Introduction to the American Political Process

Elections
The Dynamics of the Electoral Campaign

- Winnowing
- The “Big Mo”
  - Election – The horserace
  - Pre-Election: Name recognition and money
- The Horserace
  - Creating Momentum
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1/17-1/19</th>
<th>1/20-1/22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kerry</strong></td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dean</strong></td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Money Raised

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Raised Amount</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bush</td>
<td>$145,627,589*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>$47,562,192</td>
<td>(ended campaign on 2/18/04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerry</td>
<td>$32,946,297**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>$22,671,373</td>
<td>(dropped out 2/11/04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwards</td>
<td>$22,549,586***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gephardt</td>
<td>$20,454,652****</td>
<td>(dropped out 1/20/04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieberman</td>
<td>$17,981,382</td>
<td>(dropped out 2/3/04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kucinich</td>
<td>$7,756,643*****</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharpton</td>
<td>$602,616******</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moseley Braun</td>
<td>$493,136******</td>
<td>(dropped out 1/15/04)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The scale ranges from 0 to 200M (in millions) and 0 to 200K (in thousands).
Money Spent

- **Dean**: $42,579,445 (ended campaign on 2/18/04)
- **Bush**: $41,193,587
- **Kerry**: $30,810,656
- **Clark**: $22,270,543 (dropped out 2/11/04)
- **Edwards**: $22,048,422
- **Gephardt**: $18,610,790 (dropped out 1/20/04)
- **Lieberman**: $17,312,399 (dropped out 2/3/04)
- **Kucinich**: $5,143,576
- **Sharpton**: $602,423
- **Moseley Braun**: $489,118* (dropped out 1/15/04)
Presidential Elections

- Electoral College
- Strategy
  - Series of Local Elections
  - NY vs. PA
  - Battleground States
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Margin of Victory</th>
<th>Electoral Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bush Wins</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total: 97</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gore Wins</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total: 85</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Congressional Elections

- House Elections
  - Name recognition
  - The advantages of incumbency
    - Franking
    - Fundraising

- Senate Election
  - Lessened incumbency advantage
Incumbent Victory Rate: 1946-1998

Year

Percent Win

House

Senate
How Do Voters Decide

The Multiple Bases of the Vote

- Party identification
- Issues and policies
- Candidate attributes
- Retrospective evaluations
Party Identification

- Measurement and predictive ability
  - “Generally speaking, do you consider yourself a Democrat, a Republican, or an independent?”
  - High loyalty
- The psychological perspective
- The rational perspective
- Bringing it together
  - Theories not exclusive
  - Party identification is the baseline for the vote
Other Bases of the Vote

- Issues and Policies
  - Elect candidates who share your views
  - Issue conflicts

- Candidate Attributes
  - Voting for a person, not policies
  - Less “rational”? 
  - Attribute components

- Retrospective Voting
  - “Throw the bums out”
Campaigns

- Candidates and Campaigns
  - How do candidates attract supporters?

- Candidate Strategies
  - Adapt to voter sentiment
    - Move to the middle
  - Framing
    - Defining the race
Campaigns (continued)

- Negative Advertising
  - How do candidates attract supporters?
  - Effects of negative campaigns
    - Turnout effects
    - Cynicism
Women’s Health Research Is Important to Me Because My Mom’s Worth It.

That’s Why It’s Hard to Understand Dick Zimmer’s Votes Against Women’s Health Care.

It’s Hard to Understand Dick Zimmer’s Votes Against Life-Saving Mammograms

As a member of the House Ways and Means Committee, Rep. Zimmer voted against a proposed amendment to extend Medicare coverage for annual mammograms for Medicare-eligible women over age 89. (House Ways and Means Committee Vote: HR 2423, Medicare Preservation Act/Breast Cancer. Rejected 15-21, October 1995)

It’s Hard to Understand Dick Zimmer’s Votes Against Funding the National Women’s Health Resources Center

The National Women’s Health Resources Center identifies women’s health issues that require further research and distributes women’s health information to healthcare professionals throughout the nation. Rep. Zimmer voted against funding the Center, which provides a critical link between research and healthcare providers. (HR 460, Roll Call Vote #55, 3/9/93)

It’s Hard to Understand Dick Zimmer’s Repeated Votes Against the Office on Women’s Health

The Office on Women’s Health is the government’s champion and focal point for women’s health issues. It has funded over 100 scientific projects including studies in the following areas: breast and ovarian cancer; women and HIV; women and cardiovascular disease; osteoporosis; breast implant safety; the effects of estrogen and women and autoimmune disease.

Rep. Zimmer voted against funding the Office on Women’s Health time after time after time. (HR 3660, Roll Call Vote #434, 9/22/94; HR 2518, Roll Call Vote #31, 6/30/93 and Roll Call Vote #486, 10/7/93; HR 3899, Roll Call Vote #417, 11/2/93; HR 4, Roll Call Vote #62, 3/10/93)

To learn more information about the vital work the Office on Women’s Health performs please visit their website at: http://www4woman.gov/owwh.

Tell Dick Zimmer to Quit Voting Against Women’s Health.

www.zimmervotes.com
“Tasteless.”

This is how the Courier News described the offensive and negative attacks on Dick Zimmer

Rush Holt...

You Should Be Ashamed.
The Truth About Dick Zimmer’s Record.

New Jersey Congresswoman Marge Roukema said: “I have reviewed a partial list of at least 30 bills, amendments and motions where Dick Zimmer has voted to support women’s health programs.” This list includes Dick Zimmer’s support of the Breast and Cervical Cancer Prevention Act that provided $135 million for breast and cervical cancer screening for the poor. (10/22/02, June 14, 1993).

Too bad the truth hasn’t stopped Rush Holt...

or the misleading, shameful attacks on Dick Zimmer’s voting record.

Tell Rush Holt to Stop the Shameful Attacks on Dick Zimmer.

609-278-0800

So why has Rush Holt refused to end this tasteless attack on Dick Zimmer?
Campaigns

- Negative Campaigns (cont)
  - Are things getting worse?
Campaigns

- Campaign Effects
  - Predictive Models
  - Mobilization vs. Conversion
Campaign Finance

- The importance of money
- Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA)
- Circumventing the system: Soft Money
- Issue ads and “magic words”
  - "vote for," "elect," "support," "cast your ballot for," "Smith for Congress," "vote against," "defeat," and "reject"
Rick Larsen got 3 wishes...

And he used them to raise your taxes 3 times!

In two years, Rick Larsen raised spending 43%, including a pay increase for himself.

Rick Larsen voted to increase taxes so that he could increase county spending.
During Rick Larsen's two-year tenure on the County Council, spending increased 43%.

Rick Larsen voted for $116 million in increased spending for 2000. Rick Larsen voted to increase the budget by 23.6%.

How did Rick Larsen afford to increase spending?

By raising your taxes three years in a row.

In 1998 Rick Larsen endorsed and voted for ASCENT 21, five bundled propositions on the 1998 November ballot that were meant to raise $599 million over a ten-year period. (Wd. No. 368-03 through 368-05), 11/1/98

For the 1999 tax year, Rick Larsen voted for the maximum property tax increase allowable by law. This raised property taxes by 6%. (Wd. No. 368-10, 11/10/99)

Again in 2000, Rick Larsen voted for the largest tax increase possible on property owners by approving a 6% road tax. (Wd. No. 394-00)

Call Rick Larsen at 425 388-3494, ext. 2575 and tell him his increased spending is rubbing US the wrong way!
Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002

McConnell v. FEC
- Ban soft money and limit issue ads
- Throughout bans on contributions from minors, non-candidate party spending

New definition of issue ads
- Magic words or depicting a federal candidate within 60 days of a federal election

527 organizations – MoveOn.org