

The lesson from yesterday's election is to ignore pontificating from highly paid pundits. Put your faith in the numbers.

John Van Reenen finds great cause for optimism in President Obama having won a second term. He argues that this election was also a vindication for quantitative social science, as the eventual results confirmed what mathematical models had predicted contrary to the instincts of pundits.



President Obama's victory today was important for many reasons.

First and foremost, the American people will continue to live under the Affordable Care Act which Mitt Romney had promised to repeal on his first day of the Presidency. [Obamacare](#) has flaws but it extends healthcare to cover almost all Americans and placed some brakes on the escalating health cost that even now absorb almost a fifth of US GDP.

Second, an experienced President without the shadow of re-election will be able to take a calmer view of foreign affairs than a newcomer. There are major challenges on the horizon especially over Iran. Mitt Romney displayed a naivety and belligerence that increased risks. Although Obama also pushed the anti-China button, Romney's vow to label China a currency manipulator would be very damaging.

Third, the challenger's insistence that long-run [deficit](#) problems can be dealt with by spending cuts alone flies in the face of economic reason. The deficit requires a medium run plan to raise tax revenues and decreasing expenditures. Obama's plans to allow the Bush tax cuts to elapse for the richest households seems eminently reasonable given the stunning rises in US [inequality](#) over the last 40 years. Now he must be bolder in removing middle class tax deductions and reforming social security.

Is this too unfair on Romney? He governed Massachusetts from the centre even passing an early version of Obamacare. But in the primaries and until the weeks of the campaign he tacked far to the Tea Party right. Multiple policy flip flops made it unclear what he really believed.

But there was another lesser known winner last night: quantitative social science! Media reports of how the race was nail-bitingly close were just plain wrong. Obama has been clear favourite for a long time. Although the national polls have been tight, Obama maintained a slim but significant lead in the swing states like Ohio that are crucial to obtaining enough Electoral College votes to retain the Oval Office. [Nate Silver](#) of the New York Times has been running purely quantitative models based on pooling state-level voting intentions to predict electoral college votes. Even after the disastrous first Presidential debate, Silver still put Obama's chances of winning at a healthy 61%. On election morning he had Obama on a 91% chance of winning.

The lesson is to ignore pontificating from highly paid pundits using their "gut" in sports, business, and politics. Put your faith in the numbers.

Vive President Obama, Vive stats.

Note: This article gives the views of the author, and not the position of the British Politics and Policy blog, nor of the London School of Economics. Please read our [comments policy](#) before posting.

About the author

John Van Reenen is Director of the Centre for Economic Performance and a Professor at the London School of Economics

You may also be interested in the following posts (automatically generated):

1. [Top experts offer their reactions to the US election results \(20.4\)](#)
2. [Even if the Liberal Democrats vote to oust the Conservatives before 2015 a new general election is still unlikely \(15.2\)](#)
3. [Book Review: 101 Ways to Win an Election \(15.2\)](#)
4. [Despite Labour's convincing victory in the Feltham and Heston by-election, there is no strong trend in the party's favour. \(13.6\)](#)