

Abramson, et al., Ch. 2: The General Election Campaign

- I. Introduction
- II. The strategic context and candidates' choices
 - A. The Electoral-College context
 - 1. 1980-1996 Figure 2-1, p. 33
 - a. Solidly Democratic states
 - b. Leaning Democratic states
 - c. Competitive states
 - d. Leaning Republican states
 - e. Solidly Republican states
 - 2. 1980-2000 http://people.uncw.edu/lowery/pls303/Wayne_chapter_outlines/Outcome.pdf
 - a. Solidly Democratic states
 - b. Leaning Democratic states
 - c. Competitive states
 - d. Leaning Republican states
 - e. Solidly Republican states
 - 3. 2004 state-by-state polling data: <http://www.electoral-vote.com/> and http://www.nytimes.com/packages/html/politics/2004_ELECTIONGUIDE_GRAPHIC/
 - a. Solidly Democratic states
 - b. Leaning Democratic states
 - c. Competitive states
 - d. Leaning Republican states
 - e. Solidly Republican states
 - B. Alternate strategies
 - 1. Appeal to partisan base
 - 2. Appeal to moderates and swing voters
- III. From Labor Day to the debates
 - A. The Democrats: trying to exploit the "convention bounce"
 - B. The Republicans: stopping the Democrats' momentum
- IV. The debates: the Republicans surpass low expectations
- V. Final efforts
 - A. Focusing on the battleground states
 - B. Gore copes with the Nader threat
 - C. The focus on turnout
- VI. Did the campaign matter? Table 2-1, p. 44

