Does the stress of politics kill? An observational study comparing premature mortality of elected leaders to runner-ups in national elections of 8 countries

Journal:	*BMJ*
Manuscript ID:	BMJ.2015.028649
Article Type:	Christmas
BMJ Journal:	BMJ
Date Submitted by the Author:	11-Aug-2015
Complete List of Authors:	Abola, Matthew; Case Western Reserve University School of Medicine, Olenski, Andrew; Harvard Medical School, Health Care Policy Jena, Anupam; Harvard Medical School, Health Care Policy
Keywords:	premature mortality, politics

Does the stress of politics kill? An observational study comparing premature mortality of elected leaders to runner-ups in national elections of 8 countries

Matthew V. Abola, B.A.[1], Andrew R. Olenski, B.A.,[2] Anupam B. Jena, M.D, Ph.D.[3]

[1] Medical student, Case Western Reserve University School of Medicine, 2109 Adelbert Rd., Cleveland, OH 44106. Phone: 216-286-4923; Email: mva9@case.edu.

[2] Research assistant, Department of Health Care Policy, Harvard Medical School, 180 Longwood Avenue, Boston, MA 02115. Email: olenski@hcp.med.harvard.edu.

[2] Associate Professor, Department of Health Care Policy, Harvard Medical School, 180 Longwood Avenue, Boston, MA 02115; Tel: 617-432-8322; Department of Medicine, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA; and National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge, MA. Email: jena@hcp.med.harvard.edu.

Corresponding author from which reprints should be requested:

Anupam Jena, M.D., Ph.D.
Department of Health Care Policy
Harvard Medical School
180 Longwood Avenue, Boston, MA 02115
Tel: 617-432-8322
Fax: 617-432-0173
Email: jena@hcp.med.harvard.edu.

Word count: 1763

ABSTRACT

Objectives: To determine whether the stress of political life and national leadership is associated with premature mortality by studying survival differences among those elected to national public office versus runner-up candidates in elections.

Design: Observational study.

Setting: Historical survival data on winning and runner-up candidates in prime minister or presidential elections in Australia, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Spain, United Kingdom, and the United States.

Participants: Winning and runner-up political candidates.

Main outcome measures: We assembled data on winning and runner-up candidates for prime minister or presidential elections using online sources. Premature death for a candidate was defined by whether the observed number of years alive after election was less than would be expected for an average individual of the same age and sex as the candidate during the year of election, based on historical French and British life tables. We compared premature mortality rates between winning and runner-up candidates within the same election under the assumption that within a given election, both candidates would be of similar socioeconomic status, have similar access to health care, and therefore have similar baseline premature mortality risk. We compared premature mortality rates between both groups using a chi-square test. To account for the fact that several candidates appeared in multiple elections, we estimated a candidate-level linear probability model of premature mortality as a function of whether a candidate won an election, clustering standard errors at the candidate level. We also estimated a candidate-level conditional fixed effects logistic model of premature mortality which included

election-level fixed effects. In this approach, the association between being elected and premature mortality was identified only among those elections in which one candidate died prematurely and the other did not.

Results: In a sample of 322 elections, winning candidates were more likely to die prematurely compared to runner-up candidates (132/322 (41.0%) vs 107/322 (33.2%), absolute difference 7.8% (95% CI 0.3% to 15.2%), p=0.04 for chi-square comparison). In logistic analysis with election fixed-effects, winning candidates were more likely to die prematurely compared to runner-up candidates (adjusted premature mortality 59.3% (95% CI 47.3% to 71.2%) vs 40.7% (95% CI 30.3% to 51.2%), absolute adjusted difference 18.5% (95% CI 5.0% to 32.1%).

Conclusions: Those elected to prime minister or president face higher risk of premature mortality compared to runner-up candidates in national elections.

What this paper adds?

What is already known on this subject? It has been suggested that the stress of political life may lead to accelerated aging and premature mortality. However, existing studies on the issue have focused on U.S. presidents alone and findings have been mixed. A historical analysis of premature mortality among world leaders has not been conducted.

What this study adds. We assembled historical election data from eight countries and compared rates of premature mortality between national leaders and runner-up candidates under the assumption that the baseline risk of premature mortality between winning and losing candidates would be similar, because both groups would presumably be of similar socioeconomic status and have similar access to health care. Any observed differences in premature mortality between groups may therefore be plausibly attributed to differences in mortality risk created by the political stress of leading a nation. Analyzing data from 322 national elections over nearly 2 centuries, we found that being elected to public office was associated with a substantive increase in premature mortality compared to runner-up candidates in these elections.

The Corresponding Author has the right to grant on behalf of all authors and does grant on behalf of all authors, an exclusive licence (or non exclusive for government employees) on a worldwide basis to the BMJ Publishing Group Ltd to permit this article (if accepted) to be published in BMJ editions and any other BMJPGL products and sublicences such use and exploit all subsidiary rights, as set out in our licence.

All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form at www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf (available on request from the corresponding author) and declare: ABJ had support from the Office of the Director, National Institutes of Health (NIH Early Independence Award, Grant 1DP5OD017897-01) for the submitted work; no financial relationships with any organisations that might have an interest in the submitted work in the previous 3 years; no other relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced the submitted work.

The research conducted was independent of any involvement from the sponsors of the study. Study sponsors were not involved in study design, data interpretation, writing, or the decision to submit the article for publication.

Transparency statement: Dr. Jena affirms that the manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the study being reported; that no important aspects of the study have been omitted; and that any discrepancies are disclosed.

Authors contributions: All authors contributed to the design and conduct of the study, data collection and management, analysis interpretation of the data; and preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript.

Data sharing: no additional data available.

INTRODUCTION

Election to public office has been suggested to lead to premature aging due to stress of leadership and political life. In an examination of medical records of U.S. presidents dating back to President Theodore Roosevelt – including information on physical activity, diet, blood pressure, and lifestyle habits such as smoking – one analysis suggested that U.S. presidents may age at twice the rate of the overall U.S. population.[1,2] A subsequent study which compared actual survival of U.S. presidents to average life expectancy in the overall population at the time of each president's election found no difference in mortality between presidents and others.[3] However, although this finding could support the view that nationally elected leaders do not die prematurely, it may just as well suggest the opposite. Given their higher socioeconomic status, one would have expected presidents to live longer than the general population based on known inverse associations between social class and mortality.[4] The fact that they do not live longer may suggest premature mortality compared to others of similar socioeconomic status. In other words, when the correct comparisons are made, one may find that the stress of politics does kill.

We explored whether the stress of politics leads to premature mortality by analyzing historical data on survival of nationally elected leaders from 8 countries. Rather than compare survival of these leaders to the overall population, who may not be comparable, we compared their survival to runner-up candidates within the same national election, who would arguably be of similar socioeconomic status and have similar access to health care (and therefore have similar baseline mortality risk) but not face the same stress of being elected to national leadership.

METHODS

Data sources and overview of approach

We assembled data on winning and runner-up candidates for national elections occurring in Australia (prime minister (PM) elections, 1901 to 1983), Canada (PM elections, 1867 to 1988), France (presidential elections, 1873 to 1988), Germany (presidential elections, 1919 to 1999), Italy (PM elections, 1861 to 1992), Spain (PM elections, 1876 to 1989), United Kingdom (PM elections, 1722 to 1987), and the United States (presidential elections, 1789 to 1984), using online sources. For both winning and runner-up candidates in each election, we identified age at time of election and age at death, the difference of which was the observed number of years a candidate lived from the time the election was held. Elections in which either elected or runner-up candidates were alive on August 1, 2015 were excluded.

For both winning and runner-up candidates, we defined a given candidate as dying prematurely if the observed number of years alive after election was less than would be expected for an average individual in the population of the same age and sex as the candidate. Based on a prior study,[3] life expectancies in the average population (conditional on age and sex) were obtained from life tables of English civilian males and females for elections occurring during 1841-1983 and from life tables of French civilian males and females prior to 1841.[5,6] The eight countries that we analyzed were chosen because of similar historical population survival as British and French populations (for which historical lifetables dating back to the 18th and 19th centuries were available).[3]

We compared premature mortality rates between winning and runner-up candidates within the same election under the assumption that within a given election,

both winning and runner-up candidates would be of similar socioeconomic status and have similar access to health care, two factors that could potentially confound estimated differences in premature mortality if one simply compared the average observed number of years alive after election among elected candidates versus life expectancy (conditional on age/sex) in the general population. Similar approaches to ours have been used in prior studies which compare mortality among winners and losers of specific events to identify the effect of winning that event on mortality (e.g., comparison of mortality among actors winning versus losing an Academy Award, or "Oscar", nomination; baseball players inducted into the Hall of Fame; and Nobel Prize winners).[7-9]

Analysis

We matched winning and runner-up candidates within each election and began by comparing overall rates of premature mortality (binary variable) between both groups using a chi-square test. To account for the fact that several candidates were elected more than once, we then estimated a candidate-level bivariate linear probability model of premature mortality as a function of whether a candidate won or lost an election (binary variable) and clustered standard errors at the candidate level, thereby treating these observations as non-independent. Finally, we estimated a candidate-level conditional fixed effects logistic model of premature mortality as function of whether a candidate won an election and election-level fixed effects (i.e., indicator variables equal to one for a given election). In this approach, the association between being elected and premature mortality was identified only among those elections in which one candidate died prematurely and the other did not (generally, observations in which the outcome does not vary within a category – e.g., elections in which both candidates die prematurely – are

dropped from logistic models). Standard errors were again clustered at the candidate level. We reported adjusted probabilities of premature mortality for winning and losing candidates by taking predicted values from the logistic regression model holding all covariates except for winning status at their mean values.

All data were publicly available and the study was exempt from human subjects review at Harvard Medical School. The 95% confidence interval around reported estimates reflects 0.025 in each tail or P≤0.05.

RESULTS

Our sample included 322 elections (**Table 1** contains 65 UK elections; full set of elections available in online supplement **eTable 1**), the earliest of which was the election of prime minister in the United Kingdom in 1722. In that election, the winning candidate Robert Walpole did not die prematurely; he was 46 at the time of election and remained alive 22 years, which was coincidentally identical to the average remaining life expectancy of a 46 year-old male in 1722, 22 years. The losing candidate Sir William Wyndham was 34 at the time of election and lived an additional 18 years, which was less than the expected 30 years of remaining life for the average 34 year-old male in 1722 (i.e., the candidate died prematurely).

On average, winning candidates were more likely to die prematurely compared to runner-up candidates (132/322 (41.0%) vs 107/322 (33.2%), absolute difference 7.8% (95% CI 0.3% to 15.2%), p=0.04 for chi-square comparison) (**Table 2**). Clustering standard errors to account for the fact that several candidates appeared in multiple elections would only be expected to alter our 95% confidence intervals and not the point estimates themselves; doing so did not substantively affect our results (adjusted

difference in premature mortality between winning and losing candidates 7.8% (95% CI 0.2% to 15.7%). In logistic analysis, winning candidates continued to be more likely to die prematurely compared to runner-up candidates (adjusted premature mortality 59.3% (95% CI 47.3% to 71.2%) vs 40.7% (95% CI 30.3% to 51.2%), absolute adjusted difference 18.5% (95% CI 5.0% to 32.1%).

DISCUSSION

It has been suggested that the stress of political life may lead to accelerated aging and premature mortality. We assembled historical election data from eight countries and compared rates of premature mortality between national leaders and runner-up candidates under the assumption that the baseline risk of premature mortality between winning and runner-up candidates would be similar, because both groups would presumably be of similar socioeconomic status and have similar access to health care. Any observed differences in premature mortality between groups may therefore be plausibly attributed to differences in mortality risk created by the political stress of leading a nation. Analyzing data from 322 national elections over nearly 2 centuries, we found that being elected to public office was associated with a substantive increase in premature mortality compared to runner-up candidates in these elections.

Our study contributes to prior analyses of mortality among U.S. presidents and vice presidents and may help explain why prior findings have been mixed.[3,8] One study of U.S. presidents found no difference in survival after election compared to males of the same age in the general population.[3] One might expect, however, that presidents (or those in the same socioeconomic strata) would have substantially lower mortality than the general population; a failure to detect a difference in mortality could therefore be

evidence that presidency is associated with higher-than-expected mortality. It is also possible that analysis of a single country's elections may be underpowered. Another study that compared mortality among U.S. presidents and vice presidents versus presidential and vice presidential candidates found that election to office was associated with earlier death among both presidents and vice presidents.[8] This study did not account for differences in age at election between winning and runner-up candidates, which may confound analysis if winning candidates were on average older than runner-up candidates and had lower remaining life expectancy. Moreover, the study was limited to an analysis of U.S. elections alone.

Our study had several limitations. First, although our study included data from 8 countries, our results may not generalize to other countries. The countries that we analyzed were chosen on the basis of having similar historical population survival as Britain and France, two countries for which reliable lifetables were available as far back as the 18th century (e.g., France). Second, we were unable to analyze whether the association between premature mortality and being elected to office differed by country. In both politics and statistics, power is critical. In post-hoc power calculations, the statistical power to detect an absolute percentage difference in premature mortality of 7.8% (our estimated difference in premature mortality rates between winning and runner-up candidates) in a single-country comparison of 40 winning and 40 runner-up candidates was only 18%. Third, we compared premature mortality among winning and runner-up candidates under the assumption that both groups would differ only in whether a candidate was elected or not, rather than differences in baseline premature mortality risk. However, it is possible that both groups, who by definition are heavily involved in

political life, may experience higher premature mortality rates than individuals in similar socioeconomic strata who are not involved in politics. Our approach may therefore bias our estimates towards the null. Mortality among winning candidates may be more suitably compared to others of similar socioeconomic status not involved in politics. More broadly, our findings reflect associations that may be confounded.

In summary, in a large sample of national elections, we found that candidates elected to prime minister or president had substantially higher rates of premature mortality compared to runner-up candidates. Our findings suggest that the stress of politics could lead to premature mortality.

REFERENCES

1. Park M. Advice to Obama on battling presidential aging. *CNN* 2009; http://www.cnn.com/2009/HEALTH/01/06/presidential.health.aging/index.html?_s=PM:HEALTH. Accessed August 4, 2015.

2. Hanna J. Do presidents age faster in office? *CNN* 2011; http://www.cnn.com/2009/HEALTH/01/06/presidential.health.aging/index.html?_s=PM:HEALTH. Accessed August 4, 2015.

3. Olshansky SJ. Aging of US presidents. *Jama.* Dec 7 2011;306(21):2328-2329.

4. Marmot MG, Smith GD, Stansfeld S, et al. Health inequalities among British civil servants: the Whitehall II study. *Lancet.* Jun 8 1991;337(8754):1387-1393.

5. The Human Mortality Database. U.K., England, and Wales Civilian Population. 2015; http://www.mortality.org/cgi-bin/hmd/country.php?cntr=GBRCENW&level=1. Accessed June 6, 2015.

6. The Human Mortality Database. France, Civilian population. 2015; http://www.mortality.org/cgi-bin/hmd/country.php?cntr=FRACNP&level=1. Accessed June 6, 2015.

7. Redelmeier DA, Singh SM. Survival in Academy Award-winning actors and actresses. *Annals of internal medicine.* May 15 2001;134(10):955-962.

8. Link BG, Carpiano RM, Weden MM. Can Honorific Awards Give Us Clues about the Connection between Socioeconomic Status and Mortality? *American Sociological Review.* February 20, 2013 2013.

9. Rablen MD, Oswald AJ. Mortality and immortality: the Nobel Prize as an experiment into the effect of status upon longevity. *J Health Econ.* Dec 2008;27(6):1462-1471.

TABLE 1—Premature deaths among winning and runner-up candidates in UK prime minister elections, 1722-1987

Country	Election	Candidate name		Age at election		Life Years Expected/Observed		Premature death (yes/no)	
		Winner	Loser	Winner	Loser	Winner	Loser	Winner	Loser
UK	1722	R Walpole	S Wyndham	46	34	22 / 22	30 / 18	No	No
UK	1727	R Walpole	H John	51	49	19 / 17	20 / 24	No	Yes
UK	1734	R Walpole	H John	58	56	14 / 10	16 / 17	No	Yes
UK	1741	R Walpole	W Pulteney	65	57	11 / 3	15 / 23	No	Yes
UK	1747	H Pelham	(Unopposed)	53	n/a	18 / 6	n/a	No	n/a
UK	1754	T Pelham-Holles	(Unopposed)	61	n/a	13 / 14	n/a	Yes	n/a
UK	1761	T Pelham-Holles	(Unopposed)	68	n/a	9 / 7	n/a	No	n/a
UK	1768	A FitzRoy	M Rockingham	33	38	31 / 42	28 / 14	Yes	No
UK	1774	F North	M Rockingham	42	44	25 / 18	23 / 8	No	No
UK	1780	L North	M Rockingham	48	50	21 / 12	19 / 2	No	No
UK	1784	W Pitt	C Fox	25	35	36 / 21	30 / 22	No	No
UK	1790	W Pitt	C Fox	31	41	33 / 15	25 / 16	No	No
UK	1796	W Pitt	C Fox	37	47	28 / 9	21 / 10	No	No
UK	1801	H Addington	C Fox	44	52	23 / 42	18 / 5	Yes	No
UK	1802	H Addington	C Fox	45	53	23 / 41	18 / 4	Yes	No
UK	1806	L Grenville	D Portland	47	68	21 / 27	9 / 3	Yes	No
UK	1807	D Portland	L Grenville	69	48	9 / 2	21 / 26	No	Yes
UK	1812	E Liverpool	L Grenville	42	53	25 / 16	18 / 21	No	Yes
UK	1818	E Liverpool	E Grey	48	54	21 / 10	17 / 27	No	Yes
UK	1820	E Liverpool	E Grey	50	56	19 / 8	16 / 25	No	Yes
UK	1826	E Liverpool	M Lansdowne	56	46	16 / 2	22 / 36	No	Yes
UK	1830	D Wellington	M Lansdowne	61	50	13 / 22	20 / 32	Yes	Yes
UK	1831	E Grey	D Wellington	67	62	10 / 14	12 / 21	Yes	Yes
UK	1832	E Grey	D Wellington	68	63	9 / 13	12 / 20	Yes	Yes
UK	1835	T Melbourne	R Peel	56	47	16 / 13	22 / 15	No	No
UK	1837	T Melbourne	R Peel	58	49	14 / 11	19 / 13	No	No
UK	1841	R Peel	W Lamb	46	62	23 / 16	13 / 7	No	No
UK	1847	J Russell	E Smith-Stanley	55	48	15 / 30	20 / 22	Yes	Yes
UK	1857	H Temple	E Smith-Stanley	73	58	7 / 7	15 / 12	No	No
UK	1859	H Temple	E Smith-Stanley	75	60	7 / 5	14 / 10	No	No
UK	1865	H Temple	E Smith-Stanley	80	66	5 / 0	10 / 4	No	No
UK	1868	W Gladstone	B Disraeli	59	64	14 / 29	12 / 12	Yes	No
UK	1874	B Disraeli	W Gladstone	70	65	8 / 6	10 / 23	No	Yes
UK	1880	S Cavendish	B Disraeli	47	76	21 / 27	6 / 0	Yes	No
UK	1885	W Gladstone	R Cecil	76	55	6 / 12	16 / 18	Yes	Yes
UK	1886	R Cecil	W Gladstone	56	77	15 / 17	5 / 11	Yes	Yes
UK	1892	R Cecil	W Gladstone	62	83	11 / 11	4 / 5	No	Yes
UK	1895	R Cecil	A Primrose	65	48	10 / 8	20 / 34	No	Yes
UK	1900	R Cecil	S Campbell-Bannerman	70	64	8 / 3	11 / 7	No	No
UK	1906	S Campbell-Bannerman	A Balfour	70	58	8 / 1	15 / 23	No	Yes
UK	1910	H Asquith	A Balfour	58	62	15 / 17	13 / 19	Yes	Yes
UK	1918	A Law	D George	60	55	14 / 5	17 / 27	No	Yes
UK	1922	A Law	J Clynes	64	53	12 / 1	19 / 27	No	Yes

UK	1923	S Baldwin	J MacDonald	56	57	17 / 24	17 / 14	Yes	No
UK	1924	S Baldwin	J MacDonald	57	58	16 / 23	16 / 13	Yes	No
UK	1929	J MacDonald	S Baldwin	63	62	12 / 8	12 / 18	No	Yes
UK	1931	S Baldwin	A Henderson	64	68	12 / 16	10 / 4	Yes	No
UK	1935	S Baldwin	C Attlee	68	52	10 / 12	20 / 32	Yes	Yes
UK	1945	C Attlee	S Spencer-Churchill	52	71	21 / 32	9 / 19	Yes	Yes
UK	1950	C Attlee	S Spencer-Churchill	57	76	17 / 27	6 / 14	Yes	Yes
UK	1951	S Spencer-Churchill	C Attlee	77	58	6 / 13	16 / 26	Yes	Yes
UK	1955	A Eden	C Attlee	58	62	16 / 21	14 / 22	Yes	Yes
UK	1959	H Macmillan	H Gaitskell	65	53	12 / 27	20 / 3	Yes	No
UK	1964	H Wilson	A Douglas-Home	48	61	25 / 31	15 / 31	Yes	Yes
UK	1966	H Wilson	S Heath	50	50	23 / 29	23 / 39	Yes	Yes
UK	1970	S Heath	H Wilson	54	54	20 / 35	20 / 25	Yes	Yes
UK	1979	M Thatcher	L Callaghan	54	67	20 / 33	11 / 25	Yes	Yes
UK	1983	M Thatcher	M Foot	58	70	18 / 29	10 / 26	Yes	Yes
UK	1987	M Thatcher	N Kinnock	62	45	16 / 25	-	Yes	n/a

Notes: Expected years of life following national election were based on an average individual of the same age and sex as the candidate, taken from historical life-tables described in the Methods. Premature death was defined by whether a candidate lived strictly less than what would be expected for an average individual in the population of the same age and sex as the candidate (i.e., observed < expected life expectancy).Hyphen reflects candidates who were alive as of August 1, 2015.

TABLE 2—Differences in premature mortality between candidates elected to public office and runner-up candidates in national elections of 8 countries

Candidate	Premature mortality	Absolute difference, % (95% CI)
Unadjusted	**No. (%)**	
Winner	132/322 (41.0%)	7.8% (0.3% to 15.2%)
Runner-up	107/322 (33.2%)	ref
Linear probability model with candidate clustering	**% (95% CI)**	
Winner	41.0% (5.0% to 32.1%)	7.8% (0.2% to 15.7%)
Runner-up	33.2% (27.0% to 39.5%)	ref
Logistic model with candidate clustering and election fixed-effects	**% (95% CI)**	
Winner	59.3% (47.3 to 71.2%)	18.5% (5.0% to 32.1%)
Runner-up	40.7% (30.3% to 51.2%)	ref

Notes: Table shows differences in premature mortality between winning and runner-up candidates. Premature mortality was defined as a binary variable according to whether a candidate died earlier than would be expected of an individual in the average population of the same age and sex as the candidate in the year of election. Because several candidates were present in more than one election, we estimated a candidate-level linear probability model of premature mortality as a function of whether a candidate won a given election, clustering standard errors at the candidate level. In addition, we estimated a conditional fixed effects logistic model with election-level fixed effects and clustering of standard errors at the candidate level. In the logistic model, the estimated association between winning an election and premature mortality was identified from 135 elections in which one candidate died prematurely and the other did not. In logistic fixed effect models, those observations in which the outcome does not vary by category are dropped from the regression (e.g., elections in which both candidates died prematurely or neither died prematurely perfectly predict the outcome of premature mortality and are therefore dropped in the estimation).

eTABLE 1—Premature deaths among winning and runner-up candidates in national elections of 8 countries

Country	Election	Candidate name		Age at election		Life Years Expected/Observed		Premature death (yes/no)	
		Winner	Loser	Winner	Loser	Winner	Loser	Winner	Loser
UK	1722	R Walpole	S Wyndham	46	34	22 / 22	30 / 18	No	No
UK	1727	R Walpole	H John	51	49	19 / 17	20 / 24	No	Yes
UK	1734	R Walpole	H John	58	56	14 / 10	16 / 17	No	Yes
UK	1741	R Walpole	W Pulteney	65	57	11 / 3	15 / 23	No	Yes
UK	1747	H Pelham	(Unopposed)	53	n/a	18 / 6	n/a	No	n/a
UK	1754	T Pelham-Holles	(Unopposed)	61	n/a	13 / 14	n/a	Yes	n/a
UK	1761	T Pelham-Holles	(Unopposed)	68	n/a	9 / 7	n/a	No	n/a
UK	1768	A FitzRoy	M Rockingham	33	38	31 / 42	28 / 14	Yes	No
UK	1774	F North	M Rockingham	42	44	25 / 18	23 / 8	No	No
UK	1780	L North	M Rockingham	48	50	21 / 12	19 / 2	No	No
UK	1784	W Pitt	C Fox	25	35	36 / 21	30 / 22	No	No
UK	1790	W Pitt	C Fox	31	41	33 / 15	25 / 16	No	No
UK	1796	W Pitt	C Fox	37	47	28 / 9	21 / 10	No	No
UK	1801	H Addington	C Fox	44	52	23 / 42	18 / 5	Yes	No
UK	1802	H Addington	C Fox	45	53	23 / 41	18 / 4	Yes	No
UK	1806	L Grenville	D Portland	47	68	21 / 27	9 / 3	Yes	No
UK	1807	D Portland	L Grenville	69	48	9 / 2	21 / 26	No	Yes
UK	1812	E Liverpool	L Grenville	42	53	25 / 16	18 / 21	No	Yes
UK	1818	E Liverpool	E Grey	48	54	21 / 10	17 / 27	No	Yes
UK	1820	E Liverpool	E Grey	50	56	19 / 8	16 / 25	No	Yes
UK	1826	E Liverpool	M Lansdowne	56	46	16 / 2	22 / 36	No	Yes
UK	1830	D Wellington	M Lansdowne	61	50	13 / 22	20 / 32	Yes	Yes
UK	1831	E Grey	D Wellington	67	62	10 / 14	12 / 21	Yes	Yes
UK	1832	E Grey	D Wellington	68	63	9 / 13	12 / 20	Yes	Yes
UK	1835	T Melbourne	R Peel	56	47	16 / 13	22 / 15	No	No
UK	1837	T Melbourne	R Peel	58	49	14 / 11	19 / 13	No	No
UK	1841	R Peel	W Lamb	46	62	23 / 16	13 / 7	No	No
UK	1847	J Russell	E Smith-Stanley	55	48	15 / 30	20 / 22	Yes	Yes
UK	1857	H Temple	E Smith-Stanley	73	58	7 / 7	15 / 12	No	No
UK	1859	H Temple	E Smith-Stanley	75	60	7 / 5	14 / 10	No	No
UK	1865	H Temple	E Smith-Stanley	80	66	5 / 0	10 / 4	No	No
UK	1868	W Gladstone	B Disraeli	59	64	14 / 29	12 / 12	Yes	No
UK	1874	B Disraeli	W Gladstone	70	65	8 / 6	10 / 23	No	Yes
UK	1880	S Cavendish	B Disraeli	47	76	21 / 27	6 / 0	Yes	No
UK	1885	W Gladstone	R Cecil	76	55	6 / 12	16 / 18	Yes	Yes
UK	1886	R Cecil	W Gladstone	56	77	15 / 17	5 / 11	Yes	Yes
UK	1892	R Cecil	W Gladstone	62	83	11 / 11	4 / 5	No	Yes
UK	1895	R Cecil	A Primrose	65	48	10 / 8	20 / 34	No	Yes
UK	1900	R Cecil	S Campbell-Bannerman	70	64	8 / 3	11 / 7	No	No
UK	1906	S Campbell-Bannerman	A Balfour	70	58	8 / 1	15 / 23	No	Yes
UK	1910	H Asquith	A Balfour	58	62	15 / 17	13 / 19	Yes	Yes
UK	1918	A Law	D George	60	55	14 / 5	17 / 27	No	Yes
UK	1922	A Law	J Clynes	64	53	12 / 1	19 / 27	No	Yes

UK	1923	S Baldwin	J MacDonald	56	57	17 / 24	17 / 14	Yes	No
UK	1924	S Baldwin	J MacDonald	57	58	16 / 23	16 / 13	Yes	No
UK	1929	J MacDonald	S Baldwin	63	62	12 / 8	12 / 18	No	Yes
UK	1931	S Baldwin	A Henderson	64	68	12 / 16	10 / 4	Yes	No
UK	1935	S Baldwin	C Attlee	68	52	10 / 12	20 / 32	Yes	Yes
UK	1945	C Attlee	S Spencer-Churchill	52	71	21 / 32	9 / 19	Yes	Yes
UK	1950	C Attlee	S Spencer-Churchill	57	76	17 / 27	6 / 14	Yes	Yes
UK	1951	S Spencer-Churchill	C Attlee	77	58	6 / 13	16 / 26	Yes	Yes
UK	1955	A Eden	C Attlee	58	62	16 / 21	14 / 22	Yes	Yes
UK	1959	H Macmillan	H Gaitskell	65	53	12 / 27	20 / 3	Yes	No
UK	1964	H Wilson	A Douglas-Home	48	61	25 / 31	15 / 31	Yes	Yes
UK	1966	H Wilson	S Heath	50	50	23 / 29	23 / 39	Yes	Yes
UK	1970	S Heath	H Wilson	54	54	20 / 35	20 / 25	Yes	Yes
UK	1979	M Thatcher	L Callaghan	54	67	20 / 33	11 / 25	Yes	Yes
UK	1983	M Thatcher	M Foot	58	70	18 / 29	10 / 26	Yes	Yes
UK	1987	M Thatcher	N Kinnock	62	45	16 / 25	-	Yes	n/a
Australia	1901	E Barton	G Reid	52	56	18 / 18	16 / 17	No	Yes
Australia	1903	A Deakin	G Reid	47	58	22 / 16	15 / 15	No	No
Australia	1906	G Reid	C Watson	61	39	13 / 12	27 / 35	No	Yes
Australia	1910	A Fisher	A Deakin	48	54	21 / 18	17 / 9	No	No
Australia	1913	J Cook	A Fisher	53	51	18 / 33	19 / 15	Yes	No
Australia	1914	A Fisher	J Cook	52	54	18 / 14	17 / 32	No	Yes
Australia	1917	B Hughes	F Tudor	55	51	16 / 35	19 / 4	Yes	No
Australia	1919	B Hughes	F Tudor	57	53	15 / 33	18 / 2	Yes	No
Australia	1922	M Charlton	B Hughes	56	60	18 / 26	15 / 30	Yes	Yes
Australia	1925	S Bruce	M Charlton	42	59	29 / 42	16 / 23	Yes	Yes
Australia	1928	S Bruce	J Scullin	45	52	27 / 39	21 / 24	Yes	Yes
Australia	1929	J Scullin	S Bruce	53	46	20 / 23	25 / 38	Yes	Yes
Australia	1931	J Lyons	J Scullin	52	55	22 / 7	19 / 21	No	Yes
Australia	1934	J Lyons	J Scullin	55	58	19 / 4	17 / 18	No	Yes
Australia	1937	J Lyons	J Curtin	58	52	17 / 1	21 / 8	No	No
Australia	1940	R Menzies	J Curtin	46	55	26 / 37	19 / 5	Yes	No
Australia	1943	J Curtin	A Fadden	58	49	16 / 2	23 / 30	No	Yes
Australia	1946	B Chifley	R Menzies	61	52	15 / 4	21 / 31	No	Yes
Australia	1949	R Menzies	B Chifley	55	64	19 / 28	13 / 1	Yes	No
Australia	1951	R Menzies	B Chifley	57	65	17 / 26	12 / 0	Yes	No
Australia	1954	R Menzies	H Evatt	60	60	16 / 23	16 / 11	Yes	No
Australia	1955	R Menzies	H Evatt	61	61	15 / 22	15 / 10	Yes	No
Australia	1958	R Menzies	H Evatt	64	64	13 / 19	13 / 7	Yes	No
Australia	1961	R Menzies	A Calwell	67	65	11 / 16	13 / 11	Yes	No
Australia	1963	R Menzies	A Calwell	69	67	10 / 14	11 / 9	Yes	No
Australia	1966	H Holt	A Calwell	58	70	17 / 1	9 / 6	No	No
Australia	1969	J Gorton	G Whitlam	58	53	17 / 32	20 / 45	Yes	Yes
Australia	1972	G Whitlam	W McMahon	56	64	19 / 42	13 / 16	Yes	Yes
Australia	1974	G Whitlam	B Snedden	58	48	17 / 40	25 / 12	Yes	No
Australia	1975	M Fraser	G Whitlam	45	59	28 / 39	17 / 39	Yes	Yes
Australia	1977	M Fraser	G Whitlam	47	61	27 / 37	16 / 37	Yes	Yes

Australia	1980	M Fraser	B Hayden	50	47	25 / 34	-	Yes	n/a
Australia	1983	B Hawke	M Fraser	54	53	-	23 / 31	n/a	Yes
Canada	1867	J Macdonald	G Brown	52	49	18 / 24	20 / 12	Yes	No
Canada	1872	J Macdonald	E Blake	57	39	16 / 19	28 / 39	Yes	Yes
Canada	1874	A Mackenzie	J Macdonald	51	59	20 / 19	15 / 17	No	Yes
Canada	1878	J Macdonald	A Mackenzie	63	56	12 / 13	16 / 14	Yes	No
Canada	1882	J Macdonald	E Blake	67	49	10 / 9	21 / 29	No	Yes
Canada	1887	J Macdonald	E Blake	72	54	7 / 4	17 / 24	No	Yes
Canada	1891	J Macdonald	W Laurier	76	50	5 / 0	19 / 27	No	Yes
Canada	1896	W Laurier	C Tupper	55	75	17 / 22	6 / 19	Yes	Yes
Canada	1900	W Laurier	C Tupper	59	79	13 / 18	4 / 15	Yes	Yes
Canada	1904	W Laurier	R Borden	63	50	12 / 14	20 / 32	Yes	Yes
Canada	1908	W Laurier	R Borden	67	54	9 / 10	17 / 28	Yes	Yes
Canada	1911	R Borden	W Laurier	57	70	15 / 25	8 / 7	Yes	No
Canada	1917	R Borden	W Laurier	63	76	11 / 19	5 / 1	Yes	No
Canada	1921	W King	T Crerar	47	45	26 / 28	28 / 53	Yes	Yes
Canada	1925	A Meighen	W King	51	51	23 / 35	23 / 24	Yes	Yes
Canada	1926	W King	A Meighen	52	52	22 / 23	22 / 34	Yes	Yes
Canada	1930	R Bennett	W King	60	56	16 / 16	19 / 19	No	No
Canada	1935	W King	R Bennett	61	65	16 / 14	13 / 11	No	No
Canada	1940	W King	R Manion	66	59	12 / 9	17 / 2	No	No
Canada	1945	W King	J Bracken	71	62	10 / 4	15 / 23	No	Yes
Canada	1949	L Laurent	G Drew	66	55	13 / 25	20 / 23	Yes	Yes
Canada	1953	L Laurent	G Drew	71	59	10 / 20	17 / 19	Yes	Yes
Canada	1957	J Diefenbaker	L Laurent	61	75	16 / 22	8 / 16	Yes	Yes
Canada	1958	J Diefenbaker	L Pearson	63	61	15 / 20	16 / 14	Yes	No
Canada	1962	J Diefenbaker	L Pearson	67	65	12 / 16	14 / 10	Yes	No
Canada	1963	L Pearson	J Diefenbaker	66	68	13 / 9	12 / 15	No	Yes
Canada	1965	L Pearson	J Diefenbaker	68	70	12 / 7	11 / 13	No	Yes
Canada	1968	P Trudeau	R Stanfield	48	54	26 / 32	21 / 35	Yes	Yes
Canada	1972	P Trudeau	R Stanfield	53	58	22 / 27	18 / 31	Yes	Yes
Canada	1974	P Trudeau	R Stanfield	55	60	21 / 25	17 / 29	Yes	Yes
Canada	1979	J Clark	P Trudeau	39	60	-	18 / 20	n/a	Yes
Canada	1980	P Trudeau	J Clark	61	39	17 / 19	-	Yes	n/a
Canada	1984	B Mulroney	J Turner	45	55	-	22 / 31	n/a	Yes
Canada	1988	B Mulroney	J Turner	49	59	-	19 / 27	n/a	Yes
France	1873	P Mac-Mahon	J Grevy	64	66	11 / 21	10 / 18	Yes	Yes
France	1879	J Grevy	A Chanzy	71	56	7 / 13	16 / 3	Yes	No
France	1887	S Carnot	F Saussier	50	59	20 / 6	14 / 18	No	Yes
France	1894	J Casimir-Perier	H Brisson	46	59	23 / 13	14 / 17	No	Yes
France	1895	F Faure	H Brisson	53	60	18 / 5	13 / 16	No	Yes
France	1899	E Loubet	F Meline	60	61	13 / 30	13 / 26	Yes	Yes
France	1906	A Fallieres	P Doumer	64	49	11 / 25	20 / 26	Yes	Yes
France	1913	R Poincare	J Pams	52	61	19 / 22	13 / 17	Yes	Yes
France	1920	P Deschanel	C Jonnart	65	63	11 / 2	12 / 7	No	No
France	1920	A Millerand	G Delory	61	63	14 / 23	12 / 5	Yes	No
France	1924	G Doumergue	P Painleve	60	61	14 / 13	13 / 8	No	No
France	1931	P Doumer	P Marraud	74	70	6 / 1	8 / 27	No	Yes

France	1932	A Lebrun	P Faure	60	54	14 / 18	18 / 28	Yes	Yes
France	1947	V Auriol	A Ribes	62	65	14 / 19	12 / 0	Yes	No
France	1954	R Coty	M Naegelen	71	62	9 / 9	14 / 24	No	Yes
France	1959	C Gaulle	G Marrane	68	71	11 / 11	9 / 17	No	Yes
France	1969	G Pompidou	A Poher	57	60	18 / 5	16 / 27	No	Yes
France	1974	V d'Estaing	F Mitterrand	48	59	-	17 / 21	n/a	Yes
France	1981	F Mitterrand	V d'Estaing	64	55	15 / 15	-	No	n/a
France	1988	F Mitterrand	J Chirac	64	56	16 / 15	-	No	n/a
Germany	1919	F Ebert	A Posadowsky-Wehner	48	74	21 / 6	6 / 13	No	Yes
Germany	1925	P Hindenburg	W Marx	77	62	5 / 9	12 / 21	Yes	Yes
Germany	1932	K Donitz	A Hitler	53	43	18 / 36	26 / 13	Yes	No
Germany	1949	T Heuss	K Schumacher	65	54	12 / 14	19 / 2	Yes	No
Germany	1954	T Heuss	A Weber	70	86	10 / 9	3 / 3	No	No
Germany	1959	H Lubke	C Schmid	64	63	13 / 13	14 / 20	No	Yes
Germany	1964	H Lubke	E Bucher	64	50	13 / 13	23 / 27	No	Yes
Germany	1969	G Heinemann	G Schroder	69	59	10 / 7	16 / 20	No	Yes
Germany	1974	W Scheel	R Weizsacker	54	54	20 / 1	20 / 40	No	Yes
Germany	1979	K Carstens	A Renger	64	60	14 / 13	16 / 28	No	Yes
Germany	1984	R Weizsacker	L Rinser	64	73	14 / 30	-	Yes	n/a
Germany	1989	R Weizsacker	(Unopposed)	64		15 / 30	-	Yes	n/a
Germany	1994	R Herzog	J Rau	60	63	-	16 / 12	n/a	No
Germany	1999	J Rau	D Schipanski	68	56	13 / 7	-	No	n/a
Italy	1861	C Benso	U Rattazzi	50	53	20 / 0	18 / 11	No	No
Italy	1865	A Marmora	U Rattazzi	61	57	12 / 12	15 / 7	No	No
Italy	1867	U Rattazzi	B Ricasoli	59	58	14 / 5	15 / 13	No	No
Italy	1870	G Lanza	U Rattazzi	60	62	12 / 12	11 / 2	No	No
Italy	1874	M Minghetti	A Depretis	56	61	14 / 12	12 / 13	No	Yes
Italy	1876	A Depretis	M Minghetti	63	58	12 / 11	15 / 10	No	No
Italy	1880	B Cairoli	M Minghetti	55	62	15 / 9	11 / 6	No	No
Italy	1882	A Depretis	M Minghetti	69	64	9 / 5	11 / 4	No	No
Italy	1886	A Depretis	A Starabba	73	47	7 / 1	22 / 22	No	No
Italy	1890	F Crispi	A Starabba	72	51	7 / 10	19 / 18	Yes	No
Italy	1892	G Giolitti	A Starabba	50	53	20 / 35	17 / 16	Yes	No
Italy	1895	F Crispi	A Starabba	77	56	5 / 5	16 / 13	No	No
Italy	1897	G Giolitti	A Starabba	55	58	18 / 30	16 / 11	Yes	No
Italy	1900	G Giolitti	A Starabba	58	61	15 / 27	13 / 8	Yes	No
Italy	1904	G Giolitti	F Turati	62	47	13 / 23	23 / 27	Yes	Yes
Italy	1909	G Giolitti	F Turati	67	52	9 / 18	19 / 22	Yes	Yes
Italy	1913	G Giolitti	F Turati	71	56	8 / 14	17 / 18	Yes	Yes
Italy	1919	F Turati	L Sturzo	62	48	13 / 12	22 / 39	No	Yes
Italy	1921	F Turati	L Sturzo	64	50	12 / 10	22 / 37	No	Yes
Italy	1924	B Mussolini	A Gasperi	41	43	29 / 20	27 / 30	No	Yes
Italy	1946	A Gasperi	P Nenni	65	55	13 / 8	20 / 33	No	Yes
Italy	1948	A Gasperi	P Togliatti	67	55	12 / 6	20 / 16	No	No
Italy	1953	A Gasperi	P Togliatti	72	60	9 / 1	16 / 11	No	No
Italy	1958	A Fanfani	P Togliatti	50	65	24 / 41	13 / 6	Yes	No
Italy	1963	A Moro	P Togliatti	47	70	26 / 14	10 / 1	No	No
Italy	1968	M Rumor	L Longo	53	68	21 / 21	11 / 12	No	Yes

Italy	1972	A Forlani	E Berlinguer	47	50	-	25 / 12	n/a	No
Italy	1976	B Zaccagnini	E Berlinguer	64	54	14 / 13	21 / 8	No	No
Italy	1979	B Zaccagnini	E Berlinguer	67	57	12 / 10	19 / 5	No	No
Italy	1983	C Mita	E Berlinguer	55	61	-	16 / 1	n/a	No
Italy	1987	C Mita	A Natta	59	69	-	12 / 14	n/a	Yes
Spain	1876	A Castillo	P Sagasta	48	51	21 / 21	19 / 27	No	Yes
Spain	1879	A Castillo	P Sagasta	51	54	19 / 18	17 / 24	No	Yes
Spain	1881	P Sagasta	A Castillo	56	53	16 / 22	18 / 16	Yes	No
Spain	1884	A Castillo	P Sagasta	56	59	16 / 13	14 / 19	No	Yes
Spain	1886	P Sagasta	A Castillo	61	58	13 / 17	15 / 11	Yes	No
Spain	1891	A Castillo	P Sagasta	63	66	11 / 6	9 / 12	No	Yes
Spain	1893	P Sagasta	A Castillo	68	65	9 / 10	10 / 4	Yes	No
Spain	1896	A Castillo	P Sagasta	68	71	9 / 1	8 / 7	No	No
Spain	1898	P Sagasta	F Silvela	73	55	7 / 5	17 / 7	No	No
Spain	1899	F Silvela	P Sagasta	56	74	16 / 6	6 / 4	No	No
Spain	1901	P Sagasta	F Silvela	76	58	6 / 2	15 / 4	No	No
Spain	1903	F Silvela	E Rios	60	71	14 / 2	8 / 11	No	Yes
Spain	1905	E Rios	A Maura	73	52	7 / 9	18 / 20	Yes	Yes
Spain	1907	A Maura	J Canalejas	54	53	16 / 18	17 / 5	Yes	No
Spain	1910	J Canalejas	A Maura	56	57	15 / 2	15 / 15	No	No
Spain	1914	E Iradier	A Figueroa	58	51	14 / 6	19 / 36	No	Yes
Spain	1916	A Figueroa	E Iradier	53	60	17 / 34	13 / 4	Yes	No
Spain	1918	M Garcia-Prieto	E Iradier	59	62	12 / 20	11 / 2	Yes	No
Spain	1919	A Maura	M Garcia-Prieto	66	60	9 / 6	12 / 19	No	Yes
Spain	1920	E Iradier	M Garcia-Prieto	64	61	10 / 0	12 / 18	No	Yes
Spain	1923	M Garcia-Prieto	J Martinez	64	64	10 / 15	10 / 12	Yes	Yes
Spain	1931	J Besteiro	A Lerroux	61	67	13 / 9	9 / 18	No	Yes
Spain	1933	J Quinones	A Lerroux	35	69	32 / 47	9 / 16	Yes	Yes
Spain	1936	I Prieto	J Quinones	53	38	18 / 25	28 / 44	Yes	Yes
Spain	1977	A Suarez	F Gonzalez	45	35	30 / 36	-	Yes	n/a
Spain	1979	A Suarez	F Gonzalez	47	37	29 / 34	-	Yes	n/a
Spain	1982	F Gonzalez	M Iribarne	40	60	-	19 / 29	n/a	Yes
Spain	1986	F Gonzalez	M Iribarne	44	64	-	16 / 25	n/a	Yes
Spain	1989	F Gonzalez	M Iribarne	47	67	-	14 / 22	n/a	Yes
UK	1722	R Walpole	S Wyndham	46	34	22 / 22	30 / 18	No	No
UK	1727	R Walpole	H John	51	49	19 / 17	20 / 24	No	Yes
UK	1734	R Walpole	H John	58	56	14 / 10	16 / 17	No	Yes
UK	1741	R Walpole	W Pulteney	65	57	11 / 3	15 / 23	No	Yes
UK	1747	H Pelham	(Unopposed)	53	n/a	18 / 6	n/a	No	n/a
UK	1754	T Pelham-Holles	(Unopposed)	61	n/a	13 / 14	n/a	Yes	n/a
UK	1761	T Pelham-Holles	(Unopposed)	68	n/a	9 / 7	n/a	No	n/a
UK	1768	A FitzRoy	M Rockingham	33	38	31 / 42	28 / 14	Yes	No
UK	1774	F North	M Rockingham	42	44	25 / 18	23 / 8	No	No
UK	1780	L North	M Rockingham	48	50	21 / 12	19 / 2	No	No
UK	1784	W Pitt	C Fox	25	35	36 / 21	30 / 22	No	No
UK	1790	W Pitt	C Fox	31	41	33 / 15	25 / 16	No	No
UK	1796	W Pitt	C Fox	37	47	28 / 9	21 / 10	No	No
UK	1801	H Addington	C Fox	44	52	23 / 42	18 / 5	Yes	No

UK	1802	H Addington	C Fox	45	53	23 / 41	18 / 4	Yes	No
UK	1806	L Grenville	D Portland	47	68	21 / 27	9 / 3	Yes	No
UK	1807	D Portland	L Grenville	69	48	9 / 2	21 / 26	No	Yes
UK	1812	E Liverpool	L Grenville	42	53	25 / 16	18 / 21	No	Yes
UK	1818	E Liverpool	E Grey	48	54	21 / 10	17 / 27	No	Yes
UK	1820	E Liverpool	E Grey	50	56	19 / 8	16 / 25	No	Yes
UK	1826	E Liverpool	M Lansdowne	56	46	16 / 2	22 / 36	No	Yes
UK	1830	D Wellington	M Lansdowne	61	50	13 / 22	20 / 32	Yes	Yes
UK	1831	E Grey	D Wellington	67	62	10 / 14	12 / 21	Yes	Yes
UK	1832	E Grey	D Wellington	68	63	9 / 13	12 / 20	Yes	Yes
UK	1835	T Melbourne	R Peel	56	47	16 / 13	22 / 15	No	No
UK	1837	T Melbourne	R Peel	58	49	14 / 11	19 / 13	No	No
UK	1841	R Peel	W Lamb	46	62	23 / 16	13 / 7	No	No
UK	1847	J Russell	E Smith-Stanley	55	48	15 / 30	20 / 22	Yes	Yes
UK	1857	H Temple	E Smith-Stanley	73	58	7 / 7	15 / 12	No	No
UK	1859	H Temple	E Smith-Stanley	75	60	7 / 5	14 / 10	No	No
UK	1865	H Temple	E Smith-Stanley	80	66	5 / 0	10 / 4	No	No
UK	1868	W Gladstone	B Disraeli	59	64	14 / 29	12 / 12	Yes	No
UK	1874	B Disraeli	W Gladstone	70	65	8 / 6	10 / 23	No	Yes
UK	1880	S Cavendish	B Disraeli	47	76	21 / 27	6 / 0	Yes	No
UK	1885	W Gladstone	R Cecil	76	55	6 / 12	16 / 18	Yes	Yes
UK	1886	R Cecil	W Gladstone	56	77	15 / 17	5 / 11	Yes	Yes
UK	1892	R Cecil	W Gladstone	62	83	11 / 11	4 / 5	No	Yes
UK	1895	R Cecil	A Primrose	65	48	10 / 8	20 / 34	No	Yes
UK	1900	R Cecil	S Campbell-Bannerman	70	64	8 / 3	11 / 7	No	No
UK	1906	S Campbell-Bannerman	A Balfour	70	58	8 / 1	15 / 23	No	Yes
UK	1910	H Asquith	A Balfour	58	62	15 / 17	13 / 19	Yes	Yes
UK	1918	A Law	D George	60	55	14 / 5	17 / 27	No	Yes
UK	1922	A Law	J Clynes	64	53	12 / 1	19 / 27	No	Yes
UK	1923	S Baldwin	J MacDonald	56	57	17 / 24	17 / 14	Yes	No
UK	1924	S Baldwin	J MacDonald	57	58	16 / 23	16 / 13	Yes	No
UK	1929	J MacDonald	S Baldwin	63	62	12 / 8	12 / 18	No	Yes
UK	1931	S Baldwin	A Henderson	64	68	12 / 16	10 / 4	Yes	No
UK	1935	S Baldwin	C Attlee	68	52	10 / 12	20 / 32	Yes	Yes
UK	1945	C Attlee	S Spencer-Churchill	52	71	21 / 32	9 / 19	Yes	Yes
UK	1950	C Attlee	S Spencer-Churchill	57	76	17 / 27	6 / 14	Yes	Yes
UK	1951	S Spencer-Churchill	C Attlee	77	58	6 / 13	16 / 26	Yes	Yes
UK	1955	A Eden	C Attlee	58	62	16 / 21	14 / 22	Yes	Yes
UK	1959	H Macmillan	H Gaitskell	65	53	12 / 27	20 / 3	Yes	No
UK	1964	H Wilson	A Douglas-Home	48	61	25 / 31	15 / 31	Yes	Yes
UK	1966	H Wilson	S Heath	50	50	23 / 29	23 / 39	Yes	Yes
UK	1970	S Heath	H Wilson	54	54	20 / 35	20 / 25	Yes	Yes
UK	1979	M Thatcher	L Callaghan	54	67	20 / 33	11 / 25	Yes	Yes
UK	1983	M Thatcher	M Foot	58	70	18 / 29	10 / 26	Yes	Yes
UK	1987	M Thatcher	N Kinnock	62	45	16 / 25	-	Yes	n/a
USA	1789	G Washington	(Unopposed)	57	n/a	15 / 10	n/a	No	n/a

USA	1792	G Washington	(Unopposed)	60	n/a	13 / 7	n/a	No	n/a
USA	1796	J Adams	T Jefferson	61	53	13 / 29	18 / 30	Yes	Yes
USA	1800	T Jefferson	J Adams	57	65	15 / 26	11 / 25	Yes	Yes
USA	1804	T Jefferson	C Pinckney	61	58	13 / 22	14 / 21	Yes	Yes
USA	1808	J Madison	C Pinckney	58	62	15 / 27	12 / 17	Yes	Yes
USA	1812	J Madison	D Clinton	62	43	12 / 23	24 / 15	Yes	No
USA	1816	J Monroe	R King	58	61	14 / 15	13 / 11	Yes	No
USA	1820	J Monroe	(Unopposed)	62	n/a	12 / 11	n/a	No	n/a
USA	1824	J Adams	A Jackson	57	57	16 / 23	16 / 21	Yes	Yes
USA	1828	A Jackson	J Adams	61	61	13 / 17	13 / 19	Yes	Yes
USA	1832	A Jackson	H Clay	65	55	10 / 15	15 / 20	Yes	Yes
USA	1836	M Buren	W Harrison	54	64	18 / 25	11 / 4	Yes	No
USA	1840	W Harrison	M Buren	68	58	9 / 0	15 / 21	No	Yes
USA	1844	J Polk	H Clay	49	67	21 / 4	10 / 8	No	No
USA	1848	Z Taylor	L Cass	64	66	11 / 1	10 / 17	No	Yes
USA	1852	F Pierce	W Scott	48	66	21 / 16	10 / 13	No	Yes
USA	1856	J Buchanan	J Fremont	65	43	11 / 12	25 / 34	Yes	Yes
USA	1860	A Lincoln	J Breckinridge	52	39	19 / 4	28 / 15	No	No
USA	1864	A Lincoln	G McClellan	56	38	16 / 0	28 / 20	No	No
USA	1868	U Grant	H Seymour	46	58	22 / 17	14 / 17	No	Yes
USA	1872	U Grant	H Greeley	50	61	20 / 13	13 / 0	No	No
USA	1876	R Hayes	S Tilden	54	62	17 / 16	12 / 10	No	No
USA	1880	J Garfield	W Hancock	49	56	21 / 0	16 / 5	No	No
USA	1884	G Cleveland	J Blaine	47	54	22 / 24	17 / 8	Yes	No
USA	1888	B Harrison	G Cleveland	55	51	17 / 12	19 / 20	No	Yes
USA	1892	G Cleveland	B Harrison	55	59	16 / 16	14 / 8	No	No
USA	1896	W McKinley	W Bryan	54	36	18 / 4	30 / 29	No	No
USA	1900	W McKinley	W Bryan	58	40	14 / 0	26 / 25	No	No
USA	1904	T Roosevelt	A Parker	46	52	23 / 14	19 / 21	No	Yes
USA	1908	W Taft	W Bryan	51	48	19 / 21	21 / 17	Yes	No
USA	1912	W Wilson	T Roosevelt	56	54	16 / 11	17 / 6	No	No
USA	1916	W Wilson	C Hughes	60	54	13 / 7	17 / 32	No	Yes
USA	1920	W Harding	J Cox	55	50	17 / 2	21 / 37	No	Yes
USA	1924	C Coolidge	J Davis	51	51	20 / 9	20 / 30	No	Yes
USA	1928	H Hoover	A Smith	54	55	18 / 36	17 / 15	Yes	No
USA	1932	F Roosevelt	H Hoover	51	58	20 / 12	15 / 32	No	Yes
USA	1936	F Roosevelt	A Landon	55	49	18 / 8	22 / 51	No	Yes
USA	1940	F Roosevelt	W Willkie	59	48	15 / 4	23 / 4	No	No
USA	1944	F Roosevelt	T Dewey	63	42	14 / 0	28 / 26	No	No
USA	1948	H Truman	T Dewey	64	46	13 / 24	26 / 22	Yes	No
USA	1952	D Eisenhower	A Stevenson	62	52	15 / 16	21 / 13	Yes	No
USA	1956	D Eisenhower	A Stevenson	66	56	12 / 12	19 / 9	No	No
USA	1960	J Kennedy	R Nixon	43	47	29 / 3	25 / 34	No	Yes
USA	1964	L Johnson	B Goldwater	55	55	19 / 9	19 / 34	No	Yes
USA	1968	R Nixon	H Humphrey	56	57	18 / 25	18 / 9	Yes	No
USA	1972	R Nixon	G McGovern	60	50	16 / 21	23 / 40	Yes	Yes
USA	1976	J Carter	G Ford	52	63	-	15 / 30	n/a	Yes
USA	1980	R Reagan	J Carter	69	56	11 / 24	-	Yes	n/a

USA	1984	R Reagan	W Mondale	73	56	10 / 20	-	Yes	n/a

Notes: Expected years of life following national election were based on an average individual of the same age and sex as the candidate, taken from historical life-tables described in the Methods. Premature death was defined by whether a candidate lived strictly less than what would be expected for an average individual in the population of the same age and sex as the candidate (i.e., observed < expected life expectancy). Hyphen reflects candidates who were alive as of August 1, 2015.