



The Official Publication of ACT  
P. O. Box 40074, (626) 795-2798

Volume 40  
Number 10  
November, 2012

Published by Chuck Hains & Sally Beer

## Annual Holiday Potluck Dinner and ACT & ADC Meeting



Wednesday, December 5, 6:30 p.m.  
at the home of Bobbie and Henry Moon  
1961 Mar Vista Avenue, Altadena



**Program: Election Analysis - Fred Register and Jon Fuhrman**

Celebrate the election results and enjoy our traditional Holiday Potluck Dinner and the December meeting of ACT and ADC with your ACT and Arroyo Democratic Club friends and guests. The potluck starts at 6:30 p.m. The Election Analysis program with Fred and Jon - on just how America (and we locals) voted on November 6 - will begin at about 8 p.m.

Potluck assignments:    A – G:    Salads, vegetables  
                                  H – M:    Desserts, fruit  
                                  N – Z:    Main dish

Please bring enough for about six and provide your own serving utensils. Beverages, plates, cups, napkins and eating utensils will be provided. Everyone is welcome. Come and bring a friend.

### **The Phoenix Deadline**

*The Phoenix* deadline is usually the Sunday after the monthly Steering Committee meeting. The deadline for the December *Phoenix* will be **Sunday, December 9**.

Please send your items to Chuck Hains at:

[Hains27@SBCGlobal.net](mailto:Hains27@SBCGlobal.net). *ThePhoenix* will be prepared for mailing on Thursday, December 13 at 7 p.m. at Chuck and Lina's home, 1391 La Solana Drive, Altadena. (Volunteer mailers please call Ellen Coles at 626-798-2402 to verify time and place.)

### **George McGovern, 1922-2012**

ACT has always had a special connection with George McGovern, three-term Senator from South Dakota, liberal titan, idealist, who died on October 21. While many may remember him for the landslide loss in the 1972 presidential election, we remember him as the catalyst for ACT – as described below by Ralph Hurtado (then ACT Temporary Co-Chairperson) in the very first *Phoenix* in January 1973:

In October 1971, Senator George McGovern spoke in Pasadena. On that day about 20 volunteers sold bumper stickers and buttons and raised \$85. That was the birth of one of the most dynamic and effective grass roots organizations in California. Our Pasadena Committee parlayed the \$85 into \$12,000 by June 6 and \$50,000 by November 1972. The 20 volunteers mushroomed into over 3000 serving the four Assembly Districts surrounding Pasadena.

The Caucus on February 12, 1972 was attended by 205 people. At that time, no one realized the people elected would be delegates to the Miami Convention. At the Convention, the reputation of the Pasadena Committee was known. One Northern California delegate asked if we really canvassed 200 precincts in one day. (I said yes, even though the truth was closer to 100.) In the primary, we actually canvassed 35% of the precincts in the Pasadena area. The personal contact and 20,000 hand written letters were responsible for carrying the 20th Congressional District. The margin in Pasadena and Altadena offset the rest of the district and we were one of the 3 L.A. County Congressional districts to carry for McGovern.

During the summer we had a massive registration campaign. By September we reached our goal set by the State Committee and we concentrated

our efforts in East L.A. and other San Gabriel Valley communities. We registered 15,000 voters. We also began establishing offices in the surrounding communities. By October we had 15 offices in our 4 Assembly Districts (8 of which we financially supported.)

By Election Day, 92% of the area had been canvassed and we knew we were in trouble. Election night was no surprise but the margin was far more than we thought. Tears were flowing but the group spirit was high. Many people wanted us to stay organized and continue to build a grassroots organization devoted to political education and working in campaigns. We want an organization that will

help sharpen our skills and be effective in the political arena.

We invite you to join us as a Charter member... Our organization is called ACT. We have an office at 871 E. Washington Blvd., Pasadena and Jean Kulli is employed as our Executive Secretary. If you would like to discuss the organization with me, please call my home...Thank you and see you soon.



Cordially yours,

Ralph Hurtado

George McGovern never forgot us. Twice he returned to Pasadena to headline ACT anniversary celebrations, most recently in March 2008 for our 35<sup>th</sup>. On that occasion he said, "Bob McNamara wrote a book saying not only was Vietnam a mistake – it was a tragic mistake. I don't denigrate John McCain's experience in that war. But he's running 36 years later, at a time when we are again in a tragic war. Neither country was a threat to the United States."

We will miss Sen. McGovern and remember him fondly.



## Wonderings and Wanderings

By Inman Moore



### Moving On Into the 21<sup>st</sup> Century

A drunken man weaving his way home on Christmas Eve, stumbled on a street curb, fell and broke a jug of wine he was carrying. As he looked up and saw the wine trickling down the curb and into a gutter drain, he mournfully exclaimed: "There now! Christmas has done come and gone!" This is true of our national elections. They have all come and gone and Obama has been re-elected President. And we are excited at the prospects for the future! However, it will take more than the re-election of Obama for us, belatedly, to move, kicking and screaming, on into the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. Therefore I would like to suggest several things, coupled with Obama's re-election, that are necessary for us to truly move forward.

1. We must realize that we are not the same country we were in the past. In 1946 the United States population was 132 million. In 2012 the population is almost 314 million, far more than double in the space of only 66 yrs, and we are still growing. The need to take care of our planet with an exploding population requires ingenuity and thoughtfulness.

In addition to being a much larger country, we are, also, a far more diverse country. In the past white males dominated the scene and generally controlled our politics and economics. This is no longer the case. The recent election vividly demonstrated that. Romney received a majority percentage of the white male vote. Yet he was defeated. The racial makeup of our country is vastly different from times past. Caucasians still make up the largest group, but Asians, African-Americans, Palestinians, Jews, Latinos, and other racial

strains are all part of the mix. Women also play a much larger roll. In short, we are a vastly different country from the fledgling country born in 1776. And the end is not yet.

2. It is also important to remember that we are basically a country with two political parties (Democrats and Republicans) plus a large group of independents. We were that before the election, and we are that after the election. These divisions are not going away. So, we must learn to be more civil. I am a Democrat because it incorporates positions that best characterize my philosophy. But I am not under the illusion that the Democratic Party is perfect. I also have many Republican and independent friends. Both parties should strive to be more civil in their discourse. It is just possible that Obama and Romney are both better men than the recent campaign characterized them. And it is just possible that President Obama and the two parties in Congress can come together and find a way out of our economic morass.

3. The mind-set of our country needs to be radically changed. We are still clinging to beliefs and practices out of the past that need to be discarded. One of those beliefs is that there was some time in the past that was totally idyllic and perfect. Some say wouldn't it be wonderful if we could just get back to the time of the founding fathers where everyone agreed. However, I remember that Aaron Burr killed Alexander Hamilton over a political dispute in those early days. Some of our talk show hosts talk as though the 50s were that wonderful time. But I remember that the South was totally segregated, gays were in the closet, and women were in a subordinate position in the work place. All of this goes to show that things were not as they should have been in the past. Through the years changes have been made, showing that men and women acting together can make progress. And the

*Continued on page nine*

## Political Notes

by Jon Fuhrman



Sunday, November 11.

**I**t's finally over -- and WE WON! In fact, we won BIG, bigger, even, than most commentators give us credit for. Let's start with the Presidential campaign.

President Obama won 332 electoral votes (a bit shy of the 368 I had projected), including every battleground states except North Carolina, which he lost narrowly. Further, he captured a significant popular vote majority, at roughly 50.5% to 48%, with ballots still being counted. Only three other Presidents -- FDR, Eisenhower and Reagan -- captured over 50% of the popular vote in two successive elections. Compared to his first campaign, the President lost only two states -- North Carolina and Indiana. In contrast, Gov. Romney (and Sen. McCain in 2008) lost six states (Colorado, Florida, Iowa, Nevada, New Mexico, and Ohio) that Pres. Bush had carried in 2004.

Although some margins were narrow in the battleground states, they were remarkably consistent (and matched the 2008 results pretty closely). Interestingly, they were also pretty consistent with the consensus polling, even though the Republicans didn't believe the polls. Republicans truly believed the turnout would be fundamentally different than 2008, reverting to historic averages, so they "adjusted" the raw polling numbers to match their expectations. They were so confident that they purchased a permit for Tuesday night fireworks over Boston Harbor.

The rout was not limited to the Presidential race. In the Senate, not a single incumbent Democrat was defeated. Shelley Berkley did lose to the Republican incumbent in Nevada, and Tea Party favorite Jeff Flake seems to have captured an open Republican seat in Arizona. But Democrats took Scott Brown's seat in Massachusetts, captured an open Republican seat in Indiana, kept open Democratic seats in Virginia, North Dakota and Wisconsin, and held on to heavily contested seats in Ohio, Florida, Pennsylvania, Missouri and Montana, often outperforming the President. That leaves Democrats with 53 seats and two independents -- Bernie Sanders of Vermont and Angus King of Maine -- likely to caucus with them, giving them an effective total of 55 votes compared to 53 in the current Senate.

The House was the Republican's only bastion, with Democrats likely to end up with 201 seats, a gain of 9. Republicans point to this as proof that Obama's mandate is modest, that voters want the GOP to keep power and check the President's agenda. But a closer look somewhat undermines this argument. Republicans defeated 4 incumbent Democrats, two of whom in traditionally Republican districts. They also carried 5 open seats vacated by Democrats, mostly due to retirements in the face of adverse reapportionment, and one seat in Iowa where reapportionment pitted an in-

cumbent Republican and Democrat against one another. But Democrats defeated 16 incumbent Republicans, and they carried 7 seats newly created by reapportionment. They won 7 of the 9 "Toss-up" seats held by Democrats, and they won 13 of the 20 "Toss-ups" held by Republicans. So, while Republicans did maintain control of the House, it was hardly a resounding endorsement for the party. Lastly, Democrats also won 170 state legislative seats, gaining control of 8 legislative chambers while losing control of only 2.

Republicans are now descending into biting dissections of their defeat. Was it the candidate, the message, the campaign -- or all three? Several commentators have disparaged the Romney field operation. My favorite story deals with their Get-Out-The-Vote computer system, perhaps because in my professional life as an Information Technology manager, my most critical responsibility was to ensure that systems were adequately tested.

The Romney campaign developed a state-of-the-art system they called ORCA, linked to iPhones and iPads, to track voters on Election Day, collate turnout results from around the country, and direct the GOTV ground troops in their search for voters. Inexplicably, the campaign didn't test the system, release a beta-version or show the system to their field organizers ahead of time. Come Election Day, the system crashed utterly. Not only were campaign leaders in Boston left in the dark, the 30,000 GOTV troops around the country had no way of knowing who had voted already, and no addresses, no phone numbers, no e-mails of those who had not yet voted. This from the business-savvy management experts!

In contrast, the Obama ground operation was repeatedly described as flawless, overpower-

ing and awesome in its precision and achievement. That may be overstating it somewhat, but I can give a first-hand account of their operation in one battleground state.

My wife Susan and I drove out to Las Vegas two weekends before the election, in the midst of Nevada's early voting, to help with GOTV. I had twice gone to Vegas a full year ago, in November and December of 2011, to help with voter registration and gathering recruits for the early caucus. Even then, a full year before

the election, the Obama campaign had offices rented -- albeit a bit ragged -- and paid staff on the ground, an overarching plan and an organizing methodology in place. There weren't a whole lot of staffers, but there were already young volunteers and interns excitedly talking about the fall intern program, the winter and spring intern programs, about competing for regional organizers spots in Nevada and other battleground states. Their

plan focused on personal, one-on-one recruiting and building the volunteer tree out from there; they had "Count Me In" cards as a mechanism to solidify volunteers' commitment to the campaign, and they were already recruiting help from surrounding states.

By the time we got there two weeks ago, the President's campaign had 200 paid staffers in Las Vegas alone. In comparison, our local United Democratic Headquarters, which covered nearly half as many voters, had all of four paid staff. Las Vegas was divided into 6 regions, each with two field offices, and each field office had two to four "hubs", smaller local offices from which we operated. Over 300 volunteers arrived from Southern California that weekend; there were 40 at our hub, including 24 from the PCC Democratic Club. We each did 3 shifts that weekend, walking to



around 40 households each shift, equipped with clipboards, maps, and targeted lists of voters.

We worked predominantly African-American and Hispanic neighborhoods, where you could see the real impact of the recession. Many voters had moved, some forced out by foreclosures, a few homes or rental units boarded up to force squatters out. These folks were the very definition of "unlikely" voters, methodically excluded from polling calculations. But the campaign was determined to make at least four separate contacts to each of these households in search of votes, and those voters we did talk to were uniformly supportive of the President. We had "Count on Me" cards for voters to complete as a way of promising to vote early, following the organizing methodology that said if a voter takes some concrete action, like writing in their address, phone number and e-mail, they are substantially more likely to act on their theoretical predisposition. (Susan got 8 cards Sunday morning from her 40 targeted households -- the top producer in our group.) And all the data -- who was supportive, who had moved, what apartments were vacant -- were assiduously entered into the campaign database as we returned from each shift.

You can do the math. That weekend alone, the 300 California volunteers hit about 36,000 homes. Even if voters were contacted in only 1 of every 4 homes, those volunteers alone hit 1% of the state's electorate that weekend. The focus on early voting was intense, and hugely successful. In Nevada, almost 70% of the voters cast ballots before Election Day. This not only generated a margin of safety among the ballots cast; it effectively tripled the power and effectiveness of the GOTV operation on Election Day, since they could then focus solely on the remaining 30% of the voters who have not yet voted.

It wasn't a perfect operation. Shelley Berk-

ley's Senate campaign, the state party, the Congressional candidate each had their own GOTV operation that, legally, had to be independent, so we could tell many households had been contacted repeatedly by multiple organizations (and occasionally their patience was worn thin). And at times the staffers struggled to keep up with the flood of volunteers and keep everyone busy. Overall, though, things went pretty smoothly, nearly all the targeted precincts were covered, and volunteers came away feeling productive and energized.

The campaign appears to have achieved a similar intensity in other battleground states -- 140 field offices in Ohio, for example, compared to 40 for Romney. They gambled that this sort of field operation could promote the same sort of turnout that powered the President to victory in 2008, despite the presumed fall-off in enthusiasm. In a sense, they lost the gamble, because the actual vote totals (though not all ballots are counted yet) show a significant drop from 2008: the President won 69.5 million votes in 2008, but dropped to between 64 and 66 million votes this year (3 million California ballots are still being counted). The Republican vote stayed right around 60 million.

Yet despite that lower overall turnout, the President's field operation did harvest enough "unlikely" voters to boost his margin by several percentage points in each battleground state, generally outperforming the polls and guaranteeing his victory. Further, with the lower overall turnout, African-American, Latino and Asian voters became an even more important proportion of the electorate.

Nonetheless, we should note the difficulty of mounting such an intensive ground operation. Even with a nearly \$1 billion budget, the Obama campaign could afford this operation only in the eight or nine battleground states. Although the President's campaign did have

some staff and offices in every state, they were quite modest operations aimed mostly at recruiting volunteers to phone into, or otherwise help, the battleground states.

We should also be wary about turnout patterns. Turnout goes up (in Presidential years) and down (in the mid-term elections) in very reliable cycles. We won big in 2008, lost equally big in 2010. We win again in 2012, but 2014 will be a tough year. Winning increasing percentages among minority voters, among young voters and among single voters isn't enough to carry us forward irresistibly. Pennsylvania is a perfect example. In 2008, 5.9 million votes were cast for President; Obama won easily, and Democrats held the State Assembly and gained State Senate seats. In 2010, fewer than 4 million voters went to the polls; Democrats lost the Governorship, a U.S. Senate seat and control of both houses of the Legislature (and then killed in reapportionment). In 2012, turnout is back up to 5.6 million; Obama carries the state again (by 5%), we hold a U.S. Senate seat, and make gains in both state legislative houses.

That pattern was reproduced in Ohio, Florida, Wisconsin, and other states around the country. Democrats can't count solely on our ground game or the "new coalition." We still have to rely on message and winning a bigger share of the vote from "traditional" white, married voters, particularly in off-years, where we have to struggle state by state.

However, as perplexed as Republicans were about their ground game, they are even more deeply embroiled in disputes about their message. Many pundits cited the incredible comments by Todd Akin and Richard Mourdoch about rape and abortion. Others cited Romney's "tactical" turn to the right during the primaries, and particularly his comments on immigration and "self-deportation". One of the most interesting aspects of these com-

ments was the suggestion that Romney should simply have veered left, instead of right, on immigration. It suggests that these fundamental policy positions were never thought to be deeply held positions, but simply tactical moves to win the primary, and that is was simply a tactical misjudgment to veer right instead of left. What the candidate truly believed seems to be an irrelevant afterthought.

The Republicans encounter that same message problem on abortion and choice. It's one thing to say Akin and Mourdoch and their ilk should just shut up and not talk about rape and abortion on the same day. But that won't cure the fundamental policy problem. From the party platform, to their war on Planned Parenthood, to sponsorship of "Personhood" amendments, the Republican Party has adopted an extremist perspective on abortion. Simply not talking about it isn't enough to mask their true position, and it is that position that voters are increasingly finding unacceptable. They face the same problem with immigration. Even without talking about "self-deportation", Republicans' opposition to the Dream Act, state legislation in Arizona, Alabama, Georgia and elsewhere, vehement opposition to in-state tuition discounts for undocumented students all put the Republican brand into a deep conflict with the Latino community. Simply avoiding inflammatory code words won't repair the damage to their brand.

Further, if more centrist party leaders begin embracing reforms in any of these areas, they face bitter backlashes from the hardcore advocates for each hot point, be it taxes, immigration, choice or gay marriage. Movement on any one of these issues could fracture off a piece of their coalition, leading to bitter primary fights and internal struggles over control of the party apparatus. In fact, in 2016 some of the most acrid fights may be over the party platform language, which their Presidential candidate is likely to want to soften in each of

the above areas.

In California, we had a similarly good day. Congratulations to Congressmembers Adam Schiff and Judy Chu, and to State Senator Carol Liu and our new State Assemblyman Chris Holden on decisive wins in their new districts. The State Senate temporarily has a 2/3 Democratic majority, but two incumbent Democrats won Congressional seats (Juan Vargas and Gloria Negrete McCloud) so their seats will be vacant for a few months pending special elections (though the districts are pretty reliably Democratic). Although ballots are still being counted in two tight Assembly races, it looks like Democrats will have a 2/3 majority there as well -- a result that somewhat astounded most observers.

More importantly, several key ballot measures were enacted, particularly Propositions 30 and 39. Governor Brown confounded most observers by winning approval of Prop. 30 by a solid 8 percentage points, well above all polling estimates. In large part, this seems to have been due to a significant increase in turnout from young voters. The data isn't quite clear yet; the Field exit polls pegged the 18 - 29 vote at 28% of the total, but their exit polls looked only at Election Day voters. Absentee voters were almost surely far more traditionally distributed, so the actual youth vote is more likely around 18 - 19%. That's still sharply higher than typical polling estimates, and they were strongly supportive of the Governor's proposal.

Proposition 39 also passed by a relatively huge 20-point, 2 million vote margin. This proposal imposes a single tax calculation method on corporations -- their corporate income tax must reflect their percentage of sales from California. Currently, corporations can use the sales percentage, or they can opt for a blend of sales, employees, and property. That allows corporations outside California (with no

Ca. employees and no property in Ca.) to avoid at least 2/3 of their corporate income tax. This proposal had been estimated to bring in about \$1 billion a year, but that estimate may be significantly too low.

Last week the Controller's office released their monthly cash reports, and happily the state took in \$200 million more than budgeted. Personal income taxes were up sharply, but corporate income taxes were \$130 million below estimates. Those corporate taxes have consistently lagged behind budget estimates; the Controller speculated that corporations have been unexpectedly successful at using the corporate loophole to minimize their California exposure. So with Prop. 39, the state may gain well over the \$1 billion estimate -- perhaps up to \$2 billion. Along with personal income tax and sales tax revenues that seem to be topping estimates, the state could end up next June with a significant surplus for the first time in nearly a decade.

Prop. 38, in contrast, got hammered, doing well worse than its internal polling and even worse than most independent polling suggested. That could be due, in part, to the increased turnout among young voters who saw 30 and 38 as competing measures; in part to the fact that community colleges were left out of 38, thereby generating significant opposition on campuses; in part to press attacks on Molly Munger, questioning her motives or judgment for funding the initiative; in part to opposition from most newspaper editorial pages; in part to the formal opposition by the Democratic Party (to say nothing of the Republican Party) and linking a No vote on 38 to the Democratic ticket, Yes on 30 and No on 32 campaigns; and, perhaps most basically, to the broad impact of the tax change that 38 advocated, which would have hit many middle class families, albeit modestly. It certainly was easier to raise taxes on the rich (as consistently advocated by the President) by supporting 30



than to raise them on one's own family.

Nonetheless, Prop. 30 provides only a marginal lifeboat to public schools for the next few years. Perhaps, with a 2/3 majority in the Legislature, the Democrats can rejuvenate state government and, particularly if the revenue picture brightens, begin to repair the damage from the last few years. They will be beset by competing interests, each claiming to have suffered more grievous hardship than the others, but perhaps modest progress can be made. While we're not likely to increase general taxes further, I wouldn't be surprised to see an oil severance tax (perhaps at lower levels than Alaska or Texas, as a selling point) on the 2014 ballot; surely there is little justification for our being basically the only oil-producing state without a severance tax.

-- Jon Fuhrman



### **The Phoenix Deadline**

The deadline for the December *Phoenix* will be **Sunday, December 9**. Please send items to Chuck Hains at [Hains27@SBCGlobal.net](mailto:Hains27@SBCGlobal.net). *ThePhoenix* will be prepared for mailing on Thursday, December 13 at 7 p.m. at Chuck and Lena's home, 1391 La Solana Drive, Alta. (Volunteer mailers please call Ellen Coles at 626-798-2402 to verify time and place.)



### **View Our Website Every Month**

A NOTE: If you haven't been visiting [www.ACTpasadena.org](http://www.ACTpasadena.org), you should be. Bruce Wright is keeping it updated with photos, links, and other items of interest. Also, please send any items for inclusion to Bruce at [Brucewright@SBCGlobal.net](mailto:Brucewright@SBCGlobal.net).

*Inman Moore, Continued from page three*

beat goes on. Progressive change must always be the order of the day.

4. More recently, we have elements of our society who believe that God opposes homosexuality and same sex marriage, deny evolution and climate change, and continue attempting to negate the findings of scientists. It is time to recognize that science and religion are not enemies, but that fundamentalism in either science or religion is ultimately deadly. The fact is that progressive religion and good science are both searching for the truth. And that search has led to a belief in climate change, a woman's right to choose, and that homosexuality is not a chosen life style but that it is just the nature of how some people are.

5. Finally, we should never lose hope. Progress is never made by fatalists and pessimists. The fact that the progress we work for doesn't happen during our lifetime is no excuse for not working to see change happen. Racial integration in America was a long time coming, but come it did. Everything is possible for people who never lose hope and are always looking to the future with an open and inquiring mind. President Obama and enlightened leadership from all segments of our society could result in miracles these next four years, and wouldn't that be great?



### **Welcome New and Returning ACT Members:**

Betty Krachman, Pasadena

### **Special Thanks to our Sustaining Member**

John Tennant, Glendora

### **Special Thanks to our Patron**

Isabella Puccini, Pasadena

**From  
44th District  
Assemblymember  
Anthony  
Portantino**



Dear ACT Friends,

For the past six years, it has been my honor to represent the diverse and unique communities that make up the best Assembly District in California. I have worked hard to expand educational opportunities, keep our communities safe and hold state government accountable. It has been a learning experience every day and I couldn't have done it without you.

I am proud to say that throughout my time in the Legislature, I had 38 bills signed into law and I remain committed to helping in any way I can. Look for me at council meetings and on the soccer field, helping to preserve our open spaces and leading the charge for affordable higher education for all Californians.

My time with the California State Assembly ends November 30, and a new chapter begins. I am grateful for the opportunity to have been able to represent you. My wife, Ellen and I, and our daughters Sofia and Bella feel blessed to be a part of this wonderful community. I want to take a moment to wish you the best and to thank you for all that you have done to make the 44th Assembly District a special place to live.

Happy holidays and warmest thoughts for a healthy and happy New Year.

Anthony

Assemblymember Anthony Portantino represented the 44th Assembly District of California, including La Canada, Pasadena, Altadena, South Pasadena, Eagle Rock, Highland Park, Glassell Park, Temple City, Duarte and parts of Arcadia and Monrovia.

**Election Postscripts -- Part 1:  
Lessons Learned?**

From Fred Register

We are an instant society now. So the rush to solidify conventional wisdom is faster than ever. But some of the "lessons" now being drawn from the glorious November elections are likely to have a very short shelf life.

For instance, the emergence of a demographically-driven new Democratic majority is almost certainly real in the long run. But we live most of our lives in the short run, and there things look very different.

The key groups in our new coalition -- young people, Latinos, African-Americans, unmarried women, etc. -- are not easy to mobilize in Presidential years. But in the "off" years they are notoriously sketchy voters. Anyone who doubts that needs to google the election results from just two years ago, when Democrats suffered Congressional losses on a truly catastrophic scale.

Many Republicans were stunned by this year's results because they misread their great results in 2010. They didn't understand that off-year turnout is simply not a good indicator of what will happen in a Presidential year. Democrats would do well to remember that the reverse is also true. Unfortunately, history suggests that, demography notwithstanding, 2014 may look more like 2010 than 2012.

A related "lesson" that may have to be unlearned is the futility of the billionaire superpacs. It is certainly true (and delicious!) that Karl Rove and his fellow apostles of Citizens United had a very bad year. So now we know that their hundreds of millions can't buy an election -- if a reasonably popular President is on the ballot with a billion dollars of his own, and an historic investment in grassroots organization.

Sadly, none of those conditions applied in

2010, when the superpacs first hit their stride. And they won't apply in 2014 either. Rove and company will be back. The question is: who or what will be facing them on our side of the fence?

Remember that the Obama campaign planned in advance to use the 2010 elections as a rehearsal for its superb "ground game" -- a kind of shakedown cruise for 2012. As a result, many states had far superior Democratic organizations than they usually do in an off year. Yet the tactics that were so remarkably successful in 2008 and 2012 could not hold back the GOP wave.

In 2014, when voters may well be weary of a Presidency in its sixth year, there won't be an Obama campaign organization to invest in turning out the "new electorate". So a really critical issue for Democrats is this: Can the tremendous organizational and fundraising structures of the two Obama campaigns be institutionalized and replicated, at least in part? Because if they cannot, we may be in for some painful lessons in two year's time.



## From State Senator Carol Liu...

### Sacramento Update

**C**ongratulations to my colleagues on their election. working with our new and re-elected Assembly Members in the State Capitol. Congratulations also to U.S. Representatives Adam Schiff and Judy Chu. The San Gabriel and San Fernando Valleys are well represented in Congress.

Many thanks to our outstanding Democratic



Party workers and volunteers. I am sure President Obama and all of us who benefited from your hard work are very grateful. I was very happy to beat the registration spread in my own election to the new 25<sup>th</sup> Senate District. I know the great organization and get out the vote effort of the local Democratic Party headquarters contributed to that outcome.

I am fortunate to have been served by the same core political team since I first ran for the Assembly in 2002: Fred Register, Jon Fuhrman, Judy and George Van Alstine, and Wendy Soltes. Vickere Murphy joined us this year to manage the campaign. She brought us up to date with a dynamic web site, Facebook page and active Twitter repartee. I am pleased to announce that Vickere will be joining my office as a District Representative.

The Democrats held their first Caucus in Sacramento on November 8<sup>th</sup>. We welcomed new members and re-elected Darrell Steinberg as the President pro Tem of the Senate. Democrats understand that holding a supermajority in the house does not mean it's time for a tax free-for-all. We are committed to rational reform and putting our economy and our education system back on track.

My own priorities remain education, environment, infrastructure, and recreating a safety net for the disadvantaged and underserved. Veterans, seniors, the poor, and at-risk youth all need our attention. I look forward to getting to know communities that are new to me and those that I have served in the past as I represent the 25<sup>th</sup> Senate District.

Best wishes to all for a Happy Thanksgiving holiday!

*Senator Carol Liu represents nearly 850,000 people of the 21st District. Please visit [www.senate.ca.gov/LIU](http://www.senate.ca.gov/LIU).*



## Calendar

- Nov 16  
Friday  
9:00 a.m.
- Friday Morning Progressive Discussion Group at CoCo's Restaurant, 77 N. Lake Ave., Pasa. Topic: Poverty in America. Call Inman Moore for info at 626-795-2201. We meet on 1st & 3rd Fridays.
- Dec 2  
Sunday  
6 p.m.
- Research Committee dinner meeting at the home of Ralph Hurtado, 245 Marguerita Lane, Pasa. Call 626 799-7626.



- Dec 5  
Wednesday  
6:30 p.m.
- ACT and ADC Holiday Potluck and Meeting at the home of Bobbie and Henry Moon, 1961 Mar Vista Ave., Alta. Program: Election analysis by Fred Register and Jon Fuhrman. The potluck begins at 6:30 p.m. followed by the meeting at about 8 p.m. See the front page for potluck assignments. Everyone is welcome and urged to attend.
- Dec 7  
Friday
- Friday Morning Discussion Group. (Details same as 11/16.)
- Dec 14  
Friday  
10 a.m.
- SG Valley Democratic Women's Club Holiday Potluck Meeting at the home of Jeanne Register, 2345 Midlothian Dr., Altadena.
- Dec 15
- Research Committee candidate interviews. Call Ralph Hurtado at 626 799-7626 for details.



**P. O. Box 40074  
Pasadena, California  
91114-7074**