

*Abramson, et al., Ch. 1: The Nomination Struggle*

---

- I. Introduction
- II. Who ran
  - A. Incumbents are usually challenged by few or none within their own party
  - B. Open-seat contests produce many more candidates for their party's nomination
  - C. Open-seat contests with sitting vice presidents usually reduce the number of candidates in that party
  - D. Current office-holders are discouraged from running because of the increasing amounts of time, energy, and effort required
  - E. Candidates are most likely to have had prior service as: Table 1-1, p. 16
    - 1. U.S. Senator
    - 2. State governor
    - 3. U.S. Representative
- III. The rules of the nomination system: a vast amount of both short- and long-term change
  - A. Federalism, or state-based, delegate selection
    - 1. Congressional party caucuses (1790s-1820s)
    - 2. National party conventions (1830s-1968)
      - a. Selection of delegates by state party bosses
      - b. Back-loading of primaries
  - B. The nomination system of 1972: delegate selection Figure 1-1, p. 21
    - 1. Selection of delegates by rank-and-file party-primary voters
    - 2. Front-loading of primaries
  - C. The nomination system of 1972: campaign finance
    - 1. FECA of 1971, '74, '76, '79
    - 2. "Early money is like yeast"
- IV. Why Bush won Table 1-2, p. 25; Table 1-3, pp. 26-27 (over McCain)
  - A. Fund-raising advantage
  - B. Negative advertising – especially in the closed primary in SC
- V. Why Gore won Table 1-4, p. 28; Table 1-5, p. 29 (over Bradley)
  - A. Greater name recognition for Gore
  - B. Bradley's inability to define himself as a distinct alternative to Gore
- VI. The conventions
  - A. Bush chose Cheney to balance youth and national inexperience
  - B. Gore chose Lieberman to balance voter concerns about ethics and morality

