BRINGING IT TOGETHER: THE 2004 PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN AND ELECTIONS

The 2004 election for president may go down in history for how extremely it divided the nation. An entire month before the election, polls showed that only 3% of Americans remained undecided on a candidate. Despite his status as an incumbent, implementation of tax cuts, and reputation for decisiveness, President George W. Bush faced an incredibly heated race again Massachusetts Senator John Kerry. At the most basic level Americans knew that John Kerry had the knowledge and experience to serve in the highest office in the nation. Many were also unhappy with the situation in Iraq, job losses, and healthcare costs. However, Americans were casting their first presidential vote in the post-9-11 world, and they also had reservations about electing a president whose leadership during a national security crisis had not yet been proven.

The Party Nomination Battle

Although few Americans may have remembered after the election, the Republican Party *did* hold presidential primaries in 2004. Few noticed, as is usually the case when there is an incumbent candidate, because there was no significant opposition within the party to George W. Bush's reelection.

political involvement. If candidates cannot count on big donors to finance their elections, they will have to find ways of appealing to larger numbers of people. That forces candidates back into their local communities to listen to their concerns and promise to address them. Then, communities can organize to fund-raise for certain candidates. The winner is bound to address the local community's interests, which is what representative government is supposed to do in the first place.

- **Campaign finance reform opens up the door for new challengers.** Curbing the influence of wealthy interests creates an even playing field for candidates. If incumbents must run against strong challengers, they become more accountable and, if necessary, more easily replaced.

Arguments Against Campaign Finance Reform

- **Campaign contributions are political speech, the most hallowed and protected speech under the First Amendment.** All Americans have a right to freely state their political beliefs; just because one group has more money than another doesn't make a difference.
- **Bureaucracy is never the better answer to a market-driven problem.** While the intentions behind campaign finance reform are usually good, they are based on the false assumption that the way to solve all political problems is with more government. More government means a forever expanding labyrinth of quickly out-of-date rules that only years of debate and wrangling will fix, followed by implementing more quickly outgrown rules requiring another round of wrangling. Regulation is a dog chasing its tail.
- **Campaign finance reform actually assists incumbents, not challengers.** Incumbents benefit from free media, since they have name recognition and greater credibility from their experience "on the Hill." A challenger needs money to counteract this and other advantages of incumbency. Regulating campaign finance limits a challenger's competitiveness, making the government less democratic as a result.

Questions

1. Can money, in the form of campaign contributions, be considered protected speech under the First Amendment? Why or why not?
2. Is it more democratic to centralize control of elections in order to allow more interests to be heard, or to let interests compete for attention without government interference?

Selected Readings

Bradley A. Smith. *Unfree Speech: The Folly of Campaign Finance Reform.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001.

Dan Clawson, Alan Neustadtl, and Mark Weller. *Dollars and Votes: How Business Campaign Contributions Subvert Democracy.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1998.

The Democrats, meanwhile, would have ten candidates competing for their party's nomination. Democratic Party veterans Representative Dick Gephardt (MO), Senator and 2000 vice presidential nominee Joseph Lieberman (CT), Senator Bob Graham (FL), and Senator John Kerry (MA) joined the five other "original" candidates. Senator John Edwards (NC), former Illinois Senator Carol Moseley-Braun, the first African American woman in the Senate, former Governor Howard Dean, Representative Dennis Kucinich (OH), and the Reverend Al Sharpton, an African American activist from New York. Retired General Wesley Clark entered late in the race after some Democrats ran a "Draft Clark" effort.

The Democratic candidates spent the spring and summer of 2003 in the typical primary season fashion: fund-raising, debating, giving speeches, and concentrating on the key states of Iowa and New Hampshire. By autumn, Senator Graham had dropped out of the race, citing fund-raising problems. Autumn also brought the rise of the once "fringe" candidate Howard Dean. His solid stance against the Iraq War and harsh criticism of President Bush appealed to Democratic partisans, providing him with impressive grassroots support and a large war chest. Although in the spring of 2003 Democratic insiders were predicting that John Kerry would emerge as the front-runner, the fall brought Howard Dean the endorsements of party leaders such as Iowa Senator Tom Harkin and former Vice President Al Gore.

Initially, the Democrats' campaigns were focused on contrasting themselves with President Bush. However, as Dean emerged as the apparent front-runner, his rivals began aiming many of their attacks in his direction rather than at the president. The former governor's

third-place finish in the Iowa caucuses, behind both John Kerry and John Edwards, may have partially been attributed to these attacks. Others blamed the Iowa upset on the campaign's mismanagement of Dean's resources—not spending enough on ads and appearances and overspending on other items. Dean would win only one primary, in Vermont, and he dropped out of the race by February.

After Iowa, the race centered on Kerry and Edwards. The appeal of Gephardt and of Lieberman proved narrow, the former dropping out after Iowa and the latter after losing in Arizona. Edwards dropped out of the race in March, leaving Senator John Kerry of Massachusetts as the "presumptive" Democratic candidate. Democrats appeared united, at least in their determination to defeat George W. Bush in the general election. For this reason, many suggest, they chose a candidate quickly and channeled their energies toward winning in the fall.

The 2004 election indicated that left-leaning voters had become risk-averse after their experience in 2000. The "Nader effect" was a mere 1% nationally, not enough to swing any states. Whereas in 2000 some left-leaning voters complained that there was not much of a difference between Bush and Gore and thus voted for Nader, four years of a Bush presidency contributed to a mentality that came to be known as "anything but Bush." Anything-but-Bush adherents were not necessarily enthusiastic about John Kerry, but they were so determined to get President Bush out of office that they gave Kerry their votes. Low levels of third party voting therefore did not necessarily indicate increased popularity of the major parties; rather, they demonstrated that Florida had made liberal voters unwilling to take the risk of voting for a third party.

The Democratic Convention

With Kerry entering the national convention in a virtual tie with George W. Bush, he and Edwards would take this opportunity to define their candidacy, woo new voters, and rally their party faithful at the July 26-29 Democratic National Convention. The convention was held in Boston, Massachusetts, Kerry's home state and solid Democratic territory.

The first night started with a flourish, with former Presidents Bill Clinton and Jimmy Carter taking center stage, joined by former Vice President Al Gore. With polls that showed Americans giving Bush higher marks than Kerry on national security issues, Clinton sought to highlight the Democratic nominee's credentials in this area.

Photo courtesy: AP Photo/Matt York, Pool

■ At a debate held in Phoenix, Arizona on Ocober 3, 2003, several members of the Democratic primary field discussed their ideas with the audience.

TABLE 14.2 2004 Democratic Candidates and Their Strategies

Wesley Clark: to use his record as Supreme Allied Commander in Europe from 1997–2000, during which time he successfully managed a multilateral military effort ousting Serbian dictator Slobodan Milosevic, to neutralize both Bush's and his Democratic competition's claim to expertise in national defense and foreign diplomacy; to appeal to male voters who otherwise tend to vote Republican.

Howard Dean: to satisfy the dissatisfaction of many Democratic interest groups that had begun to tire of the dominance of moderate Democrats in party decision making; to tap into desire for old-style liberalism; to capitalize on the newest form of political organization and fund-raising, the World Wide Web.

John Edwards: to market himself as a fresh, new leader unconnected to inside-the-Beltway disputes and corruption; to represent the South, a necessary group of states to capture in order to win an election.

Richard Gephardt: to capitalize on his long experience in public office (in Congress since 1977; presidential candidate in 1988, minority leader in U.S. House 1995–2002); to capture the imagination of the Democratic Party with a startlingly comprehensive health care package.

Bob Graham: to capitalize on the Democratic obsession with the state of Florida that emerged following the close presidential election in 2000; to put forward a dovish foreign policy.

Dennis Kucinich: to use anti-Bush rhetoric in order to stir up far-left support and Democratic voter base.

Joseph Lieberman: to capitalize on his service as vice presidential candidate in 2000 presidential election; to satisfy interests of conservative Democrats with his morally conservative view and as a foreign policy hawk.

Carol Mosley Braun: to capitalize on her historic position as the first African American woman elected to the Senate; to promote the roles of minorities and women in Democratic office.

Al Sharpton: to present hmself as the new Jesse Jackson to have a "seat at the table" for decision making within the party; to advocate African American interests within the Democratic Party.

The second night of the convention featured a diverse series of speakers. The most surprising speaker was Ron Reagan, son of the late Republican President Ronald Reagan. His speech focused on the controversial topic of embryonic stem cell research. In 2001 President Bush limited the use of federal funds for this practice, which was opposed by some conservatives who linked it to abortion. Reagan's speech detailed stem cell research's potential to cure disease, labeling it the "future of medicine," and implored voters to vote for Kerry, who supported this type of research.

If Ron Reagan were the most unlikely speaker of the second night, it was Barack Obama, a Democratic Senate candidate from Illinois, who really stole the spotlight. The multiracial son of a Kenyan immigrant father and poor, Kansas-born mother, Obama used his own story, of "a skinny kid with a funny name who believes that America has a place for him too," to illustrate his party's hope for creating opportunity and unity in America. This appearance launched Obama into fame on the national political scene.

The next night, Senator John Edwards addressed the delegates. True to form, Edwards delivered a populist pitch for his and John Kerry's candidacy. He returned to his primary race theme of "two different Americas." "John Kerry and I believe that we shouldn't have two different economies in America: one for people who are set for life . . . and then one for most Americans, people who live paycheck to paycheck." His speech's refrain, "Hope is on the way," summarized his pledge to the nation to improve their everyday lives.

The overarching theme of the Democrats' convention was, "Respected abroad, stronger at home." This emphasis of national security was most prominent on the final night of the convention, which featured testimonials from former Senator Max Cleland and Kerry's Vietnam Swiftboat crewmates. In Kerry's speech, foreign affairs and his personal biography vastly overshadowed other topics. The biographical portion was most likely in response to polls that showed Kerry as not yet having established a personal connection with Americans. Kerry also took his speech as an opportunity to defend against GOP accusations that he "flip flops." In one of his most direct attacks on the integrity of President Bush, Kerry pledged that his leadership would "start by telling the truth to the American people."

Politics Now

The Dean Fund-raising Network

As a Democratic presidential candidate, former Vermont Governor Howard Dean was a revelation to politicians, pundits, and fellow candidates alike. Dean and his campaign manager Joe Trippi devised a fund-raising strategy that defied convention. Ordinarily, when politicians must raise money for a campaign, they call big donors who call other big donors. Then, the candidate holds large dinners and banquets, or even a concert, at which the big donors write checks. This method alienates less wealthy voters, who feel unable to catch a candidate's attention without first unloading the cash.

Dean challenged this fund-raising approach by focusing on the Internet as a new medium for donations. First, the Internet is cheap, since a Web site is easy to create and maintain, requiring only a few webmasters to update content and troubleshoot. Second, the Internet is fast—contributions come in almost instantly, making them immediately accessible as cash on hand for the candidate. Third, the Internet is interactive. Not only did Dean take in donations, but he also made small donors feel as though they were part of a movement. Frequently, Dean set a fund-raising goal and had his webmasters continually update the amount reached. All the while, Dean supporters gathered together through a Web-based organizing tool called MeetUp, posted messages on numerous Dean campaign-based message boards, and wrote Web journals ("blogs") on their political views. The sense of community gave many Dean supporters the feeling that their money was going somewhere, simultaneously making Internet fund-raising a grassroots effort, a far cry from the alienation most citizens feel with more conventional fund-raising methods.

The feeling of community is necessary, however, since matching a small number of large donations requires a large number of small donations. In July 2003, Dean averaged $53 per contribution. By October, his average donation had only gone up to $74 with 169,000 donors on his list. On the other hand, President George W. Bush averaged $280 per donation with 262,000 donors. Bush's number obviously exceeds Dean's, but what matters in this comparison is that Dean was an unknown in January 2003, while Bush was a popular president. Dean's jump from former governor of a small state to leading Democratic fundraiser demonstrated the potency of the Internet as a fund-raising tool. In fact, even though Dean eventually lost the nomination, he has become an important player in fund-raising and speech-making for the Democratic Party.

There are still some doubts about Internet fund-raising as the wave of the future. First, the Internet is not universally accessible—some donors, such as many African Americans and seniors, remain cut out.[a] Second, there is some belief that Dean's success had more to do with Dean than with the Internet as an organizing and fundraising tool. Dean's anti-war rhetoric and progressive social positions may have particularly appealed to heavy Internet users in ways that John Kerry or George W. Bush may not. Finally, unlike conventional donations, Internet donations are not always secure and could be hacked or stolen.

If President John F. Kennedy was the first television president, Dean may be the first true Internet candidate. Perhaps future candidates must have what it takes to sustain an Internet movement, or maybe Dean resembles the Internet companies of the late 1990s that showed so much promise but eventually faded from view as investors looked for more stable investments.

[a]Liz Marlantes, "Web May Revolutionize Fundraising," *Christian Science Monitor* (July 31, 2003), http://www.csmonitor.com/2003/0731/p02s01-uspo.html.

Despite what most pundits considered a solid performance, Kerry-Edwards did not receive any significant post-convention "bounce." This was unusual in that there had not been another candidate since George McGovern in 1972 whose convention had not yielded at least a small bounce. In their candidate's defense, the Kerry campaign argued that challengers historically run behind incumbents by about 15 points heading into a convention, whereas Kerry entered the convention already polling neck and neck with Bush.

The Republican Convention

The Republican National Convention was held on August 30th to September 2nd, beginning a full month after the Democratic National Convention ended. It was held in Madison Square Garden in New York City, considered to be one of the most heavily liberal, Democratic locales in the nation and most certainly Kerry territory. It was clear that the GOP picked New York City not to win over its residents, but rather in an effort to use the symbolism of the 9/11 terrorist attacks to their advantage.

Under the theme, "A Nation of Courage," the 2004 Republican National Convention had an unmistakable focus on showcasing moderate Republicans. The right-wing branch of the Republican Party that had captured the stage at past conventions would

Analyzing Visuals

JOHN KERRY WINDSURFS

On the one hand, John Kerry looked athletic and Kennedy-esque while windsurfing off the coast of Nantucket, Massachusetts, in August 2004, which was no doubt the effect that he and his advisers wanted. On the other hand, windsurfing is not exactly a common sport, and many of Kerry's aides had privately wished he had gone bowling instead. Blue-collar workers, who ended up defecting from Kerry in large numbers in November 2004, are bowlers, not windsurfers. In Kerry's own mind, he was simply being himself, believing that this genuineness would override any projected elitist image. But, to his chagrin, Kerry found that his windsurfing was interpreted as the act of an upper-class, out-of-touch northeastern liberal Democrat.

Moreover, less than three weeks later, it became the focus of a thirty-second television advertisement entitled simply "Windsurfing," aired on national cable channels and in select local markets by the Bush-Cheney campaign, In the ad, the narrator claimed that Kerry's positions on the war in Iraq, health care reform, education, and other important issues shifted "whichever way the wind blows."

As with the Bush Mission Accomplished banner, this photo op cut both ways. But, in the end, it became a negative commentary on the Democratic nominee and his electoral chances.

Photo courtesy: Reuters/Landov

After looking at the photo, what do you think about John Kerry's decision to choose windsurfing as a way to identify with voters? Is a candidate's choice of leisure activities a fair target for his opponent? Do you think Kerry's experience will make future candidates think carefully about every move they make in their spare time?

stand aside as the more moderate Arnold Schwarzenegger, Rudy Giuliani, and John McCain spoke on behalf of their party and President Bush. The convention would be a delicate balancing act between reaching out to the swing voters (who were charmed in 2000 by Bush's "compassionate conservative" agenda) without alienating the socially conservative Republican base.

The second night of the Republican convention saw less emphasis on national security and more on domestic issues, such as education and health care, under the banner "People with Compassion." Former movie actor and bodybuilder Arnold Schwarzenegger, who had become governor of California less than a year earlier used his star power and reputation as a moderate to bring support to President Bush. Schwarzenegger peppered his speech with references to his films, asserting that Bush would "terminate" terrorism and referring to the Democratic Convention as "True Lies."

If Ron Reagan were most surprising speaker at the Democratic National Convention, his equivalent at the Republican National Convention was undoubtedly Georgia Democratic Senator Zell Miller. Miller, who was by then thought of as a Democrat in name only, sharply attacked John Kerry and the Democratic Party's positions on national defense. Vice President Dick Cheney also took the stage on the third night of the Republican National Convention, accepting his party's nomination for a second term. In harmony with the Bush campaign strategy, he sought to portray Kerry as a "flip-flopper." "On Iraq, Senator Kerry has disagreed with many of his fellow Democrats. But Senator Kerry's liveliest disagreement is with himself," he said. Although the vice president made mention if domestic issues such as reforming medical liability laws, job creation and health care, his speech had the same general focuses as did the entire convention: the War on Terror, Iraq, and Homeland Security.

Photo courtesy: Mark Wilson/Getty Images

■ President George W. Bush, Vice President Dick Cheney and their wives wave to supporters during a victory rally in Washington, D.C. on November 3, 2004.

The final night was reserved for the Republican Party's official nomination of George W. Bush for a second term as president. In addition to his vows to stay the course on terrorism, he discussed education, health care, jobs, and taxes. Bush also took advantage of his location—New York City—to remind voters of his handling of the crisis and reawaken the emotion, unity and fear surrounding the 9/11 attacks. "My fellow Americans, for as long as our country stands, people will look to the resurrection of New York City and they will say: Here buildings fell, and here a nation rose," he said.

The 2004 Republican National Convention was not only a depiction of the Republican Party's agenda and campaign strategy, but also a vivid demonstration of how polarized the nation had become this election season. Thousands of New Yorkers and protesters from other states took to the streets during the convention for primarily peaceful protests against Bush, the Iraq War, and the Republican Party. Still, the GOP had reason to be pleased with its convention performance. Whereas the Democratic National Convention did not give Kerry a "bounce" in public opinion polls, Bush left New York with the prize of a modest 2 percent post-convention bounce, giving him the support of 52% of likely voters.

The Presidential Debates

The first debate took place on September 30, 2004, in Coral Gables, Florida. The candidates' format for this event featured questions posed by the moderator, PBS host Jim Lehrer, with responses and rebuttals by the candidates. During the discussion on foreign policy, Bush and Kerry clashed sharply on the war in Iraq and on fighting terrorism. Television ratings were exceptionally high, with the first debate being watched

TABLE 14.3 2004 Election Results (Popular Vote Percentage)

State	*Bush (%)*	*Kerry (%)*	*State*	*Bush (%)*	*Kerry (%)*
Alabama	63	37	Montana	59	39
Alaska	62	35	Nebraska	66	33
Arizona	55	44	Nevada	51	48
Arkansas	54	45	New Hampshire	49	50
California	45	54	New Jersey	46	53
Colorado	52	47	New Mexico	50	49
Connecticut	44	54	New York	40	58
Delaware	46	53	North Carolina	56	44
District of Columbia	9	90	North Dakota	63	36
Florida	52	47	Ohio	51	49
Georgia	58	41	Oklahoma	66	34
Hawaii	45	54	Oregon	48	52
Idaho	68	30	Pennsylvania	49	51
Illinois	45	55	Rhode Island	39	60
Indiana	60	39	South Carolina	58	41
Iowa	50	49	South Dakota	60	39
Kansas	62	37	Tennessee	57	43
Kentucky	60	40	Texas	61	38
Louisiana	57	42	Utah	71	27
Maine	45	54	Vermont	39	59
Maryland	43	56	Virginia	54	45
Massachusetts	37	62	Washington	46	53
Michigan	48	51	West Virginia	56	43
Minnesota	48	51	Wisconsin	49	50
Mississippi	60	40	Wyoming	69	29
Missouri	54	46			

Source: Official election results from CNN, http://www.cnn.com/ELECTION/2004/.

by 62.5 million viewers, the most since 1992. Viewer generally found Kerry to have won the debate, and many pundits commented on Bush's lack of energy and focus.

A town hall format was used for the second presidential debate, wherein voters found to be undecided by the Gallop polling organization were allow to ask questions of each candidate in turn. Reacting against the criticism that he seemed tired and unfocused, Bush was extremely forthright and energetic throughout the night. The candidates met for the last time on October 13 in Tempe, Arizona. This debate followed a structure similar to that for the first debate, with the candidates standing behind podiums and answering questions in turn from CBS News anchor Bob Schieffer. For the first time during the debates, the questions were geared toward domestic issues. The last debate was generally considered to have been won by Kerry by the public and media commentators. Ultimately, Kerry—with his debate performances—seemed to even the playing field going in to the final days of the campaign.

The Fall Campaign and General Election

In the final weeks of the campaign public opinion was deadlocked, and many Americans began to fear that the closeness and uncertainty of 2000 was again possible in 2004. There was even the real possibility of a tie in the Electoral College, which would throw the election into the House of Representatives. The election was especially close in the key battleground states of Ohio, Florida, Pennsylvania, New Mexico, Iowa, and Wisconsin.

Bush stayed on message during the last days of the campaign, emphasizing the need to continue the effort in Iraq and to strongly prosecute the war on terrorism. Kerry continued to hack away at the president's choice to invade Iraq as misguided and without a plan for victory. Kerry especially criticized Bush's handling of foreign relations, mentioning the bad blood in Europe and around the world created out of his Iraq policy. Kerry promised a change in international relations in which the United States would be more attuned to the concerns of allies and would expend more effort building alliances to fight the global war on terrorism. In a number of television commercials, and in public appearances, Bush fought back, attempting to paint Kerry as a "flip-flopper" who constantly switched his positions to better fit public opinion. To attack Kerry's credibility on defense, Bush also used a New York Times interview in which Kerry likened terrorism before 9/11 to a "nuisance" like illegal gambling or prostitution.

Despite the efforts of each campaign, public opinion remained very divided in key states like Ohio and Florida up until the election. Realizing this, both candidates made a marathon sprint through battleground states in the last few days before the election. Bush covered several states in the final week, but spent seven consecutive days traveling through Ohio, including Election Day. Kerry visited Michigan, Wisconsin, Florida, and Ohio in the final days of the campaign. After voting in his home state of Texas, Bush flew back to Washington to await the election results. Kerry returned to Massachusetts to cast his vote and follow an Election Day tradition of lunch at a Boston oyster bar. With the election close, and both candidates confident of their chances, the afternoon wore on in anticipation of the first exit polls.

Election Results

With the painful memories of 2000 still fresh in their minds, network and cable news bureaus proceeded with caution on election night. As the night wore on and more states began to close their polls, Bush began to show a convincing lead in the key battleground state of Florida. However, the networks remained extremely cautious, only calling the states that had given a clear and commanding victory to either candidate. As Election Day approached midnight, Florida had been called for Bush, but Ohio still remained too close to call for some networks, despite a significant lead by the president. By early the next morning, neither candidate had yet to capture the necessary 270 electoral votes. Despite a lead of over a hundred thousand votes for Bush in Ohio, the Kerry campaign believed there might be enough late votes to turn the tide.

By later that morning, the Bush campaign was confident that they had carried the election, and they informed the Kerry campaign that they would be declaring victory. Allowing Kerry the courtesy of giving his concession speech first, the Bush campaign waited until the early afternoon for Kerry to speak. Kerry then conceded formally at the historic Faneuil Hall in Boston, emphasizing the need for unity after such a divisive campaign. About an hour later, Bush gave his victory speech at the Ronald Reagan building in Washington, D.C., also speaking of the need for unity but emphasizing his victory as ratification by the people of his policies.

Turnout in the 2004 Election

The 2004 election had the highest voter turnout rate since 1968, with 59.6% of eligible citizens participating, or an estimated 120 million votes. Fifteen million more Americans voted in 2004 than in 2000, despite long lines that kept some voters waiting for over 7 hours. Not surprisingly, the largest turnouts occurred in "swing states," where a majority of campaign time and resources were spent. The major partisan divide is seen as a primary cause for such high numbers. Despite the highly publicized youth vote campaign on both sides, increases among college-attending youth were seen only in the battleground states, and there only slightly. Across the board, young people accounted for 17 percent of the overall turnout, exactly the same percentage as 2000.

Because of such a polarized campaign and election, the third party factor was almost completely nonexistent in 2004. A little over 1 million votes went to the four third-party candidates. If this political division between Republican and Democrats were to continue, the role of the third party would decline. However, this same divide that brought about such large turnouts may prove to be temporary if such polarization does not exist in the future.

SUMMARY

WITH THIS CHAPTER, we switched our focus from the election decision and turned our attention to the actual campaign process. What we have seen is that while modern campaigning makes use of dazzling new technologies and a variety of strategies to attract voters, campaigns still tend to rise and fall on the strength of the individual candidate. In this chapter we have stressed the following observations:

1. **The Structure of a Campaign**
   A campaign, the process of seeking and winning votes in the run-up to an election, consists of five separate components: the nomination campaign, in which party leaders and activists are courted to ensure that the candidate is nominated in primaries or conventions; the general election campaign, in which the goal is to appeal to the nation as a whole; the personal campaign, in which the candidate and his or her family make appearances, meet voters, hold press conferences, and give speeches; the organizational campaign, in which volunteers telephone voters, distribute literature, organize events, and raise money; and the media campaign waged on television and radio and in newspapers and magazines.

   Campaign staffs combine volunteers, a manager to oversee them, and key political consultants including media consultants, a pollster, and a direct mailer. In recent years media consultants have assumed greater and greater importance, partly because the cost of advertising has skyrocketed, so that campaign media budgets consume the lion's share of available resources.

2. **The Media and Campaigns**
   Candidates for public office primarily win by gaining access to media. They gain access with paid media, purchasing ad time on television and ad space in print media, and with free media, television and print media news coverage. Because candidates cannot easily control media coverage, they cannot rely on free media alone. Candidates, therefore, must spend campaign dollars on creating advertisements that deliver campaign messages without media criticism. The Internet increasingly makes this possible, since candidates can use it as a cheap medium to relate directly to voters and activists.

3. **Campaign Finance**
   Since the 1970s, campaign financing has been governed by the terms of the Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA). Because of the rise of soft money, the FECA was amended in 2002 by the Bipartisan Campaign Finance Reform Act, which was promptly challenged and upheld with very few exceptions by the Supreme Court.

4. **Bringing It Together: The 2004 Presidential Campaign and Election**
   A very competitive Democratic primary season, that had Howard Dean leading for much of the winter, ended in victory for John Kerry in Iowa. Kerry's momentum carried him on to a quick primary victory, and began the unofficial general campaign far in advance of the summer. Public opinion remained extremely close until the conventions, where President Bush benefited from a well orchestrated effort by the Republicans. Bush's slight lead over Kerry was diminished by a lackluster performance during three televised debates and the end of the race was a photo finish. Turnout was very brisk, and President Bush managed a close but convincing win in both the Electoral College and the popular vote.

KEY TERMS

campaign consultant, p. 516
campaign manager, p. 516
candidate debate, p. 521
communications director, p. 517
contrast ad, p. 518
direct mailer, p. 516
finance chair, p. 516
free media, p. 518
general election campaign, p. 511
get-out-the-vote (GOTV), p. 516
hard money, p. 529
inoculation ad, p. 518
matching funds, p. 529
media campaign, p. 511
media consultant, p. 518
negative ad, p. 518
nomination campaign, p. 510
organizational campaign, p. 511
paid media, p. 518
personal campaign, p. 511
political action committee (PAC), p. 526
pollster, p. 516
positive ad, p. 518
press secretary, p. 517
public funds, p. 529
soft money, p. 531
spot ad, p. 518
voter canvass, p. 514

SELECTED READINGS

Abramson, Paul R., John H. Aldrich, and David W. Rohde. *Change and Continuity in the 2000 and 2002 Elections.* Washington, DC: CQ Press, 2003.

Ansolabehere, Stephen, and Shanto Iyengar. *Going Negative: How Political Ads Shrink and Polarize the Electorate.* New York: Free Press, 1997.

Ceaser, James W., and Andrew E. Busch. *Losing to Win: The 1996 Elections and American Politics.* Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 1997.

Ceaser, James W., and Andrew E. Busch. *The Perfect Tie: The True Story of the 2000 Presidential Election.* Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2001.

Fenno, Richard F., Jr. *Senators on the Campaign Trail: The Politics of Representation.* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1998.

Greive, R. R. Bob. *The Blood, Sweat, and Tears of Political Victory . . . And Defeat.* Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1996.

Herrnson, Paul S. *Congressional Elections: Campaigning at Home and in Washington,* 4th ed. Washington, DC: CQ Press, 2003.

Holbrook, Thomas M. *Do Campaigns Matter?* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1996.

Kern, Montague. *30-Second Politics: Political Advertising in the Eighties.* New York: Praeger, 1989.

Mayer, William G., ed. *In Pursuit of the White House 2000: How We Choose Our Presidential Nominees.* Chatham, NJ: Chatham House, 2000.

Nelson, Michael, ed. *The Elections of 1996.* Washington, DC: CQ Press, 1997.

Pomper, Gerald M., ed. *The Election of 2000: Reports and Interpretations.* Washington, DC: CQ Press, 2001.

Sabato, Larry J., ed. *Campaigns and Elections: A Reader in Modern American Politics.* Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman, 1989.

Sabato, Larry J., *Paying for Elections: The Campaign Finance Thicket.* New York: Priority Press for the Twentieth Century Fund, 1989.

Sabato, Larry J., *Toward the Millennium: The Elections of 1996.* New York: Prentice Hall, 1997.

Sabato, Larry J., *Overtime! The Election 2000 Thriller.* New York: Longman, 2001.

Sabato, Larry J., and Glenn R. Simpson. *Dirty Little Secrets: The Persistence of Corruption in American Politics.* New York: Random House, 1996.

Sorauf, Frank J. *Inside Campaign Finance*, reissue ed. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1994.

Thurber, James A., and Candice J. Nelson. *Campaign Warriors: Political Consultants in Elections.* Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 2000.

Troy, Gil. *See How They Ran: The Changing Role of the Presidential Candidate,* revised ed. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996.

WEB EXPLORATIONS

To compare the development of presidential candidates, go to
http://www.cnn.com/ALLPOLITICS/
To find out what Americans have to say on a range of political issues and to experience poll-taking firsthand, go to
www.gallup.com
To get an insider's look at the detail and urgency with which campaigns are now covered, go to
http://www.cnn.com/ELECTION/2004/
To get involved and find out what you can do about campaign reform, go to
http://www.house.gov/shays/reform/cfr3526-sum.htm
http://www.cnn.com/2004/ALLPOLITICS/02/24/elec04.prez.bush.marriage/index.html