

The Invisible Primary and the 1996 Presidential Nomination

Thomas R. Marshall, *University of Texas at Arlington*

The 1996 presidential nominations process will not begin with the first state primaries and caucuses. By January 1996 the candidates had already spent millions of dollars and thousands of days campaigning during the "invisible primary." The 1996 nominations race features several new practices—such as the front-loading of delegate-selection events, and the re-emergence of Washington insiders as the early GOP leaders. For the first time since 1964 the Democrat Party did not face a spirited nominations race.

This article reviews the prenomination season for the 1996 presidential race with evidence available by early January 1996.

Public Opinion

Public opinion remained relatively stable during the 1995 "invisible primary," just as it typically has in recent presidential contests.¹ Heavy spending in key primary and caucus states, debates among the candidates, and the entry and exit of candidates all failed to move public opinion polls during 1995. In the absence of saturation media coverage and media labeling of "winners" and "losers" in the early caucuses and primaries, few dramatic poll shifts appeared.

The Republicans

Throughout 1995, the Gallup Poll reported only slight changes in the first-choice preferences of self-identified Republicans and independents leaning Republicans. Between April 1995 and January 1996, front-runner Bob Dole's support varied only from a low of 45 percent to a high of 51 percent. Support for Senator Phil Gramm varied only from a low of seven percent to a high of 13 percent. Support for Pat Buchanan varied only from five to 10 percent. Despite the entry and exit of candidates, most candidates' support varied only slightly across the pre-primary season, and poll movement occurred in a random-like fashion.

THOMAS R. MARSHALL is Professor of Political Science at the University of Texas at Arlington.

Table 1. First-choice Poll Support in 1995 for Republican Candidates

	Alexander	Buchanan	Dole	Dornan	Gramm	Keyes	Lugar	Specter	Wilson	Forbes	No Opinion
1996:											
January 5-7	2	6	49	1	10	2	6	na	na	11	14
1995:											
December 15-18	1	9	49	1	13	2	3	na	na	8	13
November 17-18	4	6	45	2	10	1	2	2	na	5	13
November 6-8	2	7	46	1	6	1	2	4	na	6	25
September 22-24	2	9	46	1	10	1	2	2	5	na	22
August 28-30	4	7	45	1	11	2	3	2	10	na	15
August 4-7	4	10	46	1	9	2	2	3	4	na	19
July 7-9	4	6	49	1	7	2	3	3	8	na	17
June 5-6	2	7	51	2	13	1	2	4	6	na	12
May 11-14	3	5	51	2	12	1	3	3	7	na	13
April 5-6	3	8	46	2	13	1	5	2	6	na	14

Source: The Gallup Poll, responses among Republicans and independents leaning Republican. Percentages sum across to 100% except for rounding off and no opinions. Figures exclude prominent non-candidates Ross Perot, Colin Powell, and Newt Gingrich, as well as minor GOP candidates Maurice Taylor and Arthur Fletcher.

As in past years, the early preference polls focused on well-known names and past contenders. Throughout 1995, the only active candidates to average poll support of ten percent or higher were past contender and Senate Majority Leader Dole and prominent conservative Senator Phil Gramm. As in earlier years, most first-time candidates could not significantly raise their national poll standings.

The exception to this pattern was celebrity author and former general Colin Powell. When Powell's name was included in a September 22-24, 1995 Gallup Poll, he tied front-runner Dole at 31 percent.² On November 8th, however, Powell announced he would not be a candidate for the Republican nomination.

These small fluctuations during the invisible primary are typical of past years. In 1987, for example, poll support for the three GOP front-runners in early polls (George Bush, Bob Dole, and Pat Robertson) varied only an average of eight percent from high to low. In the Democrat race, poll support for the three poll front-runners (Jesse Jackson, Michael Dukakis, and Paul Simon) varied only an average of four percent from high to low during 1987.

Typically, dramatic poll shifts do not occur until the early caucuses and primaries, when media attention is more focused on the election (Aldrich 1980; Marshall 1981). For example, in 1988, between late January and mid-March, poll support changed dramatically for the leading candidates. For George Bush, poll support jumped 24 percent over a six week period (from 45 to 69%)—an average poll increase of four percent a week among Republicans nationwide. In 1992, support for Bill Clinton among Democrats nationwide jumped 25 percentage points (from 17 to 41%) during a six week period in January and February—an average increase of four percent a week among Democrats nationwide.

These results suggest that the highly front-loaded 1996 primary and caucus-convention season will find public opinion still rapidly adjusting to the February and early March caucuses and primaries when the "Junior Tuesday" (March 5), "Super Tuesday" (March 12), and "Big Ten" (March 19) primaries are held. When early primary and caucus winners surge in the polls, their poll surge usually continues for a minimum of two weeks or more. In 1996, however, the primary season is so front-loaded that the time from the Iowa caucus to Super Tuesday is only one month.

The 1995 candidate field seemed to inspire unusually little public enthusiasm. Several polls reported widespread willingness to vote for a third-party candidate. In July 1996, for example, a Gallup Poll reported that only 41 percent of Americans polled would be satisfied with a Clinton-versus-Dole contest, while 56 percent would want to see an independent candidate on the

ballot. In mid-1995 ex-General and celebrity author Colin Powell ran nearly even with Clinton and Dole; a Gallup Poll reported 28 percent for Powell, 33 percent for Clinton, and 29 percent for Dole. Texas billionaire Ross Perot gathered 20 percent, versus 40 percent for Clinton, and 35 percent for Dole. Such results suggest an underlying volatility in support for both front-runners.

Several other nationwide polls also showed widespread voter dissatisfaction with the early frontrunners. In an October 27-30, 1995 *Los Angeles Times* Poll, 43 percent of voters said they would consider an alternative to the GOP and Democrat nominees. That figure was up from 29 percent in January 1995, or 28 percent in March 1992, who said they would consider an independent or third-party candidate.

A Gallup Poll question from January 5-7, 1996 showed similar results. Only a third (37%) of Americans indicated that they thought there was a presidential candidate from either party who would make a good president. A plurality (43%) said there was not. The percentage responding that there was no candidate who would make a good president was highest among Independents (49%), but also relatively high among both Republicans (42%) or Democrats (37%).

The Democrats

The lack of a significant challenger to Democrat incumbent Bill Clinton is somewhat surprising. Of the last four incumbents, two (Ford in 1976, Carter in 1980) drew significant opposition, while two (Reagan in 1984, Bush in 1992) did not.³ Mid-term losses better predict whether an incumbent will have a significant challenge than do early public opinion standings. By this mid-term loss predictor, the Democrat Party's unusually large 1994 Congressional losses would suggest a significant Democrat challenge would have arisen to President Clinton's renomination.

Table 2. Midterm Losses for Recent Incumbent Presidents*

Year	Incumbent President	House Losses	Senate Losses	Combined Losses	Serious Challenge?
1976	Ford	-48	-5	-53	YES
1980	Carter	-15	-3	-18	YES
1982	Reagan	-26	+1	-25	NO
1990	Bush	-9	-1	-10	NO
1994	Clinton	-52	-8*	-60	NO

* Midterm election losses only; does not count subsequent party switches.

Public opinion polls somewhat offset the prediction that President Clinton would have a significant challenge for renomination. During 1995 Clinton fared considerably better among self-identified Democrats than did President Carter during 1979. On the average, about a quarter of self-identified Democrats either disapproved of Clinton's performance or expressed no opinion. In an August 28-30, 1995 Gallup Poll, for example, some 26 percent of Democrats disapproved of Clinton's performance or expressed no opinion. In an August 4-7, 1995 Gallup Poll, a third (34%) of Democrats preferred another candidate or were undecided in a three-way match-up between Clinton, Dole, and Perot.

By contrast, President Carter's "invisible primary" poll standings during 1979 were much more negative. Among self-identified Democrats, on the average, barely half of Democrats approved Carter's performance during 1979. In an August 3-6, 1979 poll, for example, 41 percent approved Carter's performance, 46 percent disapproved, and 13 percent expressed no opinion.

Table 3. Public Opinion Poll Approval for Recent Incumbent Presidents

		Percent Approval Year Before Election				
		First of January	Mid- Year	Last of Year	Average Approval	Serious Challenge?
1975	Ford	37	52	39	43	YES
1979	Carter	50	28	54	38	YES
1983	Reagan	37	47	54	44	NO
1991	Bush	58	72	50	71	NO
1995	Clinton	47	46	51	48	NO

Source: Gallup Poll "Do you approve or disapprove of the way ___ is handling his job as president?"

Aside from his relatively strong poll support among self-identified Democrats, how can President Clinton's lack of opposition best be explained? At least two more answers can be offered.

First, the large number of unpledged, official "super-delegates" in the Democrat Party helps explain the lack of opposition to Clinton's renomination. Super-delegates include all Democrat members of the U.S. House and Senate, national committee members, governors, the President and Vice

President, former presidents and vice presidents, former House Speakers and Senate Majority Leaders, and former chairs or current members of the Democrat National Committee. These unpledged delegate votes account for 18 percent (or 773 of 4294) of the 1996 Democrat convention delegates. In addition, state party leaders and elected officials account for another 11 percent (or 461 of 4294) of delegate votes.⁴ Overall, only 3060 delegate votes are directly chosen through district or at-large delegate process—some 71 percent of the total Democrat delegate votes.

Because of the super-delegates, a majority of Democrat convention delegates will be picked (in primary states) or the process begun (in caucus-convention states) by March 9, 1996. By comparison, for the GOP nominations process, the date on which a majority of delegates have been selected (or the process begun) is almost two weeks later, on March 19th.

The super-delegates provide a significant buffer against challenges to an incumbent president. Super-delegates were approved by the Hunt Commission prior to the 1984 Democrat nominations process. The aim was to provide a greater voice to recognized party leaders and to those who would have to work with the candidate, should he be elected president (Crotty 1983; Crotty and Jackson 1985). In 1984 the super-delegates heavily backed former vice-president and party insider Walter Mondale. In 1988 such delegates overwhelmingly preferred nominee Michael Dukakis over party rival Jesse Jackson. Overall, the track record of Democrat super-delegates probably benefits centrists and incumbents.

Second, the lack of a challenge to incumbent Democrat President Clinton may have also resulted in part from the Democrats' heavy Congressional losses in 1994. Ironically, these unexpectedly large losses led to GOP control in both the U.S. House and Senate. In turn, potential Congressional challengers lost their committee chairmanships and staffs, their ability to control the legislative calendar, and much of their funding sources.

Whatever the explanation, President Clinton's lack of invisible primary opposition benefits his campaign considerably. By one calculation, Clinton's campaign will have almost \$40 million in private contributions and federal matching funds to use before August 1996—when both Clinton and his GOP opponent will receive more federal funding for the general election (Broder 1996).

Campaign Fund-raising

As in past years, the announced contenders showed a large range in fund-raising totals and sources of contributions. According to September 30,

1995 Federal Election Commission (FEC) figures, the Clinton, Dole, and Gramm campaigns led in contributions.

According to one press report, front-runner Dole raised another \$5.7 million during the last quarter of 1995. Gramm (\$1.9 million), Buchanan (\$2.3 million), Alexander (\$1.5 million), and Lugar (\$700,000) trailed in last-quarter fundraising (Marcus, 1996).

The Federal Election Commission set a first-time record by failing to raise sufficient taxpayer funds to fully pay all the matching funds approved. The full matching fund amounts will be paid later in the spring, but only sixty percent of the dollars candidates qualified for will be paid immediately. Several candidates were expected to be forced to take out bank loans against the expected amounts, and to pay interest until the matching funds were finally paid.⁵

The September FEC figures in Table Four do not include cash-on-hand. According to campaign sources, Dole led GOP contenders in that category with \$7 million at years end, with Gramm (\$4.7 million) and Alexander (\$1.2 million) as the next most solvent candidates.

Table 4. Federal Election Commission Reports on Campaign Fundraising, Through September 30, 1995

	Individual Contributions	Candidate Loans/Contrib.	Other	Total
Democrats				
Clinton	19,252	0	292	\$19,544
LaRouche	815	0	1	816
Republicans				
Alexander	8,395	4	258	8,657
Buchanan	4,294	38	10	4,342
Dole	18,025	0	1030	19,055
Dornan	199	40	1	240
Forbes	10	4,016	0	4,026
Gramm	13,508	0	5,413	18,921
Keyes	844	5	5	854
Lugar	3,726	0	515	4,241
Specter	2,110	1	659	2,770
Taylor	5	2,951	1	2,957
Wilson	5,006	0	232	5,238

Note: Republicans and Democrats only shown. "Other" categories include transfers from other committees, loans, and party contributions minus refunds. No matching funds had been yet distributed. All figures are rounded off to the nearest thousands (000) of dollars.

Large differences in the candidates' federally-approved matching funds also occurred, as Table Five, below, indicates. Candidates Dole, Clinton, and Dole had been certified to receive the largest amounts of federal matching funds, as of the December 27, 1995, FEC figures. These large amounts will further magnify the front-runners' ability to run a nationwide race, over their less well-funded challengers.

Table 5. Federal Matching Funds Approved, End of 1995

Dole	9,265	Lugar	2,275
Clinton	9,015	Wilson	1,591
Gramm	6,654	Specter	989
Buchanan	3,977	LaRouche	261
Alexander	3,226	Hagelin*	100

Note: All figures are rounded off to the nearest thousands (000) of dollars.

*Natural Law Party candidate.

Candidate Strategies

Republican candidates pursued markedly different strategies throughout 1995. All the major GOP followed the now-conventional strategies of organizing early, raising large dollars, and building organizations in several states (Wayne 1996). The candidates also focused their efforts on the early contests, particularly the traditionally-critical Iowa caucuses and New Hampshire primaries. By one estimate, the GOP candidates spent a record 379 days campaigning in Iowa alone (Berke 1996). Altogether, the GOP candidates spent an estimated \$60 million before 1996, with heavy early organizing, focus groups and polls, and television campaigns (Berke 1996). Senator Dole, for example, campaigned extensively in both states, and won an early endorsement from New Hampshire GOP Governor Stephen Merrill.

Front-runner Bob Dole clearly led prenomination season GOP polls, and joined Senator Gramm as the fund-raiser frontrunner. Dole's early endorsements from elected Republicans, his standing and media presence as Senate Majority Leader, and his past campaigns all helped his nomination bid. Dole also benefitted from a fragmented field of opponents, including the proliferation of conservative Republicans, such as Gramm, Buchanan, Dornan, and Keyes. Prolonged media speculation over ex-General Powell's candidacy, and the late entry of media mogul Steve Forbes also diverted attention from Dole's opponents. By January 1996 Dole seemed to have the

resources in depth needed to remain in the race, despite a possible early setback.⁶

Faced with weak early showings in Iowa and New Hampshire polls, Senator Gramm's campaign joined state party activists to encourage early events in states more likely to be favorable to him, such as the Arizona and Delaware primaries and Louisiana caucuses.⁷ Gramm's well-funded and strong grassroots organization also focused heavily on a series of non-binding straw polls during 1995, with considerable success. Gramm's repeated first- or second-place finish in early GOP straw polls, however, did not significantly raise his nationwide poll figures. By January 1996, Gramm ran third in nationwide polls, trailing both Dole and newcomer Steve Forbes.

Notably, the invisible primary witnessed at least two prominent GOP candidates drop out even before the first primary—first, California Governor Pete Wilson (on September 29, 1995), and second, Pennsylvania GOP Senator Alan Specter (on November 22). Their unusually early exit reflected the high costs of organizing an increasingly front-loaded set of primaries and caucuses, and the difficulty of organizing within a fragmented field. California Governor Wilson had a difficult reelection contest in 1994, delaying his presidential bid.⁸

Several other potential candidates did not enter the contest—including Bill Bennett, Richard Cheney, Jack Kemp, and former vice-president Dan Quayle. For most of the non-candidates, the demands of raising funds was cited in their decision not to run. The large number of GOP non-candidates and early dropouts clearly shows that the invisible primary is a critical stage of the presidential nominations process.

For the first time in recent years, the dynamics of the race appeared to favor Washington-based office-holders. Early GOP front-runners Bob Dole and Phil Gramm were both Senators—a group previously thought to be disadvantaged by the heavy time demands of the open nominations process.

Senate Majority Leader Dole benefitted from extensive media coverage during the 1995 Congress-White House conflicts, from his support among key GOP governors, and from his fund-raising ability as Senate Majority Leader. The GOP sweep in the 1994 Congressional election also provided a GOP Senate majority, thereby ensuring that Dole could better control the Senate schedule than had he been the Senate minority leader. His strong early showing calls into question the widespread thesis that the post-1968 "open" nominations process effectively excludes Washington insiders, incumbent presidents aside (Marshall 1981).

Senator Gramm benefitted from the so-called "LBJ Law"—a vestige of earlier presidential races which allowed a Texas Senator to run for

re-election and for President at the same time. While the unique Texas law was often criticized, no serious effort was made in the 1995 Texas legislature to change the law, which had earlier benefitted Senators Lyndon Johnson and Lloyd Bentsen. Gramm's frequent absences from the Senate and from Texas were sometimes blamed for his sliding home-state popularity. According to the statewide Texas Poll, Gramm's approval ratings slid from 63 percent in Spring 1991 to 46 percent in Summer 1995.⁹ Nonetheless, no serious GOP challenger appeared for Gramm's U.S. Senate seat in the U.S. Senate primary.

Both early front-running Senators also benefitted from their extensive contacts. Dole had run three times previously in the GOP national race. Gramm had served as National Republican Senatorial Committee in the 1994 election.

Perhaps the most unusual challenger was millionaire heir and media mogul Malcolm S. "Steve" Forbes. The heir to a media fortune estimated by *Fortune* magazine to be some \$439 million, Forbes could self-fund a late-starting (September 22, 1995) nomination bid. Forbes spent an estimated \$7 million in media advertising in 1995, and \$12 million total, according to media estimates. By turning down federal matching funds, Forbes will be able to spend unlimited funds in the 1996 nominations contest. Forbes's heavy-spending campaign pushed him to a second-place virtual tie in early polls in Iowa and New Hampshire,¹⁰ as well as a first-place finish in at least one statewide poll (Arizona).¹¹ Like Ross Perot, Forbes demonstrated that well-funded outsiders can make a credible race despite a lack of prior party service or elective office. The rising prominence of self-funded multimillionaires may challenge reformers to rethink the complex federal fundraising and spending limits.

The remaining GOP candidates struggled to attract media attention, a nationwide organization, and stronger financial and poll standings. Of the remaining GOP candidates, former Tennessee Governor and U.S. Education Secretary Lamar Alexander and former contender Pat Buchanan appeared to have a strong early organization in several states. Both focused on early events, especially Iowa and New Hampshire as the traditional "outsider's" strategy, but also organized in several Southern and Midwestern states.

The Campaign Schedule

Perhaps the most dramatic change for the 1996 presidential nomination season is the moving forward of many states' delegate-selection events. Several states moved their dates forward to increase their influence over the nominations process and attract more candidate attention. The most notable

changes include Louisiana Republicans, who scheduled a February 6th caucus, just 6 days before Iowa's traditional first caucus,¹² and Delaware, which scheduled a primary only four days after New Hampshire's traditional first primary.¹³ Because both Iowa and New Hampshire state law specify that the state will retain the first scheduled date (Iowa), or precede any other primary by a week (New Hampshire), the changes caused a prolonged stand-off. At this writing, the Louisiana GOP caucus and Delaware primaries were still scheduled.

Several other states also moved their primaries forward. The California primary, for example, had traditionally been held in early June. For 1996, however, the event was scheduled much earlier, on March 26th. Because so many other states or state parties also moved delegate-selection earlier, however, the California GOP primary will still occur relatively late—after 60 percent of GOP delegates are already selected.

The "front-loading" of delegate-selection events mean that a majority of GOP delegates will be chosen by the time of the March 19th Midwestern regional primary (Illinois, Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin). By another comparison, in 1996, one-half the GOP delegates will be selected by the 7th week of the delegate-selection process. In 1992, half the GOP delegates were not selected until the 11th week, and in 1988, not until the 13th week of the delegate-selection process (Berke 1966).

The front-loading of delegate selection also means that early-raised money and field organizations become especially important, and that momentum may have a stronger impact on the 1996 GOP race than in previous years. A successful candidate must compete in 30 caucuses and primaries within six weeks of the February 12th Iowa caucus—with much less time to raise more money or place together a field organization than in past years.

The importance of front-loading primaries and caucuses in 1996 will need to be re-examined after the nominations season. Clearly, early fundraising and a strong field organization become more important. Early primary and caucus successes, free media coverage, and media labeling of "winners" and "losers" may also take on considerable more importance. Whether the front-loaded nominations season will benefit a candidate with the resources to organize widely, versus the early primary and caucus winner is as yet unclear. Some even speculated that the increasingly front-loaded primaries and caucuses might encourage a national primary (Busch and Ceasar 1996).

The front-loading of the primary season suggests that most candidates will almost certainly drop out of the race well before they become well-known and that the perennially low levels of issue voting in past presidential

nominations races will likely continue. The highly front-loaded primary season may preclude very much issue learning among voters, even for the eventual nominee (Zukin and Keeter 1980; Patterson 1980).

Several reasons contributed to the extensive front-loading of the 1996 nominations season. In several states, legislators saw early primaries and caucuses as a way to attract media attention or dollars, and thereby increase their influence within the nominations process (Balz 1993; Berke 1993; Sack 1994). In Louisiana and Arizona, Gramm and Buchanan supporters saw earlier events as a way to provide momentum for their candidate. Interviews with several Sunbelt state legislators also pointed to a widespread resentment with the media's traditional focus on Iowa and New Hampshire as minimizing the growing importance of Southern Republicanism.

The 1996 GOP primary and caucus calendar also helped several candidates when early primaries or caucuses were held in friendly states. The early and neighboring Iowa caucuses seemed to most observers to give Bob Dole an assist. So did the complex New York primary rules which (as of this writing), discouraged most rivals, except Pat Buchanan and Steve Forbes.¹⁴ Dole also benefitted from the over-representation of Northern and Midwestern states holding delegate-selection events during the first month of the nominations race.¹⁵

For conservatives Phil Gramm and Pat Buchanan, the rescheduled Louisiana caucuses seemed likely to provide a boost. Before newcomer Steve Forbe's rise in the polls, the early primaries in Arizona and Delaware were also seen as benefitting Gramm. By comparison, ex-candidates Pete Wilson and Arlen Specter had no such "schedule luck," and neither did Richard Lugar.

The campaign calendar for 1996 also shows a lesser importance for the Super Tuesday primary. In 1992 9 states held a GOP Super Tuesday event. By 1996 seven GOP state events (with roughly 18 percent of all GOP delegates) were scheduled for Super Tuesday will be picked in the 1996 Super Tuesday primaries.

As Hadley and Stanley (1996) have written, Super Tuesday 1988 failed to match its Democrat Party backers' hopes for greater Southern influence in either the Democrat nominations race.¹⁶ Super Tuesday 1992 did, however, have an impact in clinching the 1992 nomination for Clinton. By 1996, the Super Tuesday GOP primaries had attracted far less media attention than in earlier years.

Whether the smaller number of 1996 Super Tuesday GOP primaries will have a great effect on the 1996 nominations race is unclear, and perhaps doubtful. Thirty-one percent of GOP convention delegates will already have been chosen by Super Tuesday—with more state events in non-southern

Table 6. Republican and Democrat Nominations Schedule and Number of Delegates to be Selected in 1996

January 25	Hawaii	caucus R(14)
January 26	Alaska	caucus R(19)
February 6	Louisiana	primary R (restricted) (21)
February 12	Iowa	caucus R(25), D(56)
February 20	New Hampshire	primary R(16),D(26)
February 24	Delaware	primary R(12), D(22)*
February 27	Arizona	primary R(39)
	North Dakota	primary R(18)
	South Dakota	primary R(18)
March 2	South Carolina	primary R(37)
	Wyoming	caucus R(20)
March 5	Colorado	primary R(27),D(58)
	Connecticut	primary R(27),D(66)
	Georgia	primary R(42),D(91)
	Idaho	caucus D(24)
	Maine	caucus R(15), primary D(32)
	Maryland	primary R(32),D(87)
	Massachusetts	primary R(37),D(115)
	Minnesota	caucus R(33),D(92)
	Rhode Island	primary R(16),D(31)
	South Carolina	caucus D(52)
	Vermont	primary R(12),D(22)
	Washington	caucus R(27), D(90)
	American Samoa	caucus D(6)
March 7	Missouri	caucus D(93)
	New York	primary R(102),D(289)
March 9-11	Democrats Abroad	caucus D(9)
March 9	Alaska	caucus D(66)
	Arizona	caucus D(48)
	South Dakota	caucus D(22)
March 10	Nevada	caucus D(27)
	Puerto Rico	primary D(58)
March 12	Florida	primary R(98),D(177)
	Hawaii	caucus D(30)
	Louisiana	primary R(9), D(75)
	Mississippi	primary R(33),D(47)
	Oklahoma	primary R(38),D(52)
	Oregon	primary R(23),D(56) (mail-in)
	Tennessee	primary R(38),D(83)
	Texas	primary R(123)
		primary/caucus D(229)
March 16	Michigan	caucus D(157)
March 17	Puerto Rico	primary R(14)
March 19	Illinois	primary R(69),D(194)
January 13th, 1996	Michigan	primary R(57)

Table 6 (continued)

March 19 (cont.)	Ohio	primary R(67),D(172)
	Wisconsin	primary R(36),D(93)
March 23	Wyoming	caucus D(19)
March 25	Utah	caucus R(28),D(30)
March 26	California	primary R(165),D(423)
	Nevada	primary R(14)
	Washington	primary R(9)
March 29	North Dakota	caucus D(22)
March 30	Virgin Islands	caucus D(4)
April 2	Kansas	primary R(31),D(41)
April 13,15	Virginia	caucus D(96)
April 23	Pennsylvania	primary R(73),D(195)
April 27	Alaska	convention R(19)
May 4	Wyoming	caucus R(14)
	Guam	caucus D(6)
May 7	D.C.	primary R(14),D(36)
	Indiana	primary R(52),D(89)
	North Carolina	primary R(58),D(98)
May 11	Virginia	caucuses R(33)
May 14	Nebraska	primary R(24),D(33)
	West Virginia	primary R(18),D(43)
May 17	Missouri	caucus R(36)
May 21	Arkansas	primary R(20),D(48)
May 28	Idaho	primary R(23)
	Kentucky	primary R(26),D(61)
June 1	Virginia	convention R(20)
June 4	Alabama	primary R(40),D(66)
	Montana	primary R(14),D(25)
	New Jersey	primary R(48), D(120)
	New Mexico	primary R(18), D(34)

Note: Caucus dates reflect the first date of the delegate-selection process. The Republican Party's delegate-allocation formula is based on a minimum (of six delegates) per state; a bonus for a GOP presidential win in 1992; and a bonus for GOP Senators, U.S. Representatives, and the state legislative delegation. Delegate selection procedures for the four delegates apiece from American Samoa, Guam, and the Virgin Islands were not available at this writing.

The Democratic Party's delegate-allocation formula is based on population; the number of Democratic National committee members, Democrats in Congress, Democrat governors, and top party leaders per state. In the Democrat race, the formula provides for 3,521 pledged delegates, plus another 773 unpledged or "super"-delegates. Both numbers may be subject to change because of interim elections, deaths, resignations, or party switches by elected officials. At this writing, the total number of GOP delegates was 1,988 and for the Democrats 4,294.

*The Delaware primary date was not approved by the Democratic National Committee's Rules and Bylaws Committee. The Delaware Democrat party was threatened with a loss of 25 percent of their delegates, as well as other potential (but unspecified) sanctions, if they proceeded with their February 24th primary date.

states. If past experience holds, most of the GOP candidates will have dropped out of the field before March 12th. If the field does remain contested, then several candidates, including conservative Pat Buchanan, former Tennessee Governor Lamar Alexander, Texas Senator Phil Gramm, Majority Leader Bob Dole, and media mogul Steve Forbes, would seem poised to win at least a share of delegates in the mostly Southern Super Tuesday primaries, if they remain in the race.

NOTES

¹The term "invisible primary" was first popularized by Arthur Hadley (1976).

²The complete first-choice results were Dole and Powell, both at 31 percent; Gramm had eight percent, Buchanan seven, Wilson and Forbes three, Alexander two, and Specter, Lugar, and Dornan at one percent each. Twelve percent of Republicans identifiers and leaners expressed no opinion.

³On the nomination roll-call vote or final prenomination test vote, 47 percent of 1976 GOP convention votes were cast against Ford, and 42 percent of 1980 Democrat convention votes were cast against Carter. Less than one percent of final roll-call votes were cast against Reagan at the 1984 GOP convention, while only one percent of final roll-call votes were cast against Bush at the 1992 Republican convention.

⁴Figures are based on delegate numbers provided by the Democrat National Committee, and are subject to changes through deaths, resignations, party switches, or selection of super delegates as pledged delegate votes. The 461 state party leaders and elected officials are selected late in the delegate-selection process and must be approved by the candidate they represent.

⁵The Federal Election Commission anticipates that the ten presidential candidates who qualified for matching funds by December 7, 1995, would be entitled to approximately \$38 million. Only \$22 million would be available for paying certified claims, however. As a result, candidates would receive only 60 percent of their certified matching funds until 1996 tax returns replenished the federal matching funds account.

⁶See William Mayer, "Forecasting Presidential Nominations," in Mayer, ed. (1996, 44-71).

⁷Though called a caucus by the Louisiana Republican Party, the contest actually was a primary election within limited hours (4-8:00 p.m.) and vastly restricted polling places (42 statewide) (Grace 1996, A-1, A-3).

⁸Indiana Senator Richard Lugar also faced reelection in 1994 although he won by a large margin.

⁹A January 1996 statewide poll reported in the *Dallas Morning News*, however, revealed that 55 percent of Texans approved of the job Senator Gramm was doing as U.S. Senator, while 29 percent disapproved.

¹⁰A January poll in New Hampshire put Dole at 37 percent of 512 voters who identified themselves as likely to vote in the New Hampshire primary. Forbes placed second at 18 percent. The poll was conducted by WMUR-TV, and was released Monday, January 15th, 1996.

¹¹According to an early January 1996 statewide poll conducted by Arizona State University, Forbes led with 34 percent, with Dole at 26 percent. Gramm (8%), Buchanan (7%), and Lugar and Alexander (2% each) trailed.

¹²The Louisiana GOP event triggered a Voting Rights Act-based challenge in federal court by millionaire long shot Morry Taylor, on grounds that southern states must have changes in election procedures pre-approved by the U.S. Justice Department; there was no result before the truncated primary election was held.

¹³The Delaware primary did not win approval from the Democrat Party, which threatened the party with a loss of one-quarter of their delegates, as well as other (unspecified) sanctions, should they proceed.

¹⁴The New York GOP presidential primary's complex rules were challenged in court by Dole's rivals, but, as of this writing, were still in place.

¹⁵Of the 20 states holding GOP delegate-selection events prior to the March 12th Super-Tuesday primaries, 12 were in the North or Midwest, and 8 were in the South or West.

¹⁶Charles D. Hadley and Harold W. Stanley, "The Southern Super Tuesday: Southern Democrats Seeking Relief from Rising Republicanism," in Mayer, ed. (1996, 158-189).

REFERENCES

- Aldrich, John. 1980. *Before the Convention: Strategies and Choices in Presidential Nominations Campaigns*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Attlesey, Sam. 1996. Poll finds strong backing for Gramm re-election, *The Dallas Morning News*, 11 January, 1A.
- Balz, Dan. 1993. California Moves Up '96 Primary to March, *The Washington Post*, 6 October, A3.
- Berke, Richard. 1993. California Guarantees Warn Primary Season, *The New York Times*, 23 September, A6.
- Berke, Richard. 1996. Long, Costly Prelude Does Little To Alter Cast of Presidential Race, *The New York Times*, 3 January, A1.
- Broder, David. 1996. Finally, They're Off—More or Less Officially, *The Washington Post National Weekly Edition*, 8-14 January, 17.
- Busch, Andrew, and James Ceaser. 1996. Does Party Reform Have a Future? In William Mayer, ed. *In Pursuit of the White House*. Chatham, NJ: Chatham House.
- Crotty, William. 1983. *Party Reform*. New York: Longman.
- Crotty, William, and John Jackson III. 1985. *Presidential Primaries and Nominations*. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press.
- Grace, Stephanie. 1996. Tiny turnout expected in caucuses, New Orleans *The Times-Picayune*, 6 February, A-1, A-3.
- Hadley, Arthur. 1976. *The Invisible Primary*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hadley, Charles D., and Harold W. Stanley. 1996. The Southern Super Tuesday: Southern Democrats Seeking Relief from Rising Republicanism. In William Mayer, ed. *In Pursuit of the White House*. Chatham, NJ: Chatham House.

- Marcus, Ruth. 1996. In the Race for Dollars, Dole is Ahead, *The Washington Post National Weekly Edition*, 8-14 January, 18.
- Marshall, Thomas. 1981. *Presidential Nominations in a Reform Age*. New York: Praeger.
- Patterson, William. 1980. *The Mass Media Election*. New York: Praeger.
- Sack, Kevin. 1994. Albany Poised to Advance 1996 Primary, *The New York Times*, 6 March, A33.
- Wayne, Stephen. 1996. *The Road to the White House 1996*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Zukin, Cliff, and Scott Keeter. 1980. The original and development of voter's images during presidential primaries. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association annual meeting, Washington, D.C.