I. 1996 election – Christian-right races had mixed results
   A. Major races
      1. U.S. Senate: Jesse Helms (R) v. Gantt (D)
         a. Both moved to center – Helms on abortion, Gantt on welfare & crime
         b. Major predictor variables [Table 6, attached]
      2. Governor: Robin Hayes (R) v. Jim Hunt (D)
         a. Most important role for NC Christian right in 1996 was in primary contest
            (1) Close and divisive race – 50:46
            (2) Religious purists > pragmatists (Charles Vinroot) in Republican primary
         b. General election won easily by Hunt – largest victory margin since 1980
            (1) Hayes trailed Helms
               (a) Republicans
               (b) Political conservatives
               (c) Christian-right identifiers
               (d) Political moderates
      3. U.S. House of Representatives: CC backed two politically vulnerable incumbents that lost
         a. 2nd District: David Funderburk (R) (motor-vehicle violation) v. Bob Etheridge (D) 46:53
         b. 4th District: Fred Heineman (R) (defined mc as $300-750k) v. David Price (D) 44:54 (Raleigh-Cary-Chapel Hill)

II. 1998 elections
   A. Major races
      1. U.S. Senate election: Lauch Faircloth v. John Edwards
         a. Faircloth campaign: late attempt to link Edwards to Clinton & impeachment
         b. Edwards campaign: “New Democrat” centricism
         c. Major predictor variables [Table 6 handout]
      2. U.S. House: National Republican Congressional Committee TV ads attempted to link Democratic incumbents to Clinton
         a. 2nd District: State Senator Dan Page (R) unsuccessfully challenged incumbent Bob Etheridge (D)
         b. 4th District: Software executive Tom Roberg (R) unsuccessfully challenged David Price (D)
         c. 8th District: open seat won by textile millionaire Robin Hayes (R) over Mike Taylor (D)

III. Both elections
   A. Electioneering on religious right
      1. Christian Coalition
      2. FEC lawsuit
         a. Endorsing candidates in phone-bank calls
         b. Partisan voter guides
         c. Partisan get-out-the-vote drives
   B. Counter-mobilization on religious left
      1. Interfaith Alliance
      2. Evangelicals for Social Action
      3. Call to Renewal
Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>1990 Helms</th>
<th>1996 Helms</th>
<th>1998 Faircloth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Republican identifiers</td>
<td>2.86***</td>
<td>4.86***</td>
<td>5.78***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton impeachment supporters</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>2.72***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believers that the sexual behavior of politicians is very important</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>1.96**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Christian-right Protestants</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly-or-more church attenders</td>
<td>1.73*</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.90*</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.01*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonwhites</td>
<td>0.16***</td>
<td>0.18***</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic identifiers</td>
<td>0.30***</td>
<td>0.30***</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>0.56**</td>
<td>0.49***</td>
<td>0.40***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban dwellers</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.41***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>(494)</td>
<td>(603)</td>
<td>(498)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.05 ** p < 0.01 *** p < 0.001