Trump Cats and Politics:

A Sabbatical Report

James T. Salt, Ph.D.

November 2019

Introduction

As elaborated in my application, my sabbatical goals included the concomitant tasks of working on a politically vital research project, while returning part of my professional focus to sociological research, after a roughly twenty-year period of efforts focused on teaching and faculty association work. The then-recent election of Donald Trump (my application was written in January, 2017) had reinstilled in me a belief in the importance of political sociological research, work that I had spent the previously prior twenty years or so focused on, but which I had largely tabled while paying attention to other, more locally pressing matters. Thus my goal was to both research a crucial (to me at least) political question, as well as to refresh and update my skills and knowledge in this important subfield of sociology, thereby allowing me to experience a real "sabbatical" in its professional meaning, i.e., where one finally has the time and space away from the regular professional demands to work and reflect on matters in a way that provides professional and personal growth and allows one to more effectively serve their college upon their return as a restored.

Background

My doctoral dissertation, now nearly 30 years old, sought to explain the so-called "Right Turn" of the U.S. government in the late 1970s, a term used to describe the turning away from a reasonably steady, long term trend in the US, where both achieved and, especially, ascribed inequalities were slowly, if painfully, being reduced, to a now roughly 40 year period of politics where previously "far right" members of Congress and the White House hold significant sway, turning around or at least challenging many of the victories of the labor movement, the Civil Rights Movement, the women's movement, the environmental movement, etc.

As I then quoted on page the third page of said dissertation, Thomas Ferguson had shown clearly that this 'right turn' was NOT the product of a conservative shift in the broader population, as demonstrated by many polls; the population had been continuing to slowly indicate less racism, less sexism, more environmentalism, greater expectation that government would regulate business to protect the people and to better address class inequality, etc. Which at the time left the question of just how to explain the right turn, if it wasn't the product of a shift in voter attitudes and politics.

One popular theory (though with different variants and varied names) suggested that the key was that that the U.S. political system isn't actually all that democratic, and that the wealthy and corporations actually dominate the political system, and that it was either some combination of these two sectors as a group that 'moved right', or in some framings, that certain sectors of business and the wealthy either had turned to the right, or simply came into greater power, either through more successful political

efforts and/or simply because of their growing relative economic power. Then popular variants versions of the latter included "Corporate Liberalism Theory", and so-called Yankee Cowboy theory, a.k.a. "Sunbelt Capital Theory."

The former generally argued that much of the leading and largest corporations in the U.S. tended to support more moderate if not more liberal political policies than smaller and newer businesses, an argument that a colleague and I had previously shown was simply not supported by the evidence. The latter theory argued that there is a fundamental schism within the U.S. capitalist class largely along regional lines, where the 'old rich' in the Northeast and perhaps Midwest held to more moderate/liberal political views, while the increasingly successful businesses headquartered in the Southern, Mountain, and Western states, were more traditionally conservative, anti-statist, anti-union, anti-liberal, etc. Different versions of these arguments existed, with some stressing cultural differences between the various sectors, others psychological differences, others pointing to economic differences and interests, such as different industries, different vulnerabilities to different political policies, etc.

It was this theory that my dissertation rigorously studied, both theoretically (by attempting to clearly articulate the various arguments embedded and not always clearly made) and empirically (by gathering a massive amount of data on five congressional elections, and massive amount of data on the over 1000 corporations, and their officers), and later by collecting a similarly massive amount of similar data on corporations and their campaign contributions in the Presidential election of 1980, seeking to see what insights that might provide into the rise of Reagan.

Sabbatical Application

Which brings us to the present: Perhaps not too surprisingly, Donald Trump's election in 2016 -- where he too promised to 'turn America back again', taking a number of positions in stark contrast to positions traditionally supported not just by Republican Party, but by big business in general – lead me to wonder whether his election was simply an electoral anomaly, or if too might represent some "right turn" of American businesses, or, more likely, of some sectors of business, and if so, by who and why.

So in January 2017 I submitted a sabbatical proposal to do just that, once again committing to collect a massive amount of data on corporate campaign contributions and the corporations and their top officers, and then analyzing it all. Key to me was understanding if there were any industries or other sections of business that were disproportionately supporting Trump and thereby apparently rejecting key elements of the neoliberal paradigm that has largely dominated US and many international organizations for decades.

If so, one would expect to find significant campaign contributions to Trump from some such industries or sectors during the nomination period for the GOP (comparing contributions to Hillary Clinton and Trump would certainly also be interested, but political sociologists and political scientists have long noted the importance of distinguishing partisan contributions, which one sees in the general elections, from more ideological activities, as often more strongly demonstrated in party nomination periods). My plan was to gather two sets of data: my "Dependent Variable" data, i.e., political contributions to Republican (and Democratic) candidates from U.S. corporate officers, data that are gathered and made publicly available by the Federal Election Commission; and as well as a broad sample of corporations and their officers who made political contributions in the 2016 Presidential election, as well as a long list of "Independent Variable" data on each.

Since the form and availability of such data had dramatically changed since the last time I'd completed similar research, due to the development of the internet and downloadable data, my first task would be to determine the best sources for such data and determine how to best procure them, and what software to use to analyze the massive files. I also planned to catch up on the literature in this 'subfield' of political sociology / political science, to see what others had done on this topic in recent years.

Data Collection

Collecting the data on political contributions turned out to be both easier but also harder in some ways, than had my previous studies in the 1980s, when the FEC had intentionally made such data virtually impossible to use to track contributions to individuals (requiring massive computer work by mainframe computers to link data in three separate data tapes, reading them back and forth, literally millions of times each). Since then, with the increasingly important exception of so-called Dark Money, the data are now very public and easy to physically access. More challenging, they are now kept in huge and nearly unmanageable datasets, given their size (note that there are a number of very useful websites that allow one to easily identify individual contributions, contributions by sector, etc, but to get the data in the systematic form I needed, I had to download the large, raw datasets themselves from the FEC, and then systematically mine them for the data I needed). This meant downloading 11 files with approximately 2 million lines of data, each line representing a separate contribution made to a PAC that election, each approximately 2GB, that the FEC divides the database into, because of the difficulty of dealing with 20+GB files if kept in one piece. Which in turn required recombining these 11 huge files, creating one massive file so I could mine it for what I needed, giving me a 21 GB file to manage. It also took significant time to determine which software would successfully handle such large files, time to learn the software, and long periods of processing time with the software for each simple inquiry or data management action (hint: SPSS PC proved far more useful than R+, at least for me).

My next step was to determine and select contributions made to Presidential campaign or committees making substantial contributions to presidential candidates, resulting in a list approximately two million contributions, each of which consisted of dozens of columns of data. To do so I needed to match one list of 5+ million lines of contributions with a separate list of 100+ such committees, another significant challenge in an area of personal computers (I greatly appreciate the initial help from the data specialists located in the University of Oregon library), as well as the kind advice and support from Malloy Wilson in LCC's IRAP department). Eventually, after learning new software, and trying different approaches, and days more cleaning and making sense of the results, I had my (still very large) "dependent variable" data.

Simultaneously I was working on the 'corporate sample', and spent some other weeks in the University of Oregon library more hours hand collecting online data that was parallel to what I had hand collected while in grad school. My first task was to familiarize myself with the new databases and other now mostly online resources with corporate and corporate officer data; for that I consulted at length with several UO reference librarians, whose helpfulness I am very grateful for. And I'm even more grateful for the "Courtesy Faculty Appointment" in the UO Sociology Department that I was kindly provided, which gave me full access to UO databases, library and wifi resources, etc.

By now, several months into the work, I had gathered all of the political contribution data and begun to make some general sense of it, and had whittled the 20+GB file down to 5 million lines of data, with just the variables I was interested in, making the file somewhat manageable.

I'd also determined my sample and collected a significant amount of the data I needed to collect on corporations and their officers in order to test theories that may point to possible reasons for any variances found in support for Trump's GOP nomination (I'd decided to emulate the sample I used in the Reagan study, both because the original choice still made great sense, and because it would allow me to work on a future paper, comparing differences in the two campaigns).

My next step would be sitting down with my list of corporate officers and manually go through the lines of contributions, looking for contributions from the officers or their spouses (since many wealthy contributors seek to double their allowable contributions to candidates by contributing in their spouses name as well), and then begin collecting data on the corporations and their contributing officers for whom I had found contributions. My hope was to take this portion of work 'on the road' so I'd get a proper 'Sabbatical break' from Eugene, as encouraged in sabbaticals and as I'd done in on my first sabbatical.

Literature Discovery

At this point, as part of my ongoing literature review, I stumbled almost accidently (via a link to an online video of an unknown-to-me political talk show) of a reference to an online not formally published "working paper", led by none other than Thomas Ferguson, the aforementioned political scientist. This new work -- entitled "Industrial Structure and Party Competition in an Age of Hunger Games: Donald Trump and the 2016 Presidential Election" -- proved eerily similar to my focus. To my surprise and mixed emotions, I found that he and another political scientist and statistician had analyzed corporation campaign contributions to Donald Trump and other candidates in the 2016 election, to see if there were variations by industry and other sectors, virtually identically to what I was now in the midst of collecting data on. And they had developed an 'auto-searching' computer method that allowed them to review a much broader sample that I was working on, collecting contributions on nearly 100,000 officers, far larger than my work focused on.

A quick read of their paper showed clearly that there really was very little support, relatively speaking, from corporate officers across the country, and little variation by industry to the extent Ferguson et al studied it. To double check the last point, central as it was to my research, I reconstructed Ferguson's data in a table allowing a careful comparison of support for candidates for the Republican nomination (as well as for the Democratic nomination). See which Table 1, below.

Table 1

G7 =COUNTIF(G8:G59,">50.1")

Industrial Structure and the GOP in the 2016 Presidential Election

Industry (N = 50, plus 100 Small Businesses)	Trump	Bush	Rubio	Cruz	Kasich	Christie	Graham	Carson	Fiorina	Walker	Paul	Jindal	H

Industry (N = 50, plus 100 Small Businesses)	Trump	Bush	Rubio	Cruz	Kasich	Christie	Graham	Carson	Fiorina	Walker	Paul	Jindal
Ave	0.8	30.2	14.9	13.2	13.1	6.5	5.8	3.7	3.5	3.1	2.4	0.7
Rank	11	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	12
Max	2.9	84.9	83.9	41.9	59.0	49.1	47.4	16.0	57.5	26.3	31.1	6.3
Waste Mgt.	2.9	13.7	2.5	41.4	15.8	0.0	0.0	4.4	15.9	0.0	1.6	1.8
Real Estate	2.7	37.6	14.5	11.4	10.5	7.3	1.3	3.0	3.2	2.0	1.0	0.9
Steel	2.5	31.0	11.3	22.4	10.1	0.8	1.4	10.2	1.8	3.8	3.5	0.0
Airlines	2.3	11.5	11.0	41.9	3.8	1.4	0.0	15.8	3.6	1.7	4.4	0.0
Health	2.2	40.0	7.1	22.3	4.4	6.4	0.7	7.4	1.2	1.3	2.2	2.2
Printing and Pub	2.1	66.9	12.2	7.4	2.3	0.0	0.0	1.7	1.4	0.5	0.2	0.0
100 Small Bus nec	1.9	23.1		14.9	12.9	5.9	1.5	4.5	2.1			1.3
Chemical	1.9	38.5	6.2	11.1	20.7	1.1	4.1	3.7	0.9	1.9	2.9	4.6
Guns, Ammo	1.7	76.5	7.8	4.7	2.0	0.4	0.0	2.7	0.0	3.6	0.1	0.0
Altern Energy	1.6	0.0	16.6	18.0	0.0	0.0	31.1	0.0	0.0	1.6	31.1	0.0
Comm Banking	1.4	41.3	14.9	16.6	6.4	1.1	0.6	1.6	1.1	10.4	3.0	0.2
Rubber	1.4	18.3	11.0	26.5	14.7	0.0	1.0	10.0	10.7	0.6	2.6	1.4
Heavy Constr.	1.3	17.6	5.7	38.1	15.1	10.3	1.5	2.8	1.3	1.6	1.1	0.4
Autos	1.2	27.4	4.7	26.7	5.3	7.5	2.2	14.0	1.3	0.9	3.7	0.0
Apparel	1.2	8.8	4.6	0.2	46.4	0.9	35.4	0.9	0.1	0.0	0.4	0.0
Electronics	1.2	7.5	20.2	26.4	4.9	5.3	10.2	7.4	5.7	4.7	3.5	1.0
Internet Mfgr	1.1	9.7	4.7	18.1	28.7	5.0	13.5	6.6	2.4	1.9	5.0	0.0
Transp, Trk, RR	0.9	45.2	5.1	31.0	2.0	0.5	1.8	3.4	0.5	7.3	1.3	0.5
Computers	0.8	20.2	6.5	12.8	2.1	35.0	0.2	3.7	4.5	9.1	3.3	0.7
Aerospace	0.8	13.5	10.3	27.8	7.2	2.2	16.1	10.6	2.9	3.3	3.8	0.2
Food	0.7	48.4	12.2	5.7	8.7	8.9	2.5	3.2	1.0	5.1	0.5	1.9
Pharma	0.7	20.9	7.6	6.2	11.1	31.3	0.9	3.2	1.7	9.9	4.9	0.0
Utilities	0.7	51.5	9.3	7.9	7.2	11.9	3.9	2.6	0.4	1.7	0.7	0.5
Accounting	0.7	48.8	9.9	5.3	14.6	13.1	0.6	2.5	1.0	2.7	0.5	0.0

Sheet tabs: 4 & 5 | 4 & 5 % firms | 4 & 5 %$ | **4 & 5 %$ Rankings GOP** | 4 & 5 %$ Rankings Dems | Sample | 6

READY

As one can see, Trump ranked 11th of the 17 candidates in receipt of contributions from 94,274 corporate officers (666,911 if one includes contributors from small businesses), and received *less than 1%* of total corporate officer contributions. Most important to my research question, he received a *maximum* of 2.9% of total contributions from any single industry (waste management). Only two of the other 16 candidates received a smaller 'maximum share' from any single industry, while a majority of

the 17 candidates received at least one-fourth of the contributions from at least one industry (two candidates – namely, Bush and Rubio -- received over 5/6ths of the contributions from at least one industry).

Table 2 presents Table 1 in a summary fashion, and shows perhaps more clearly that there simply were *no* "Trump industries", as there were "Bush industries" (e.g. Mining, at 84.9%) or "Clinton industries (basically everyone; *all* gave at least 2/3 of their Democratic contributions to Clinton, and only Waste Management gave more than 1/4th of their Democratic money to Sanders during the nomination period).

Table 2

| FILE | HOME | DATA | INSERT | PAGE LAYOUT | REVIEW | VIEW |

Y15

Industrial Structure and the GOP in the 2016 Presidential Election

Industry (N = 50, plus 100 Small Businesses)	Trump	Bush	Rubio	Cruz	Kasich	Christie	Graham	Carson	Fiorina	Walker	Paul	Jindal	H

Industrial Structure and the GOP in the 2016 Presidential Election

Industry (N = 50, plus 100 Small Businesses)	Trump	Bush	Rubio	Cruz	Kasich	Christie	Graham	Carson	Fiorina	Walker	Paul	Jindal	H
Ave	0.8	30.2	14.9	13.2	13.1	6.5	5.8	3.7	3.5	3.1	2.4	0.7	
Rank	11	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	12	
Max	2.9	84.9	83.9	41.9	59.0	49.1	47.4	16.0	57.5	26.3	31.1	6.3	
# of industries receiving at least 50% of the contribs	0	8	3	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
# of industries receiving at least 33% of the contribs	0	20	8	5	5	3	3	0	1	0	0	0	
# of industries receiving at least 25% of the contribs	0	26	9	11	9	5	4	0	1	1	1	0	
# of industries receiving at least 10% of the contribs	0	41	21	26	24	10	10	6	5	2	2	0	
# of industries receiving at least 5% of the contribs	0	47	34	37	31	17	11	11	6	9	3	2	

Sheet tabs: 4 & 5 | 4 & 5 % firms | 4 & 5 %$ | **4 & 5 %$ Rankings GOP** | 4 & 5 %$ Rankings Dems | Sample | 6

READY

My data (see Table 3) had shown that there *was* some significant "early money" from Business for Donald Trump via contributions to 'outside' PACs providing support for Trump. For example, Robert Mercer had provided *$11 million* back in early 2015, and a number of wealthy contributors (including Mercer again, along with other well known rightwing capitalists, including Marlene Rickets, Richard Uihlein, Joe Ricketts, Paul Singer, and even Meg Whitman) had provided significant support for Trump's

nomination in 2015 and early 2016 before he sewed up the nomination. But when looking systematically at business *as a group*, by systematically studying the contributions of the top corporate officers, one finds very little total support for Trump, as well as no significant support for him from even a single industry.

Table 3

Committee #	Contributor	City	State	Zip	Employer	Occ
C0057537: IN	MERCER, ROBERT	EAST SETAUKET	NY	11700	RENAISSANCE TECHN(	FIN/
C00603621 IN	RICKETTS, MARLENE	OMAHA	NE	68100	N/A	RET
C0057537: IN	MERCER, ROBERT	EAST SETAUKET	NY	11700	RENAISSANCE TECHN(	FIN/
C00603621 IN	UIHLEIN, RICHARD	LAKE FOREST	IL	60000	ULINE	CEC
C00603621 IN	VLOCK, MICHAEL K.	BRANFORD	CT	6410	SELF-EMPLOYED	INV
C0058037: IN	RUFFIN, PHIL	LAS VEGAS	NV	89100	TREASURER ISALND	INV
C0058037: IN	RUFFIN, PHIL	LAS VEGAS	NV	89100	NA	NA
C00603621 IN	RICKETTS, MARLENE	OMAHA	NE	68100	N/A	RET
C00603621 IN	STEPHENS, WARREN A.	LITTLE ROCK	AR	72200	STEPHENS, INC.	CHA
C00603621 IN	RICKETTS, J. JOE	LITTLE JACKSON HOLE	WY	82900	SELF-EMPLOYED	ENT
C00603621 IN	SINGER, PAUL	NEW YORK	NY	10000	ELLIOTT MANAGEMEN	C.E.
C00603621 IN	STEPHENS, WARREN A.	LITTLE ROCK	AR	72200	STEPHENS, INC.	CHA
C00603621 IN	ASNESS, CLIFF	GREENWICH	CT	6830	AQR CAPITAL MANAGI	INV
C00603621 IN	VLOCK, MICHAEL K.	BRANFORD	CT	6410	SELF-EMPLOYED	INV
C00603621 IN	SINGER, PAUL	NEW YORK	NY	10000	ELLIOTT MANAGEMEN	C.E.
C00603621 IN	RICKETTS, MARLENE	OMAHA	NE	68100	N/A	RET
C00603621 IN	RICKETTS, MARLENE	OMAHA	NE	68100	N/A	RET
C0057537: IN	MERCER, ROBERT	EAST SETAUKET	NY	11700	RENAISSANCE TECHN(	FIN/
C00603621 IN	OBERNDORF, BILL	SAN FRANCISCO	CA	94100	OBERNDORF ENTERPR	OW
C00603621 IN	STEPHENS, WARREN A.	LITTLE ROCK	AR	72200	STEPHENS, INC.	CHA
C00603621 IN	CROW, HARLAN	DALLAS	TX	75200	CROW HOLDINGS	INV
C00603621 IN	KOVNER, BRUCE	PRINCETON	NJ	8540	CAM CAPITAL	CHA
C00603621 IN	OBERNDORF, WILLIAM E.	SAN FRANCISCO	CA	94100	OBERNDORF ENTERPR	EXE(
C00603621 IN	RICKETTS, MARLENE	OMAHA	NE	68100	N/A	RET
C00603621 IN	SINGER, PAUL	NEW YORK	NY	10000	ELLIOTT MANAGEMEN	C.E.
C00603621 IN	RICKETTS, MARLENE	OMAHA	NE	68100	N/A	RET
C00603621 IN	SINGER, PAUL	NEW YORK	NY	10000	ELLIOTT MANAGEMEN	C.E.
C00603621 P/	KEEP THE PROMISE I	PORT JEFFERSON STAT	NY	11800	NA	NA
C00603621 IN	VLOCK, MICHAEL K.	BRANFORD	CT	6410	SELF-EMPLOYED	INV
C0058989 OI	JOHN POWERS MIDDLETON C	LOS ANGELES	CA	90100	NA	NA
C0057537: P/	TRUSTED LEADERSHIP PAC	AUSTIN	TX	78700	NA	NA
C0058037: IN	KUSHNER, SERYL	LIVINGSTON	NJ	7040	N/A	HOM
C0058037: IN	BEAL, ANDY	HOUSTON	TX	77000	BEAL BANK	INV
C0058037: IN	PILEVSKY, PHILIP	NEW YORK	NY	10000	PHILIPS INTERNATION	BRC
C0058037: IN	DEZERTZOV, MICHAEL	SUNNY ISLE	FL	33200	DEZER PROPERTIES	FOU
C00603621 IN	CROW, HARLAN	DALLAS	TX	75200	CROW HOLDINGS	INV
C0057537: IN	JUNG, J.M.	NOVI	MI	48400	INFORMATION REQUE	INF(
C00603621 IN	STEPHENSON, JAMES E.	AUSTELL	GA	30200	YANCEY BROS. CO., IN	CHA
C0057537: P/	TRUSTED LEADERSHIP PAC	AUSTIN	TX	78700	NA	NA
C00603621 IN	WHITMAN, MEG	ATHERTON	CA	94000	HEWLETT PACKARD EN	CHI

Having reviewed Ferguson's data and conclusions, my central *theoretical* question was now answered: to the extent that one can expect corporations and their officers to demonstrate their political and ideological positions in campaign contributions, an assumption that has been well supported in decades of previous research, one can conclude that Trump's GOP nomination did NOT indicate a 'Trump Turn', or a turn to economic nationalism or other policies favored by Trump and not by other more 'mainstream' Republicans. There just wasn't any significant support for Trump by business *before* he sewed up the GOP nomination (he did receive significant support *after* that, but as previously noted, such contributions indicate many things other than the ideological indicators one can find in contributions to Presidential candidates during the nomination period).

<u>What next</u>

I still wanted to test some of the theories about political variance within business within the 2016 election, and well aware of the professional norm that researchers are expected to make their data available to other researchers to examine (e.g. so they can confirm, or not, the author's findings), I attempted to contact Professor Ferguson to graciously ask for a copy of their 'Hunger Games' database, promising to treat their data properly, give them credit for collecting the data if I used any of it publicly, etc. Having found a similar "working paper" published by Ferguson and his colleagues the very same year that had promised on its front page to 'share its full [and very similar] database when the work is complete', I was hopeful that I would receive a copy of their dataset, which I could then build on and structure the final stage of my project based upon their already complete (and much broader) data on corporate officer contributions.

While waiting for a response and, hopefully, I then left Oregon for nearly a month, finally getting out of town and a break from the University of Oregon libraries and sitting in front of my computer. I continued to read all I could find online of similar analyses of the election and 'the politics of Trump and the capitalist class', including other works by Ferguson and discussions of his analyses. During this time I also working on organizing and analyzing the massive database I'd already collected, all waiting with baited breath to hear back from Ferguson.

Unfortunately, despite my repeated efforts, including writing to the publishers of the websites with both of the aforementioned working papers, I never received any responses.

With my key empirical and theoretical questions now answered, and my sabbatical time line running out (it was now late May), and no response from Ferguson, I had to decide whether to continue to work my way manually through 5 million lines of data looking for contributions from 2000 officers of the largest 1000 corporations in the U.S., and then collect a similarly daunting amount of data on the corporations and the contributing top officers. Torn, I wrote a friend who is a (more likely *the*) leading scholar in the field and asked for his advice: should I still work my way through 5+ million lines of contributions to Presidential Candidates and supporting PACs, when we already have the results and I'm waiting to hear back from Ferguson to share his data? His response was straight to the point: he just didn't think it would be worth it now that Ferguson already published his analysis and answered the key question.

Somewhat reluctantly, I reached the same conclusion, deciding to direct my efforts at questions that have yet to be answered, and to developing methods to facilitate such analyses, without having to

manually review millions of lines of data, both to more work to be done with similar amounts of effort, and also to broaden the analysis to a larger sample, as Ferguson had now demonstrated was possible.

Conclusion

My analysis of Ferguson's data shows clearly that Trump received very little support from business; and that that lack of support was steady, across the board. The 'hypothesis' that Trump represented a new "turn" of business or any sectors is rejected, strongly.

I am still hopeful that one day Ferguson et al will share their data with me. And whether they do or not, I will use the work I did and the familiarity I gained with new data sources and software to prepare to analyze the Democratic party nomination and the general election in the 2020 election, which will offer an opportunity to answer important questions about ideology, party, and business interests in what is promising to be an historic election, regardless of the outcome. In the meantime, I plan to work on developing and testing my own 'auto search technique', obviating the most labor intensive component of this work. If successful, I will likely also apply it to the data I collected from the 2016 election. While my question about any business foundation for a 'Trump Turn' has been answered for now, other relevant questions remain that the Ferguson paper didn't address (as they had not gathered the detailed data on corporate officers and corporate economics that I had for my previous work).

On a more personal note, I had delayed the start of my sabbatical from the fall of 2017 when I'd planned to begin the research, to the winter of 2019, due to unrelated professional interests and needs that arose. Had I not done so, I would have completed the work likely around the time that Ferguson et al completed and posted theirs. Having now seen their results I'm emotionally torn, as the delay in my getting started resulted in someone else 'publishing (sort of) first'. I'm not sure what lessons there are in that, but it's another intellectual component of the sabbatical to mull over over time.

I did succeed in restoring my currency in the research, the data, and the software used to analyze it. And I also had a true break from the demands of teaching and Association work, while pleasantly spending countless hours once again in the University of Oregon library, and working with some old and new colleagues.

In short, while the project's end took an unanticipated turn (if not wholly surprising, since one knows going into a project like this that others may be working on a similar project as well), it was, both professionally and personally, a real success and an excellent way to start the next professional chapter in life, after 16 years as Association President and 10 years as President of the state union council.

I thank LCC's Faculty Professional Development (FPD) program, the Sabbatical Review Committee, and the Lane Community College Education Association (LCCEA) for its support.