Election FOCUS 2004

JANUARY 14, 2004 | U.S. Department *of* State | ISSUE 1 • NO 1

Inside This Issue:

- **Overview of 2004 Race** . . . . . .*page 1*
- **The 2004 Presidential Election:** An interview with Charles Cook . . . . . .*page 1*
- **Campaign Highlight:** Biographies of the 10 Candidates . . . . . .*page 8*
- **Campaign Calendar:** Schedule of Primaries and Caucuses . . . . . .*page 10*

FAST **FACTS:**

✔ **History Shows January Front Runner Often Does Not Win Democratic Nomination**

In only 4 out of 10 election years did the front runner at this stage of the campaign win the Democratic Party's nomination, according to a recent poll analysis done by the Gallup Organization. These four were Adlai Stevenson in 1952, John F. Kennedy in 1960, Walter Mondale in 1984, and Al Gore in 2000. In all other instances, someone else came from behind as the primary season unfolded.

To receive this newsletter via a listserv go to: http://lists.state.gov/archives/election2004.html

An Overview of the 2004 Presidential Race

The 2004 race for the White House begins with the Iowa caucuses on January 19, and then, a little more than a week later the New Hampshire primary on January 27. These initial election events are considered to be the official start to the campaign season, and their outcomes will set the tone for the primaries and caucuses that follow, state by state, until early June. On March 2, "Super Tuesday," 10 states—California, Connecticut, Georgia, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New York, Ohio, Rhode Island and Vermont—will hold primary elections or caucuses. Many believe that the eventual Democratic nominee will be known soon after this date. President Bush, running unopposed for the Republican nomination, is certain to be his party's candidate.

This year there are nine Democratic contenders—former Senator Carol Moseley Braun, former NATO Supreme Allied Commander General Wesley Clark, former Vermont Governor Howard Dean, Senator John Edwards (North Carolina), Congressman Richard Gephardt (Missouri), Senator John Kerry (Massachusetts), Congressman Dennis Kucinich (Ohio), Senator Joseph Lieberman (Connecticut) and Reverend Alfred Sharpton.

(continued on page 2)

The 2004 Presidential Election: An Interview with Charles Cook

Charles E. Cook, Jr., editor and publisher of *The Cook Report*, is a political analyst for the National Journal Group, and is regarded as one of the nation's leading authorities on U.S. elections and political trends. Recently, Washington File Staff writer Darlisa Crawford talked to Cook about the 2004 presidential election. He predicts that the upcoming presidential race will be a "big-issue" election with trade, the economy, job growth and the war in Iraq, dominating the campaign.

Q: What will be the major issues in the 2004 elections?

A: If I had a choice, if I had to predict whether President Bush was going to get reelected or not, and if I had a choice of knowing either who the Democratic nominee was going to be

(continued on page 3)

(continued from page 1)

In recent elections, presidential candidates have begun their campaigns more than a year before the first caucuses and primaries. The media, public opinion polls and fundraising test a candidate's popularity long before any votes are cast. Therefore, candidates must get their message out and attract new supporters early in the process. They also need to maintain their momentum and continue to bring in funds through the lengthy election cycle: the primaries, the political conventions and the general campaign.

Another reason getting off to a fast start is crucial is the increasingly early scheduling of primaries and caucuses, a phenomenon known as "front-loading." Various states, hoping to play a more decisive role in the process, have scheduled their primaries and caucuses early in 2004. Other states—Colorado, Kansas, Utah and Washington—have reacted to this front-loading of the campaign calendar by canceling their primaries altogether in the belief that a late primary will have little impact on the outcome, and choosing instead to save the millions of dollars required to stage an election.

Results from the primaries and caucuses gradually lessen the number of candidates, as some contenders drop out, and determine how many delegates will be pledged to each candidate. The delegates come together at their parties' national convention, held during the summer, where a final selection is made for the presidential and vice presidential nominee, and their policy positions, or "platforms." The Democratic National Convention will take place July 26th – 29th in Boston, Massachusetts. The Republican National Convention will take place in New York City from August 30th – September 2nd, the latest a Republican national convention has ever been held.

The financing of campaigns remains an issue of great attention and controversy. The McCain-Feingold Law, recently upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court, places some restrictions on how money for political campaigns can be raised and spent. Despite these limitations, however, candidates and parties will spend many hundreds of millions of dollars on television and radio advertising, direct voter outreach and so-called "issue ads" promoting political positions on specific issues without endorsing a candidate by name. The federal government also provides funding to help national candidates finance the campaigns for their parties' nominations, but several candidates, including President Bush, Senator Kerry, and Howard Dean, the current Democratic front runner, have opted out of this system, believing they can raise more funds by themselves. This decision will free all three candidates from a $45 million spending limit, which is imposed on any candidate who receives such public funding. All three candidates believe they can raise larger amounts than $18.8 million in public subsidies through the nominating conventions for their campaign.

At the general election on November 2 voters across the country cast their votes for president. But a nationwide popular vote does not determine the winner. In actuality, voters have selected a slate of "electors" to the Electoral College, a system written into the U.S. Constitution by the Founding Fathers. In all states except Maine and Nebraska, the party that wins the popular vote commits all of its electors—each state is entitled to as many electors as it has U.S. senators and representatives in Congress—to the winning candidate.

On December 13, 2004 the electors will meet and vote for president and vice president. The two-party electoral system of Democrats and Republicans requires an absolute majority of the 50 states or 270 electoral votes, since there are 538 total electoral votes. The votes are certified by state authorities and sent to Washington, D.C. where on January 6, 2005, the votes will be counted by the president of the Senate, with the full Senate and House of Representatives in attendance. At that time, the candidate officially becomes the winner and president-elect.

The inauguration of the new president takes place at noon on January 20, 2005, ending an election process that began nearly two years before. ■

— BUREAU OF —
INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION PROGRAMS

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE
Washington, DC 20547
http://usinfo.state.gov

The U.S. Department of State is pleased to present its election coverage newsletter, **Election Focus 2004**. The newsletter will provide non-partisan coverage of the U.S. election process, featuring articles, interviews, public opinion polls, and other information on the presidential primaries, debates, conventions and campaign activities of the major presidential candidates.

Election Focus 2004 is produced by the Democracy and Human Rights team in the Bureau of International Information Programs.

If you are interested in receiving this newsletter via a listserv, please send your request to:
http://lists.state.gov/archives/election2004.html

(continued from page 1)

The 2004 Presidential Election: An Interview with Charles Cook

or how the war in Iraq is doing in the three or four months leading into the election, I'd rather know how the war is doing. I think that's more relevant.

If I had a choice of knowing who the Democratic nominee was going to be or what the economy is looking like in 2004, particularly in the second quarter of 2004—because we know from history that it's the second quarter economic statistics that are the best predictors of how an incumbent president is going to do—I would rather know that, not just what's the gross domestic product growth rate, but also what's the unemployment rate, what's the employment number, and how does that number compare to January 2001, and what's the degree of under-employment of people that have lesser jobs today than two or three or four years ago? I'd like to know that.

And it's not to say that who the Democrats nominate isn't important, because it is, but overwhelmingly we know that when an incumbent president is up for reelection, it's basically a referendum on the incumbent more than it is a comparison between two candidates. It's "do you believe that this incumbent has performed well enough to deserve reelection; do you have confidence in that incumbent leading us for the next four years?"

And the answers are "yes," "no" and "maybe." If the answer is yes, then the voters do believe that the president deserves reelection and they do have confidence in the president to lead us for the next four years, and then it really doesn't matter who the opponent is.

And conversely, if people have lost confidence in a president, if they don't believe he deserves reelection, they don't have confidence in him to lead us for the next four years, then it almost doesn't matter who the opponent is, either. Any Democrat would have a plausible chance of winning the Democratic nomination, and would be perfectly capable of winning.

It's only if it's in that narrow "maybe" zone, where the voters are not sure if a president deserves reelection; they're not sure they have confidence in the president for the next four years, and only then is the identity and the caliber of the opponent really relevant.

I tend to think that that "maybe" zone in the middle may be where we're headed, because I think it's unlikely that the situation in Iraq will be significantly better. I don't think it's going to be resolved by then. The overall economy may or may not be better, but is the job situation going to be significantly better by then? We don't know that.

Q: How will the Democratic candidates discuss and/or criticize the administration's policy on Iraq after the capture of Saddam?

A: I think this creates a period of time of a month or so where it's going to be awkward for Democrats to attack the president. But I also suspect it's only going to be weeks or a month—not all the way to the election—because these situations tend to have what we call a "short shelf life," where they don't last very long and tend to be overtaken by events.

It also depends on who the Democratic candidate is.

Obviously, if you're Howard Dean and oppose the war completely, your attacks are of one nature.

If you're Joe Lieberman, and were fully supportive of the war, enthusiastic about the war, but have differences with how the president has conducted it, that's very different.

And John Kerry and Dick Gephardt are yet different again.

So, it depends on who the Democratic candidate is.

I think what you'll probably see is more Democrats saying that it's great that Saddam Hussein has been captured and brought to justice, and this is a good thing, but that we probably should have waited for greater, more widespread international participation, that we shouldn't have been in such a hurry, and that the whole second phase of the war should have been planned better.

Q: How will Dean maintain his lead as the Democratic front runner?

A: I think everything comes down to January 19th when the Iowa caucus takes place. If Governor Dean wins in Iowa, if he beats Congressman Dick Gephardt—and they are—right now as we say, neck and neck in the polls—absolutely tied—then if Governor Dean wins Iowa, I think there's probably a 90 percent chance that he'll win the nomination. He'll have so much momentum and his trajectory will be so high that he could win New Hampshire by an enormous margin, and then he would be very difficult to beat even on

February 3rd when you have the third round of events, which is primaries and caucuses in South Carolina, Arizona, New Mexico, Michigan, Oklahoma, North Dakota, and Delaware.

If Dean were to lose to Gephardt in Iowa, I think that, at that point, his chances of getting the nomination would drop down to maybe 60 percent. He could still go on to win in New Hampshire, because he has such a huge lead there, but his momentum would be slow enough and his trajectory low enough where the chances of Gephardt or former General Wesley Clark or John Edwards from North Carolina, or maybe even John Kerry of Massachusetts, could catch him on or after February 3rd.

But I really think that the defining event will be the Iowa caucus, that will sort of tell us whether Dean is likely to roll on and win the nomination or whether he's going to have a tough fight ahead.

Q: Senator Lieberman and General Clark have chosen not to participate in the Iowa caucuses. How will this decision affect their respective campaigns?

A: Senator Lieberman and General Clark decided not to compete in Iowa because they realized that they just had absolutely no chance of winning, in fact, not much of a chance of even coming in second, third or even fourth place; and so they decided, rather than fight and spend a lot of money and lose, that they would hold their resources back and compete more aggressively in New Hampshire or in the February 3rd primaries. I think it's bad for a campaign to be in a position where they feel like they have to pull out of Iowa and not compete, but under the circumstances, I think their assessment was exactly right. They weren't going to do well.

So does forfeiting Iowa hurt their credibility? Yes. But since they weren't going to win it, they are probably better off taking that money they would have spent in Iowa and trying to improve their chances of winning in New Hampshire or South Carolina or some of the other February 3rd states.

Q: Senator John Kerry, former Governor Howard Dean, and President Bush have rejected public financing. How will this decision affect their respective strategies?

A: I don't think voters understand public financing, matching funds, and I don't think they really care.

In terms of affecting the candidates' strategies, it just gives them greater flexibility, that, under the law, if you accept the matching funds, there's a limit to how much money you can spend in each individual state, an individual spending limit.

And so now, if they're in a tough fight in one state or another state, they can spend as much as they want, which is a flexibility that's very, very important, and that helps them a great deal.

So it's not just a matter of being able to spend more money total, it's being able to spend more money in places where you need to spend it the most, and not be hampered.

For example, if Kerry needs to spend all the money in the world in New Hampshire, but not spend as much money in Iowa, he can do that. He's got that flexibility that he would not have had had he abided by matching funds.

Q: Dean won the endorsement of Elijah Cummings of Maryland, the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, and former Vice President Al Gore, as well as a dozen state and local lawmakers in Georgia. Will this position Dean as the "favorite candidate" for the African American community?

A: I think Governor Dean has made a big deal out of some of these endorsements, but I think he's done that because he doesn't have real strong support on the grassroots level in the African American community, and so he's trying to kind of leverage support among some of the leaders into grassroots support.

The polling I've seen in places like South Carolina, for example, the African American vote is absolutely wide open. I mean, it is absolutely up for grabs. Dean is getting very little of it now. If he wins Iowa, if he wins New Hampshire, he'll probably get a very healthy share.

I think the most important endorsement was when South Carolina Congressman Jim Clyburn, who is African American, and is, arguably, the most influential Democrat in the state, endorsed Dick Gephardt. I'd rather have Jim Clyburn's endorsement than Al Gore's, because Howard Dean was doing so well that I'm not sure any endorsement would help him

enormously. Conversely, had anyone else won the Gore endorsement, it would mean a lot more to them, because they all needed a break.

So, in terms of translating into votes, I would rather have Jim Clyburn's support, because I think South Carolina is going to be a critical primary, and I think he would probably have more sway among voters in South Carolina, particularly African American voters in South Carolina than Al Gore would have nationally.

Q: Do you think Gore's endorsement of Dean increases his base of support in the South?

A: I think Governor Dean is now trying to create a beachhead in the South, and he's trying to do it with endorsements from key leaders, but he hasn't been endorsed by that many significant figures in either the white or African American communities in the South.

Q: How will the Supreme Court decision to ban soft money and restrict some TV and radio issue ads influence the campaign strategies of the candidates?

A: In the primary, it's not going to make much of a difference in the fight for the Democratic nomination.

In the general election, what it means is that a lot of the money that the national parties would be spending on behalf of the presidential campaigns, instead will be spent by other independent groups who will be cropping up on both the Republican and Democratic sides, and who will raise and spend much of the soft money that was being raised and spent by the national parties.

So to be honest, I don't think the new law will end the influence of big money. It will just rechannel it away from the parties and more into these new independent groups.

Q: What role will the Internet play in the 2004 election?

A: The Internet is a very, very useful tool. So is the telephone. So is the fax machine. So is the photocopy machine and the printing press. It's an instrument.

Some campaigns are in a position to use the Internet more effectively than others.

For example, Howard Dean's campaign has used the Internet very effectively, both in terms of being able to raise money from non-traditional campaign donors, and as an organizational tool.

In some cases people who have never given to a political candidate before are simply going on the Internet and going on Dean's website and contributing money using a credit card right over the Internet.

In other cases, it's an organizational tool—helping people communicate with other people and to organize rallies and events for Dean, to organize groups of supporters, either in a geographic area or with a common interest to support Governor Dean. So he's used it extremely effectively.

I also think, though, that the kind of supporters that Howard Dean usually has are younger, a little bit more affluent, tend to be more open to technology. His appeal is uniquely suited towards the Internet. Another candidate,

"I think it's going to be a big-issue election, not a small-issue election.

When the economy is good and when there is no war, then issues like abortion or gay rights or the environment, some of these other kinds of issues have an opportunity to kind of percolate, to come up to the top, and to dominate.

But when you've got big issues like war and peace, prosperity or economic turmoil, then those issues are going to dominate over anything else."

— Charles E. Cook, Jr., editor and publisher of The Cook Report

like Dick Gephardt, could have just as good a website and pour just as much money into using the Internet as Howard Dean has, but it wouldn't do nearly as well, because his membership tends to be older, they tend to be a little bit less affluent, they tend to be more unionized, and they're a lot less wired to the Internet than, say, Dean's pool of potential supporters.

Q: How will the role of private contributors such as Soros's commitment to voter funds influence the outcome of the 2004 election?

A: I think President Bush is going to raise and spend far more money than the Democratic nominee will, and I think it's safe to say that the Republican National Committee will raise and spend considerably more than the Democratic National Committee will spend.

But having said that, I think there's going to be more money raised outside of the two campaigns and outside of the two major national party committees.

I think there will be more money raised on the left, on the liberal, labor, pro-Democratic side, than there will be on the business, conservative, pro-Republican side once you take out the two candidates, the two national committees.

I think there's going to be more money on the left than on the right, and that it will partially, not entirely but partially, offset the Republican spending advantage that otherwise is going to be taking place. I think it's going to make the fight a little bit more evenly split between the two sides.

Q: If Ralph Nader decides to run for the 2004 presidency on the Green Party ticket, how will that decision affect the other candidates?

A: If the election is very close, any other candidate on the ballot even getting a relatively small number of votes can make the difference.

The question is, is the election going to be close enough so that Nader could make a difference if he decides to run?

I tend to think that Nader will get even fewer votes in 2004 than he did in 2000, just as I think if there is a conservative third-party candidate running, they will probably get even fewer votes than Pat Buchanan did in 2000.

And I think the reason for that is that because the last election was so close, I think there's going to be a reluctance on the part of voters on the liberal or the conservative side to "throw away" their vote for someone else.

If I were a liberal living in Florida and I had voted for Ralph Nader, I would probably have regretted that vote every single day since the 2000 election; and conversely, if Al Gore had won Florida and the election by 537 votes, and if I were a conservative who had voted for Pat Buchanan in Florida, I probably would have regretted that vote every single day, too, because I would have seen that there was an enormous difference between Gore and Bush and that, voting for a third candidate hurt the cause.

So I would say there's going to be a lower third party vote in 2004 than there was in 2000, and it just depends on how close the election is as to whether it's enough to make a difference.

Q: Dean secured the endorsement from two politically powerful labor unions, the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees and the Service Employees International Union. How critical is the role of labor unions in the upcoming election, and are there particular states that are more labor union intensive in terms of voting?

A: Within the Republican Party, labor is of minimal influence. But on the Democratic side, labor does have a great deal of influence. But there's an enormous split this year within the world of labor. The unions that have traditionally hired manufacturing workers, for instance, have largely backed Gephardt, while unions of public employees, government employees and of service employee workers have gone more with Howard Dean.

And it comes down to trade. The unions that care about trade are almost all backing Gephardt and the unions for which trade is of no consequence whatsoever tend to be backing Dean.

It's what we call "white collar" or government employee and public sector and service employee unions on the one side versus "blue collar" manufacturing-oriented jobs, going with Gephardt.

Now, which states?

Iowa is a key state with unions. The Michigan caucus which is coming

up on February 7th is a huge state with industrial unions playing a large part.

Q: How will General Wesley Clark's extensive military and foreign policy experience pose a threat to the other Democratic candidates?

General Clark's background is obviously a huge advantage in a key area. It gives him a level of credibility and authority that no other Democrat has. However, it's offset by the fact that he's not as experienced in politics.

If Dean were to win the nomination, I think the chances are very strong that he would pick General Clark, because Clark's strength is Howard Dean's weakness, and I think they would complement each other a great deal. In fact, I have a hard time seeing how Dean would pick anyone other than Wesley Clark.

Clark may or may not be the best running mate for other candidates, but I think he would be a much bigger asset for Dean than anyone else.

Q: Do you want to add any other comments or reflections?

A: I think it's going to be a big-issue election, not a small-issue election.

When the economy is good and when there is no war, then issues like abortion or gay rights or the environment, some of these other kinds of issues have an opportunity to kind of percolate, to come up to the top, and to dominate.

But when you've got big issues like war and peace, prosperity or economic turmoil, then those issues are going to dominate over anything else.

The other thing I would suggest is that I have not seen trade as a major campaign issue since the Democratic presidential primaries in 1988, but I see trade really picking up as an issue in this election, and it's because of some of the structural job losses that we've seen.

There was a study by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York that was released back in August, and it looked at the last four economic downturns. In the downturns of the mid-'70s, 49 percent of the job losses were what we call cyclical job losses—temporary job losses—but when the economy comes back, those jobs come back, and 51 percent of the job losses were structural, were more permanent job losses.

In the downturn of the early '80s, the percentages were exactly the same—49 cyclical, 51 structural.

In the downturn of the early '90s, though, the cyclical—the temporary job loses—dropped down to 43 and the structural ones went up to 57.

But the current downturn, only 21 percent of the job losses were cyclical; 79 percent were structural.

And we know that it always takes longer to create brand new jobs than it does to basically bring people back to old jobs: it doesn't take long to add another shift back at the factory or to call back salespeople that had been laid off when sales were down. That happens pretty quickly.

But when you have to create whole new jobs, sometimes from entirely new companies, or from entirely new industries, that takes much, much longer.

So, the jobs issue, I think, is going to be a very big one in this campaign, because I think that it will require an unusually high level of economic growth to create enough new jobs to get us back to anywhere near where we were in January 2001.

And that's why I think the trade issue is going to be big, and one thing that complicates it is that a lot of these job losses are white collar jobs. In many cases, they're knowledge-based jobs that are going to foreign countries, and they're very high-paying jobs. They're the jobs that we were training people to get out of manufacturing and go into knowledge-based jobs that would be more permanent jobs, that would last them for a career, and now we're starting to lose many of these.

And that's why I think the economy is going to continue to be an issue and jobs will continue to likely be an issue through this election, much more so than in other recent elections. ■

The opinions expressed in this article are those of the interviewee and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the U.S. government.

Campaign★Highlight

The 2004 Presidential Candidates

REPUBLICAN INCUMBENT

George W. Bush

Sworn into office on January 20, 2001, as the 43rd president, George W. Bush is the second son of a president to also serve in that office. John Quincy Adams, son of John Adams, was first. Bush spent his childhood in Midland and Houston, Texas, and received a bachelor's degree in history from Yale University in 1968, followed by an MBA from Harvard Business School in 1975. Elected governor of Texas in 1994, Bush was re-elected to a second four-year term in 1998.

The attacks of September 11, 2002, gave the Bush administration, in the president's words, "our mission and our moment." Since that time, the war against terrorism has been the administration's highest priority.

Bush was born on July 6, 1946, in New Haven, Connecticut. He and his wife, Laura, have two daughters.

DEMOCRATS

(Listed in alphabetical order)

Carol Moseley Braun

As a U.S. senator from Illinois from 1993-1999, Carol Moseley Braun was the first female African American to serve in that capacity. Moseley Braun graduated from the University of Illinois with a B.A. in 1969 and the University of Chicago Law School with a J.D. in 1972. She also served as President Bill Clinton's ambassador to New Zealand from 1999 to 2001. Moseley Braun, a critic of the war in Iraq and the Patriot Act, supports expanding health care and pension protections. In announcing her candidacy, she said a woman president could move the nation "toward peace, prosperity and progress."

Carol Moseley Braun was born on August 16, 1947 in Chicago, Illinois. She is divorced with one child.

Wesley K. Clark

After graduating from the U.S. Military Academy at West Point with a B.S. in 1966, Wesley K. Clark went on to Oxford University in 1968 and earned his M.A. degree. During his 34 years of distinguished duty in the U.S. Army, Clark served as a four-star general, with stints on the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as commander-in-chief of the U.S. Southern and European commands and as supreme commander of NATO. After army service, Clark became chairman and CEO of Wesley K. Clark & Associates and a military analyst for CNN. He has been critical of the war with Iraq, and emphasizes the importance of building international coalitions to deal with terrorism.

Wesley Clark was born on December 23, 1944 in Chicago, Illinois. He and his wife, Gert, have one child.

Howard Dean

After graduating from Yale University with a B.S. in 1971, Howard Dean received an M.D. from the Albert Einstein College of Medicine in New York in 1978. Before turning to politics, he shared a medical practice with his wife. Dean was first elected governor of Vermont in 1992, after serving the remaining term of his deceased predecessor. He was re-elected to four consecutive two-year terms, opting not to run in 2002, in order to pursue the presidency. Dean was the first Democrat to oppose the congressional resolution authorizing military action against Iraq. Recognized as the Democratic front runner, Dean emphasizes new spending that emphasizes health and education, paired with a repeal of the 2001 tax cuts and a balanced budget.

Dean was born on November 17, 1948, in New York, New York. He and his wife, Judith, have two children.

John R. Edwards

U.S. Senator John R. Edwards was elected from North Carolina in 1998. Before that, he was a practicing attorney. Edwards graduated from North Carolina State University with a B.S. in 1974 and from the University of North Carolina with a J.D. in 1977. Senator Edwards opposed the 2001 tax cuts and supported normalizing trade relations with China and "fast track" trade authority. Although he voted to authorize President Bush to use military force

against Iraq, Edwards proposes a federal agency that focuses on collecting intelligence about terrorist threats within the United States, divorcing the FBI from that responsibility.

John Edwards was born on June 10, 1953 in Seneca, South Carolina. He and his wife, Elizabeth, have three children.

Richard A. Gephardt

Congressman Richard A. "Dick" Gephardt is currently serving his 14th term in the U.S. House of Representatives. After graduating from Northwestern University in 1962 with a B.S. degree, he received a J.D. from the University of Michigan in 1965. He served in the Air National Guard from 1965-1971. Gephardt ran for the Democratic presidential nomination in 1988, winning the Iowa caucus, but losing the later primaries. He voted for the October 2002 congressional resolution giving President Bush authority to use military force against Iraq.

Richard Gephardt was born on January 31, 1941 in St. Louis, Missouri. He and his wife, Jayne, have three children.

John F. Kerry

U.S. Senator John F. Kerry has served four consecutive terms from Massachusetts, beginning in 1984. He graduated from Yale University with a B.A. in 1966, and after serving in the U.S. Navy from 1968-1969, he obtained a J.D. from Boston College in 1976. Although he received the Silver and Bronze Stars, and three Purple Hearts while serving in Vietnam, Kerry gained notoriety as a spokesman for Vietnam Veterans Against the War in 1971. He supported the October 2002 congressional resolution giving President Bush authority to use military force against Iraq, but opposed funding of missile defense research.

Kerry was born on December 11, 1943 in Denver, Colorado. He has two children from his first marriage, and three step-children, with his wife, Theresa.

Dennis J. Kucinich

As a member of the U.S. House of Representatives from Ohio, Dennis J. Kucinich is currently serving his fourth term in Congress. Kucinich received both a B.A. and an M.A. in 1973 from Case Western Reserve University. He supported the congressional resolution authorizing President Bush to use military force against Iraq, but also wants a Department of Peace created that would seek "not only to make nonviolence an organizing principle in our society, but to make war archaic." Few political observers think that Kucinich has a chance of becoming the Democratic nominee in 2004, but he may appear on the presidential ballot as the nominee of the Natural Law Party.

Dennis Kucinich was born on October 8, 1946 in Cleveland, Ohio. He is divorced with one child.

Joseph Lieberman

U.S. Senator Joseph Lieberman has served three consecutive six-year terms from Connecticut, beginning in 1988. Prior to that he was the Connecticut state attorney general from 1983-1988. He received a B.A. degree from Yale University in 1964 and an L.L.B. from Yale Law School in 1967. As former Vice President Al Gore's running mate in the 2000 presidential election, Lieberman became the first Jewish nominee for national office on a major party ticket. He supported the October 2002 congressional resolution giving President Bush authority to use military force against Iraq.

Lieberman was born on February 24, 1942 in Stamford, Connecticut. He and his wife, Hadassah, have four children.

Alfred C. Sharpton

Alfred C. "Al" Sharpton is an ordained Pentecostal minister. He ran unsuccessfully for the New York state senate in 1978, and also lost bids to be U.S. senator from New York in 1992 and 1994, as well as the mayor of New York City in 1997. As president of the National Action Network, a civil rights organization, Sharpton disagrees with the use of military force in Iraq, claiming the Bush administration's response to the attacks on September 11, 2001, have put citizens' constitutional rights in jeopardy.

Sharpton was born on October 3, 1954, in Brooklyn, New York. He and his wife, Kathy, have two children. ■

Calendar of Primaries & Caucuses

In the United States primary elections and party caucuses are essential to choosing presidential candidates. This calendar lists currently scheduled presidential primaries and caucuses leading up to the national 2004 election. The Democratic National Convention is July 26-29 in Boston, Massachusetts. The Republican National Convention is August 30 – September 2 in New York City.

A primary is a state-level election in which voters choose a candidate within a political party to run against a candidate of other political parties in a later, general election. A primary may be either open—allowing any registered voter in a state to vote for a candidate to represent a political party, or closed—allowing only registered voters who belong to a particular political party to vote for a candidate from that party.

A caucus is an informal meeting with candidates and potential voters in which participants discuss their preference for a certain candidate, and delegates, pledged to a particular candidate, are selected to go to party conventions. In Iowa, one of the six U.S. states to hold a caucus, a candidate must have at least 15 percent of the vote to send delegates on to a county convention. The supporters of candidates who do not receive at least 15 percent of the vote must choose a more viable candidate or none at all. A caucus is the most local form of election politics, with voters being directly involved in the process. ■

PRIMARIES & CAUCUSES

JANUARY 19
Iowa

JANUARY 27
New Hampshire

FEBRUARY 3
Arizona
Delaware
Missouri
Oklahoma
S. Carolina (D)
New Mexico (D)
North Dakota

FEBRUARY 7
Michigan (D)

FEBRUARY 8
Maine (D)

FEBRUARY 10
Tennessee
Virginia
District of Columbia (R)

FEBRUARY 14
District of Columbia (D)
Nevada (D)

FEBRUARY 17
Wisconsin

FEBRUARY 24
Utah (D)
Hawaii
Idaho

MARCH 2
California
Connecticut
Georgia
Maryland
Massachusetts
New York
Ohio
Rhode Island
Vermont
Washington
Minnesota

MARCH 9
Florida
Louisiana
Mississippi
Texas

MARCH 13
Kansas (D)

MARCH 16
Illinois

MARCH 20
Alaska (D)
Wyoming (D)

APRIL 13
Colorado (D)

APRIL 27
Pennsylvania

MAY 4
Indiana
North Carolina

MAY 6-8
Wyoming (R)

MAY 11
Nebraska
West Virginia

MAY 18
Arkansas
Kentucky
Oregon

MAY 25
Idaho

JUNE 1
Alabama
New Mexico
South Dakota

JUNE 8
Montana
New Jersey

Note: Primaries are in blue; Caucuses are in *red italic*.