elections in 2005-06

Democrat Francine Busby ran far ahead of the rest of the field in first-round special election voting April 11 in California's 50th District. But by failing to win a majority of the vote, as required by state law, she may have missed her best chance to win the Republican-oriented district that was held for a decade by the recently convicted Randy "Duke" Cunningham (R). The winner of the San Diego-area seat will be determined in a June 6 runoff between Busby and the top Republican vote-getter, former Rep. Brian Bilbray.

The special election was necessitated by Cunningham's resignation late last year after pleading guilty to charges of accepting bribes and tax evasion. Busby, a school board member in the suburban community of Cardiff, took 36% of the vote against Cunningham in 2004 and 44% in this month's special election (out of more than 135,000 votes cast). Her vote was nearly triple the total for Bilbray, who took 15%. Still, the vote for the 14 Republicans on the ballot eclipsed the total for Busby and the one other Democrat listed, a warning for Democrats that a Busby victory in June would be no cakewalk.

District	Former Member	New Member	Election	Turnout	Dem.	Rep.	Other	'04 Pres. Winner
California 5	Robert Matsui (D)	Doris Matsui (D)	March 8, 2005	82,396	68.2%	-	-	Kerry by 23%
Ohio 2	Rob Portman (R)	Jean Schmidt (R)	Aug. 2, 2005	115,576	48.4%	51.6%	-	Bush by 28%
California 48	Christopher Cox (R)	John Campbell (R)	Dec. 6, 2005	103,948	27.8%	44.4%	27.8%	Bush by 18%

Vacancies to be filled:

California 50	Randy "Duke" Cunningham (R)	-	June 6, 2006					Bush by 11%
New Jersey 13	Robert Menendez (D)	-	Nov. 7, 2006					Kerry by 38%

Source: *The Almanac of American Politics 2006* (National Journal) for the 2004 presidential winners by district and their margins of victory.