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MR. SHARP: Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to the Institute of Politics and to this wonderful forum that many of you have been involved in helping to bring about. My name is Phil Sharp, I'm the Acting Director at the Institute. And you may or may not have seen the news, but we will have our new director coming up, a former Governor of New Hampshire, Jean Shaheen, who is going to be a fantastic addition here at the Kennedy School.

But I'm delighted to see what you are trying to accomplish today for two reasons, one is, as a recovering politician myself, in my very first election in 1970 in the last millennia, I won my first primary by one vote per polling place, by 400 votes and seven people, so I have a particular interest in the notion that every vote counts because I would have been counted out very quickly in that proposition. I also always win narrowly, so maybe I was just a poor politician. But the fact is that they do and, last fall, they really did count, and young people came out, and despite the fact that some commentators seemed to get the message wrong, as you folks know and will be
reiterated here, we did see a considerable upsurge in the voting by young people. We think that was heavily concentrated among college students, who tend to turn out better than their peers.

And from my perspective and I think from all our perspectives, it went well beyond that, there was an intense interest that showed up in voting, there was an intense interest that showed up in taking the campaign seriously, there was an intense interest that showed up in people's participation in the campaigns. And as I think our polling data will show when it's presented, that interest seems to have held and continued, despite the usual kind of predictions where all the people who don't win their way, or whatever, or after they've won their way, they'll all fall off again and be indifferent to politics. And this represents a very significant change over the last six to eight years in the country with this revival of interest among young Americans, which many of us feel is critical to our democratic institutions.

The second, apart from my own personal and selfish reason to get people to vote, no longer in my life but at one point, is we at the Institute of Politics, have a long history, since 1972, of
sponsoring something called Campaign Decision Makers where we get the people who led the various campaigns, usually against each other, to come in and sit at a table like this, in a reasonably civil fashion, and to discuss what went on, what they thought was successful, what they thought they were doing to each other for their own campaign, and to answer questions from journalists, as is going to happen here, in that process.

And over the years, we've produced that transcript about the American campaigns and while maybe the general public is not buying it immediately and it's at the top of the list, the best seller list, the fact is that journalists involved in politics, people involved in running campaigns often go back to those volumes for insights into how things are done and strategic decisions are made. So, in a way, we are going to replicate that here with the recognition that many of you were involved in organizational efforts last fall to see if you couldn't engage your colleagues in voting, in participation in campaigns and to see what you think worked, in hopes of enlightening others that follow in your footsteps has to how we might make sure this revival of student interest is sustained.
Well, with that, I think our goal here, Elise, all of our programs are run by our students, virtually, and Elise is vice president of our student association. I think we are going to go around the room, am I correct? And have everybody introduce themselves.

MS. STEFANIK: Yes. I'm just going to say a quick welcome on behalf of the students. I want to, before we begin, give special thanks to Kristin, and Carrie and Adam who, as students, were basically the liaisons who planned this conference, and also a special thanks to Jennifer Phillips and Laura Simolaris for all their planning on this. Director Sharp actually took my, I was going to talk about the campaign managers conference but, as is probably not surprising, every four years, when we have a Campaign Decision Makers Conference, we don't spend a lot of time talking about whether the youth turned out or did not turn out. And I think, for this reason, it's such a pleasure to have all of our guests here today.

And I hope that the Campaign Decision Makers Conference, that this becomes something we do every four years so we can really build upon how to reach out to young voters because it is an important constituency that is often overlooked. So, with that, I'm going to
go around this way and introduce ourselves. Again, I'm Elise, I'm a junior at the college and I'm Vice President of the Institute of Politics.

MR. FLYNN: I just want to make one housekeeping thing, the short mics are for the recording of this event, they will not be amplified, and the taller mikes are for the microphones. If you have a soft voice, just use the tall mikes but if you can belt it out, that's all right too.

MR. ZAPEDA: I'm Paloma Zapeda, I'm a junior at Harvard College and I'm a member at large of the Student Advisory Committee of the Institute.

MR. WEBER: Good morning. My name is Hugh Weber. At this previous cycle, I was Director of Political Education and Training at the RNC, and now I'm serving as a consultant with Heather Smith and the Young Voters Strategies Project.

MR. FERGUSON: My name is Ben Ferguson, I'm a syndicated talk show host, as well as an author, and acted as a surrogate for the Bush/Cheney Campaign during the last election specifically speaking with young people around the country.

MS. DAVIS: I'm Meighan Davis, I was the Organizing Director for the youth arm of moveon.org
this cycle and right now I'm at the AFL/CIO.

MS. FLEMING: I'm Jane Fleming, I'm the Executive Director of the Young Democrats of America and was part of the team that headed up our project called the Young Voter Alliance which was a peer to peer contact project I'll talk about later.

MR. HOPLIN: Good day. My name is Eric Hoplin, I'm the National Chairman of the Colleague Republican National Committee.

MS. ACKER: My name is Alexandra Acker, I was the National Youth Outreach Director for the Kerry Campaign and I currently work for Democratic GAIN, as their Regional Training Director.

MR. SEKULOW: Jordan Sekulow, I was the National Youth Director for the Bush Campaign. We know each other well.

(Laughter)

MR. SEKULOW: And I am now the Political Director for Ralph Reid's campaign down in Georgia for Lieutenant Governor.

MS. ANDERSEN: I'm Carrie Andersen, I'm a freshman at the college and I worked with Kristin and the staff to help put this on.

MR. FRIEDRICH: I'm Ryan Friedrichs, I worked
at the Young Voter Alliance in 2004 and am working with Skyline Public Works right now doing a study on young voter turnout in 2004.

MS. WALKER: My name is Tobi Walker, I'm a program officer at the Pew Charitable Trust where I do work on youth political engagement and particularly youth voting.

MR. DELLA VOLPE: I'm John Della Volpe, I'm a partner in the bipartisan polling firm of Schneiders, Della Volpe and Schulman and since 2000, I've been working with the students here at the IOP on voter opinion surveys.

MR. LEVINE: I'm Jeff Levine, I'm the Director of the Center for Public Interest Polling at the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers University.

MS. SHERR: Hi. I'm Susan Sherr and I'm the Director of the Civic Engagement and Political Participation Program also at the Eagleton Institute.

MS. RAPP: Hi. I'm April Rapp, I'm a Research Project Coordinator also at the Eagleton Center for Public Interest Polling.

MS. BLAGG: Hi. I'm Kristin Blagg, I'm a freshman at the college and I worked with Kerry and the rest of the conferences committee to help put this
together.

MR. NICKERSON: My name is David Nickerson, I teach political science at Notre Dame and I study youth voter mobilization and program evaluations of different campaigns.

MS. CAMPBELL: My name is Melanie Campbell, I'm Executive Director and CEO of the National Coalition on Black Civic Participation. And I have a program called Black Youth Vote which is a youth led program to engage young African American youth, and I was a 2003 fellow so it's nice to be back.

MR. DAVIS: I'm Gary Davis, I work with World Wrestling Entertainment and I'm here representing our involvement in the Smackdown Your Vote! partnership.

MS. PHILLIPS: I'm Jennifer Phillips, I'm the Director of National Programs here at the IOP and work with a group of colleges around the country under the auspices of the National Campaign for Political and Civic Engagement. Thank you all for coming today.

MR. FRISHBERG: Ivan Frishberg, I was the Outreach and Communications Director for the New Voters Project in the `04 cycle, and am now working with Hugh, and Heather and Tobi on the Young Strategies project at George Washington University and work also with
grassroots campaigns.

MS. MCGILL: I'm Alexis McGill, I'm the Executive Director of Citizen Change and also the, well during the election cycle, I also served as Political Director for the Hip Hop Summit Action Network, so I was involved mobilizing the hip hop generation.

MR. UZETA: My name is Jaime Uzeta and I co-developed the political and social campaigns for MTV and Choose or Lose, was our big focus last year.

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: I'm Cathy McLaughlin, I am the Executive Director at the Institute of Politics.

MS. SMITH: I'm Heather Smith, I was the National Field Director for the New Voters Project in the 2004 elections and now I'm the Director of Young Voters Strategies, based at the Graduate School for Political Management at George Washington University. It's a mouthful.

(Laughter)

MR. MCSORLEY: I'm Tom McSorley, I'm a junior at Harvard College and I work on campus outreach at the Institute of Politics.

MS. SINDERBRAND: My name is Rebecca Sinderbrand I'm a National Affairs Reporter for Newsweek Magazine and last year I was on our political
team covering first the Dean Campaign and then the Bush Campaign.

MS. SNOW: My name is Kate Snow, I'm the Anchor of weekend Good Morning America, and then I work during the week ABC for various different shows, and I covered Kerry during the primary season last year and then Bush, and was at the White House the rest of the time.

MR. SHARP: I was very remiss in my remarks in not recognizing a couple of our staff people who have people who really do an incredible amount of work. Each of our programs at the Institute of Politics has student leadership and staff leadership in support. And Jennifer Phillips, who introduced herself and is running our national program has very much been involved in these activities here at Harvard and with 19 other schools we have an alliance with. And she is helped by Laura Simolaris, where is Laura?

MS. PHILLIPS: Oh, Laura just had to run downstairs.

(Laughter)

MR. SHARP: She's back. And Christian Flynn helped with the logistics with this. And Cathy of course is our Executive Director who oversees and causes everything to work around here, since the...
current Acting Director is rather deficient in some of these categories.

(Laughter)

MR. SHARP: But I'm a recovering politician so everything is excusable. With that, I think we are ready to have Tobi make, we've got a couple of presentations before we start the conversation which our journalists will be leading.

MS. WALKER: Great. Well thank you very much and let me just say that I am fighting an allergy attack, so I'm going to be representing two of the seven dwarves, both Dopey and Sneezy.

(Laughter)

MS. WALKER: So excuse me in advance, and we'll see just how well the Dopey thing goes when I try to do this. Help? What am I doing here?

(Pause)

MS. WALKER: Okay, so, the youth vote, you all know the numbers, I'm going to go through them very quickly but I'm going to tantalize you by saying that we are going to release some new data today that looks at -- woo-hoo, we love data -- that looks at the racial and ethnic composition of young voters and this is the first time that that analysis has been done.
Everything that I'm presenting today I'm presenting on behalf of CIRCLE, the Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement which has become the prime source of data on the youth vote. So what do we know about the youth vote? Well there is actually two ways, using exit polls, that we can calculate the numbers, we can look at the national exit polls which show that turnout among 18 to 24 year olds went up by about 5.3 percent. However, there is a second way to do the analysis which is to look at aggregated state polls. Now I prefer to use that number because it has a much larger sample size and so I think it gives us a little bit more accuracy in trying to understand the impact of young people in this election cycle. When you use that number, you see that the youth vote, among 18 to 24 year olds, went up by about 11 percentage points. If these numbers hold true and are verified when the census bureau data comes out in early 2006, this will be one of the most significant election cycles for young people ever since they earned the right to vote in 1972.

What I think is particularly exciting about this as well is that this was not driven primarily by
candidates. So if you look at 1992, a lot of people will argue that the rise in the youth vote came about because of Ross Perot's entrance into that race. In this cycle, we think actually the youth vote was driven much more by the kind of grassroots and media efforts that were going on, in large part being run by people in this room.

Here we see the importance of the battleground states. The youth vote was definitely drive by the battleground states, by the amount of activity among the candidates, among their surrogates and also the amount of grassroots activity that was happening in the battleground states.

Women versus men: Women were huge drivers in this election cycle, when we are looking at the youth vote, almost all of the increase we can attribute to the number of young women that were hitting the polls.

The new data: This, to me, is so fascinating, this increase in the youth vote comes from African American young people, dramatic increases in the number of African American young people that voted in this election cycle. African American young people were far more likely to vote for Mr. Kerry while white young
people were far more likely to vote for President Bush.

What we see here though is that among Latino and Asian populations, you actually see a decrease in the number of those young people who voted between 2000 and 2004. Now I should caution on the Latino vote that the exit polls are highly disputed about what actually happened with Latinos in this election cycle, so look at these numbers with some caution, but I think you see just how dramatically things differed for African Americans in this election cycle.

Presidential choice: You all know this number, 18 to 29 year olds were the only population, short of those over the age of 75, that preferred Mr. Kerry in this election cycle. We can talk at some point, and I hope we do have an opportunity to talk at some point about why that is the case. Some people will argue it was the draft, it was the war, some folks will argue it was the economy, some folks will argue it was that the Kerry Campaign spent more money and had more surrogates voting out and trying to get the youth vote up and mobilized. I'll be very interested to hear, from those folks who are on the ground, your perspective on why that happened.

What's important to note, however, is that this
is actually the first time ever that young people did not vote for the winner of the popular vote.

Historically, young people have always gone with the winner and so this is the first time that young people kind of veered off from the rest of the population.

Issues: Again, this is based upon exit poll data, which we know is problematic in some ways, particularly this moral values question. But what I think is very interesting about this chart is it gives us the sense that young people are not dramatically different from the rest of the population. What they think about, what they care about, what motivates them to vote, they pretty much look like the rest of the population. A little bit higher on education obviously, particularly for those young people that are still enrolled in college. And I should say that the college student data does come from the lovely Harvard poll which everybody cited and which is a fabulous addition to the work in the field.

So what happened? Why did this year look so dramatically different? When people ask me what does it take to get young people to vote? I say it's not rocket science, all you have to do is ask them. And in this election cycle, conditions were ripe, there were
lots of opportunities for young people to be invited to vote and they responded.

First of all, we saw a lot more money going into the election cycle, our sort of back of the envelope calculation is that just among the non-partisan groups, the six major non-partisan efforts, they spent about $40 million getting young people to vote. Now $40 million seems like a lot of money except when you put it in the context of a $3 billion political economy, $40 million is really a drop in the bucket.

We also saw a higher level of interest on the part of campaigns in recognizing the importance of the youth vote, whether it was the College Republicans, who are seen as one of the top organizing forces on college campuses around the country, whether it was the Kerry Campaign sending the Kerry daughters out or buying ad time, we saw the campaigns paying more attention than we had ever seen before to youth voters. And we also saw a much stronger use of data, research and a common message, particularly among the non-partisan groups.

There was a higher level, I think, in this cycle, of accountability and honesty about the numbers and about what was going on in the field. And I think
that forced the media and political journalists to take
the youth vote more seriously than we had ever seen
before. Of course we also know how quickly and how
easy it was for us to get the youth vote, it was a bust
story on election night and I'm just enormously
thankful for the folks at CIRCLE who were able to get
out the next morning with data that could tell us a
different story and the hard work of everybody in this
room to change that story.

The question we always ask at the Pew
Charitable Trust, we have been investing in this area
since 1998, we've invested probably $40 million over
the past six years, is what happens next? You saw this
big spike, where do we go from here? We think there is
a lot of capacity that's been put in place that can be
capitalized on in this next cycle, whether it's the
thousands of organizers that were trained, whether it's
the technology that was used to track young people, the
data that was collected about young people, whether it
was the political interest that was generated.

It's really interesting to see, in the two
gubernatorial races that we are seeing in 2005, New
Jersey and Virginia, that the candidates are putting
higher education affordability at the top of their
issue agenda, and then of course we are seeing it as an
issue frame. I mean President Bush does not talk about
Social Security without talking about young people.
Ken Mehlman is out there saying Social Security is a
great way for us to build the party and to bring young
people onto our team. And so we think, we are looking
at this question and saying young people are going to
be a hot political commodity going forward, how can we
help build that infrastructure? And that's why we
think about young people as a political constituency.

The example that we are always using is
seniors, now what do seniors do? They vote and they
are engaged in the policy debate, and that forces
politicians to pay attention to them, both in terms of
spending resources on them in a campaign but also
paying attention to their policy agenda. And so we are
asking the question can we really create this cycle of
engagement where you've got young people voting,
politicians are paying attention, you've got young
people engaged in the policy process, and therefore,
politicians have to pay attention to their issue
concerns.

So what's it going to take? Well we think
there are four things that have to happen going forward
over the next 18 months to two years, first, we've got to register a lot more young people. We all know that it's all about the voter files and until you get young people, their cell phones, their e-mails, their addresses into high quality voter files, they are not going to get contacted by the campaigns.

The second thing that needs to happen is we think you've got to engage them on issues. We've got to move passed the let's mobilize them every four years or let's mobilize them every two years and have them involved as full participants in the policy process, but we've also got to pay attention to 2005 and 2006. It's going to be too easy, we know that the youth vote is going to go down in 2005 and 2006, everybody's participation goes down in off year election cycles. Ad so the question is can we at least maintain the level of youth engagement going forward in 2005 and 2006? And the final thing we have to do is we have to tell the story, we've got to be out there talking to every constituency group possible, saying young people made a difference in this election cycle, they look like a different generation, you ignore them at your own peril.

Thanks very much for your time and I look
forward to continuing the discussion.

(Applause)

MR. SHARP: Thank you very much, Tobi. We'll hear from John next.

MR. DELLA VOLPE: I'll spend the next ten minutes finding my PowerPoint and then two minutes talking about it.

(Laughter)

MR. SHARP: I might just say, procedurally, is what's going to happen is after we have the presentations, we'll have our two journalists begin sort of by asking questions of the panelists, but perhaps of some of you as well, and you may, in that process, get into the conversation. And some of you will have questions I'm sure about what has been said here. And also, if they don't get answered, you can always submit, on the pink cards, the question, Jennifer is holding one up there, they are along the tables here, questions that you want to see answered.

MR. DELLA VOLPE: Okay, well, thank you very much. As I said, I've had the pleasure of working with students here at the IOP since 2000, what began as just a single project conceived by some students who were concerned that their fellow classmates and their peers
throughout the country were not as involved in politics as they were in community service. And it started with one survey to understand some of the differences that the viewpoints that college students between community service and political service. That was 2000, that was five years ago and eight surveys ago.

And what I want to do over the next few minutes is to kind of catch everybody back up to speed here. And I think we've seen some very interesting trends in our data, since 2000, that I think help explain part of the story Tobi was telling regarding the very high turnout just a few months ago.

And this is a chart that I've used at every presentation we've had, and I know Tobi just talked about the big turnout, but I was just a luncheon, just a couple of days ago, with some of the board members of the Institute of Politics and some of the conversation around the lunch table was that it's great but it's too bad they didn't turn out like everybody thought they would turn out.

It's still being talked about and everybody here knows that's not the case but, unfortunately, it still exists out there in the media. And this, I think, is one of the best graphics that tells the story. Tobi
talked about the influence of that senior constituency and how everybody wants to kind of compare their demographic group to see it in terms of their likelihood to vote and their efficacy on lobbying many issues. Well, in the last campaign, in 2004, there were more votes cast by men and women under the age of 30 than there were among seniors, 65 plus.

Seventeen percent of the electorate, according to a CNN exit poll, were between the ages of 18 and 29 and 16 percent were the ages of 65 plus and I think, personally, that the 17 percent number is probably on the conservative side, knowing that we know that a third of all college students cast their votes absentee, which are not recorded in those exit polls. So in terms of a political force, this was the first year that they made their voices known and to the degree that we can all talk about this number, I think it's going to be very significant to help correct much of that record.

So just to kind of refresh everybody's memory, in 2000, when we first did the survey, five years ago, we found college students were disengaged politically and had little faith that government could solve any of the major problems facing the nation. Students saw a
distinction between social activism and political activism, social activism, community service was viewed as local, micro effective and very tangible. Students talked at length, through our focus groups and through our survey, that you can actually see the results. Whether you are tutoring somebody and teaching them how to read, you can see the results. Building a house or passing food in a homeless shelter, you can see the results immediately. And that wasn't the case in political activism, they could not connect the dots between fighting for some legislation and seeing how it would have an end effect. Political activism was viewed as distant, macro, bureaucratic and abstract.

At that time, 75 percent of all college students thought that elected officials were motivated mostly by selfish reasons. The majority thought that there was very little tangible results that could be gathered from political involvement. Only half said they were planning on voting in the 2000 election campaign and only seven percent had planned to or actually did volunteer on that campaign, whereas, 60 percent to 75 percent, over the past couple years, have actually volunteered in community service. Volunteerism on college campus is tremendously high,
the low point was 2000 where we started the survey, at 60 percent and it's been as high as 75 percent in our past surveys. These are habits that they actually picked up in high school and have continued, found out that they are rewarded by it and they continued to do so throughout their college years.

So kind of what's changed? I think this past 2004 campaign was, in many ways, kind of a perfect storm. I think three things were happening, I think one of the only positive things to happen out of 9/11 is that politics very, very quickly became relevant again. Adding two new barriers that we talked about just a minute ago, some personal gains where it began to wither away, I think there were kind of a couple of different barriers, we had the attitudinal barriers about their vote didn't matter, and politics was irrelevant and people involved in the process were just concerned about themselves. And then you also had some kind of mechanical barriers in terms the get out to vote efforts, and absentee ballots and some of those things.

The first thing that happened, post 9/11, I think, is the attitudinal barriers slowly began to break away. There are three statements that were
measured over time, since 2000, and I'll just walk through those for a moment, you can see the differences. Most of the attitudinal measures that we kept haven't changed too much over the past five years, or eight surveys, these have changed dramatically. Politics is relevant to my life right now. In 2000, when we first did it, 68 percent indicated that was the fact. In 2001, 77 percent, and during the campaign, 87 percent.

So there has been a net increase of 19 percent where politics is relevant to my life right now. So you can see the spike after 9/11 and then again another spike, not surprisingly, during the 2004 campaign, remembering though that 2000 was also a political year, obviously, of which they were not as engaged.

Elected officials seem to be motivated by selfish reasons, there has been a net decrease in that number, down 16 percentage points. In 2004, as I mentioned, in 2000, as I mentioned earlier, three out of four college students believed that elected officials were just motivated for selfish reasons. Today, that's cut by 16 percentage points where it's 58 percent. Still too high but some tremendous progress and I think we can understand some of the reasons they
actually came out and voted when we look at some of the picture data here.

Political involvement rarely has tangible results. And I think this is the best story of all. We talked about the reason they were involved in community service is because you could see the tangible results. Half disagreed that political involvement had those sorts of results four years ago, five years ago and today, that number has been dropped by 50 percent or 25 percentage points, that they can actually see the connection between their political involvement having very specific tangible results.

The second piece of this is, after September 11th, they had very, very strong views on U.S. policy taking shape. When we did the first survey, we asked an open ended question, what's the number one priority in the United States today? Fourteen percent said education, ten percent said crime, eight percent said health care. There was no compelling issue on college campuses that they felt was kind of affecting their lives. That obviously changed after September 11th and as we progressed in Afghanistan and Iraq. And as they thought about these issues, they saw the kids that they went to high school with and others joining the
military and the numbers of casualties increase, they started to think seriously about politics.

During that time, a majority of them believed that the country was on the wrong track, more opposed the war than supported it. At the early stages of the war, college students were more likely than their older voters to support the war, and we've seen a dramatic decrease in that support over the past couple of years, and as I said, education and crime were the major issues on college campuses in 2000. In the last couple of years, we've seen Iraq and terrorism be a major concern. The economy, two thirds of students are concerned about getting a job when they graduate.

And as Tobi mentioned earlier, that we've seen quite a bit of, in the exit polling as well as in our data, and I think Professor King will talk later about that this afternoon, the kind of importance of moral, religious issues and values effecting their votes. Forty percent, give or take a couple of percentage points, are Born Again Christian on college campuses. The importance of religion and morals, how they view the world and how they view politics is incredibly important and I know Professor King is going to talk more about that this afternoon.
And then the other thing is we are seeing partisanship on the increase, not surprisingly, during the election season. We had 40 percent, 41 percent of college students claiming themselves to be independent and self-identified, self-identified independents. As the election drew closer, we saw increasing identification with both of the major political parties.

In terms of some of the attitudinal questions that we asked in 2004, 87 percent said they were registered to vote. Also, a similar number, the exact same number, 87 percent followed the campaign closely during the last couple of months of the election in the fall semester.

And 87 percent also said the campaign was very relevant in their lives. When we called them up in late September/early October, we asked them, in the last day, when was the last time you talked about the campaign? In the last day? In the last couple of days? In the last week, etcetera? Seventy-five percent had talked about the campaign the last day, something that was the focus, a major focal point of their lives, and 91 percent cared a great deal about who won.
Now I remember doing focus groups not too long ago where we would ask which party are you a member of, who are you planning on voting for, and they didn't care, they had thought it was just a bunch of old white men who, excuse me, Director Sharp, a bunch of old white men in Washington, D.C.--

(Laughter)

MR. SHARP: Pale, male and stale.

(Laughter)

MR. DELLA VOLPE: And it didn't matter, they didn't think they could relate to them in any way whatsoever, and that changed dramatically.

Just to give you some sense of some of the issues I think that were driving the campaign and one of the reasons that Senator Kerry did so well among this demographic, is he understands the problems of people like you. Kerry had a significant advantage in the closing weeks of that campaign in 'shares your values'. I think those are kind of the two drivers behind the Kerry vote. President Bush did well on several, including strong leadership, takes a clear stand on issues, but obviously, they weren't the same issues that the college students cared mostly about during that time, and I think that goes a little way in
at least explaining that vote.

And this is just, very quickly, looking at the progression of the vote. We saw very early, in the spring, once Senator Kerry became the nominee, that he had an 11 point lead in the spring. We did a panel back survey in the summer, we that lead increase, we saw 19 percent of college students thought through it, before the conventions actually switched their position, from undecided or for one candidate to another, they actually switched. And in the fall, it tightened up from the summer months at 52-39, which is about where it ended in November.

I think the third driver, so we first talked about kind of attitudinal barriers and being broken down after 9/11. The second thing is the relevance of it during the `04 campaign cycle. And the third thing is is why most of us are here today, the outreach and mobilization, I think paid off in a major way.

Fifty six percent of college students were encouraged to register to vote by others on their campus, 62 percent were encouraged to actually vote. According to our survey that we just completed a few weeks ago, 73 percent said they voted and a third used absentee ballots. This 33 to 40 percent or so who
used absentee ballots has been a very solid number that we've seen over the last year actually, in terms of leading up to the campaign and a couple of surveys we've looked at post campaign.

Twenty-five percent, again, I think a remarkable number, 25 percent were actively engaged in a political campaign, actively engaged being they gave their time, they gave their money or both. When we first did the survey in 2000, again, a presidential year, only seven percent had plans to become active in the campaign, so five years, three times as many people were involved.

And one of the, again, one of the very optimistic numbers is this final number here, that we asked people, based on this last campaign, some people said it's negative, others may debate that but, based on your experience with the last campaign, how likely are you to be involved with politics in the future? Are you more likely or less likely? Two-thirds said they were more likely to be involved in politics in the future, based on their experience with this last campaign, so a tremendously, I think, positive experience for this group, this demographic group.

And also, I think there are many, many
indications and statistical data that says that once they get involved early, they are much more likely to stay involved and become active as they are getting older. So it's been fun watching this group evolve the next five years, over the last five years and I expect them to become an increasingly important part of the electorate. So thank you very much.

(Applause)

MR. SHARP: Thank you.

Now, we'll turn to Jeff and Susan from the Eagleton Institute.

MR. LEVINE: Thank you.

So right after the election day in 2004, there was a lot of news, particularly in our neck of the woods in New Jersey, and particularly around the Rutgers campus, that students were having problems on election day actually voting, that is not just standing in long lines, but actually showing up at the polls and having people turn them away and not being able to find their names on the list, and so on and so forth. So, at that time, we actually did a survey of students on the Rutgers campus to find out about what students felt, what their evaluation of the voting process was on that day.
We subsequently, after that, decided to do this nationally because we got some good results and we thought it was interesting. The Carnegie Foundation was good enough to give us some funding to do so and so we just recently completed a national survey of students in four year colleges which we just wrapped up a couple of weeks ago, so we are going to give you a quick overview of what we saw. This is sort of literally hot off the presses. I'm going to walk you through some of the turnout stuff that we saw, what students told us they were experiencing, in terms of getting help, and then Susan is going to walk you through some of the problems, and the incidents of problems that students had and the kinds of problems that students said they were experiencing actually on election day.

Just real quick, we, as I said, we wrapped this up April 15th so it's a fairly recent study, it was a national sample of 1,000. We also went out and did a couple of extra hundred in the election day registration states to see if there was differences between those kind of states, and we have some of those results here, but obviously we'll be looking into even more as time goes on.
So, just a quick, top line overview, we found similar I think to what John was talking about, that students this year were really engaged and active on election day. I'll give you the numbers in a minute but the vast majority of students told us that they showed up and were able to vote without having a lot of problems actually, despite some of the reports that we heard about and saw on the news that students actually had a fairly good experience overall. There was a small percentage who didn't, we'll talk about those, but mainly people felt pretty good on election day.

And that students received significant assistance from various groups, various people in the course of the registration process and the course of the voting process that, as I'll talk about here, what was somewhat surprising to us is that it was really mainly they did get help from organizations but they got an enormous amount and at least what they reported was even more help from more informal interactions, particularly with parents, which we thought was an interesting finding. Let me walk you through some of the specific findings.

As I said, the vast majority of students in our survey and again, we did a survey of students who were
registered to vote in four year colleges, 87 percent said that they voted on election day, six percent said they didn't even try to vote and seven percent, which is a fairly small number, said they tried to but weren't able to vote. And as I said, Susan will talk more about what that really meant and who those seven, the seven percent were saying that, what kinds of things they were talking about.

The students who didn't vote wasn't a big surprise to us but they tended to be most likely to be, the extent to which students didn't vote they tended to be younger students, they tended to be students who lived on campus, they tended to be students who voted on campus versus going home to vote. So it's more that it's not particularly surprising to us to find that it is sort of the newer students who live on campus a little more, that's sort of the part of the population that I'm sure comes to no surprise to you, it's a little more vulnerable to having problems or being less inclined to show up and vote.

Where did they cast their ballots? We asked people which of the following ways did you vote, did you vote in person? Did you vote absentee? What we saw, which I think is consistent with other stuff that
we've seen, that the majority of people voted in person but a good chunk, 34 percent, said that they ended up voting absentee. The people who voted absentee tended to live on campus, tended to get registration help from their parents which we found interesting. Again, it's a common theme that we keep finding, that parents are really not the sole but certainly one of the primary ways that students are getting information, that students are getting encouraged to vote and certainly, in this case, are helping people absentee, walking students through how you absentee vote.

A good chunk of people, the majority of students, said that they voted in their home towns but about 44 percent said that they actually voted either on campus or near camps. So it was striking, in New Jersey, when we did that poll, it was even a higher percentage of people that ended up voting in their home towns, but there was a general perception that students are all voting on campus, that's clearly not the case, a good chunk of them are not doing so. The ones who are voting at home tend to be older students, people who are not, who are sophomores and upper classmen, people who registered not at the last minute. So what you are really getting is the segment of students who
are voting on campus are students who are younger, who
are doing it more at the last minute. Again, that
certain segment we see throughout.

We asked the question why did they cast or not
cast their ballots? Again, most people cast their
ballots, 60 percent, my duty as a citizen, lot's of
polls show that, a certain segment of students believe
that. There is also some social desirability
associated with that but that topped out as number one.
But then you got into the issues portion of it and the
candidate part of it, that that's what they, at least,
were telling us was driving them.

And I think this gets back to some of the other
things that we've, the other point which lots of people
have been talking about is that to drive people and to
get them to show up, it's getting and making sure
students are connected to issues and making sure that
that is relevant to them, and so those kind of things.

And then just interesting to note about the parent or
older adult encouraged me to vote, we'll show that a
little bit more down the line but that's a big thing
that's driving people.

And then the small segment of people who
weren't and decided not to vote, too busy popped out
but almost just as much as they didn't like the candidates or campaign issues. So, again, it speaks to that point again about the way to mobilize students is certainly to tell them how to vote and show them the process but to get them excited and encouraged, it's making sure that the issues and the parties and the candidates are relevant to them.

We took a quick look at the difference between turnout and election day registration states versus non-election day registration states, it fell out kind of like you would expect and in other research that we've seen in election day registration states, turnout or more people reported voting. Part of that is due to the fact that those states, at least three of them, were pretty competitive states anyway, so there is a little bit of a chicken and the egg problem there, but still, there was a bump and in the way that we would expect it to be.

We asked people, we asked students where they went to get information, where they went to get assistance and the process of voting. Again, that's really what we were focused most on and we found that a good chunk of students reported getting assistance in the registration process as well as in the voting
process, much more on the registration end of things. But again, that, certainly from our experience, is consistent with what we were seeing. Sixty-one percent said that they received some sort of help in terms of registration and 40 percent said they got some sort of help in terms of voting.

We just took a look to see whether or not people who got assistance or didn't get assistance displayed a higher incidence of voting, it ended up being pretty similar either way. But again, as John was talking about, this is a way in which a lot of students were interested, a lot of students were motivated, so I think you would probably end up seeing more of an impact perhaps in a year like 2000 where people were, there was a segment of students paying a little bit less attention.

We asked people for registration and for voting, we didn't just ask did you get assistance but where you got assistance from, and this chart shows a little bit what I was talking, it demonstrates that look to parents and other relatives more than anyone else for assistance in voting and registering. Clearly, 16 percent for voting, for getting help in terms of voting outdistanced all the other ones,
friends, a government office, student university vote
drive, professor TA, church, group not affiliated with
a political party or issue, group affiliated with a
political party or issue, and we gave them examples of
each of those different kinds of organizations. And
clearly, for both voting and registration help, really
the primary place people were getting it was from these
informal discussions that they were having with
parents.

And then we asked, well, that's fine, what
kinds of specific information and what kinds of help
were you receiving from these different sources? And
we asked them, we gave them four, help you fill out a
form or submit a form for registration, gave you a
registration form, told you where to find information
about registering and encouraged you to register. And
what you see is for, we took the top three places that
people got information about, reported getting
information about registration and what you see is that
for the state, country and municipal office for,
including university effort, they were getting much
more of the mechanics of registering. That is gave
them a registration form, helped them walk through that
process. And what they are getting from parents and
informal contacts is sort of that encouragement to actually go out and do it.

So it's sort of interesting from our point of view, I mean in terms of mobilizing students, there is certainly the need to get students the practical information to be able to walk through it, but there is also the need to get them motivated and encouraged to do so, and it was interesting to us that people were putting a lot of that coming from their families.

So, in terms of communication efforts, that has potential implications to think about in terms of targeting people, not just students themselves and the process of how you register and do things but also the people around them because that has something to say and that certainly is something that at least students reported to us as being important to encourage them to even go through this process.

We asked them which websites, if any, did they look to for registration information in particular. This isn't voting information, this is particularly registration information, and 41 percent said they used the website for registration help, the other segment said not specifically for registration help. We asked them which particular kinds, it was sort of a mishmash
all over the place. This isn't about voting or voting information, this is specifically about registration information but we thought it would be interesting to take a look at that and at least on the registration end of it, less than half of the people said they were going to websites at that point, so that was something that was obvious we wanted to take a look into this year.

Independent, ignore that the title, this slide is probably a little over the top, but we did take a look at Republicans, Democrats and Independents, finding, not so surprisingly, that Independents were less likely to have voted, it's what we would have expected, but they were also less likely to have gotten help registering, or at least reported getting help registering, and less likely to get help voting. So, as a group, obviously Independents are less engaged in various ways but they are also being reached out to less directly, which keeps that cycle going a little bit and keeps them at an additional potential disadvantage.

So I'm going to turn it over to Susan and as I said, the other part of this that we wanted to look into is really the process on the day to see what kinds
of problems the students actually experience, so she'll
walk you through that.

MS. SHERR: Okay, so now we'll talk a little
bit about what problems students encountered when they
were registering and voting. Certainly in order to
vote successfully, ultimately, first you have to
register successfully and so we began by asking
students how difficult they found the registration
process and happily, only a small percentage of
students reported having any difficulties with
registration. In fact only seven percent of students
reported having any problems when asked a general
question about whether they had any problems with
registration.

Then we asked them a series of specific
questions about whether they had trouble obtaining --. There is a little spider crawling towards me on table
here.

(Laughter)

MS. SHERR: Obtaining a registration form,
finding out the deadline for, thank you, filling out
the form, finding out where to send the form--

(Laughter)

MS. SHERR: Or filling out the registration
form and in this case, in response to these specific questions, less than six percent of the students reported having difficulty with any of these tasks, so they were having a fairly successful experience there.

Having had a successful registration experience, we then asked how difficult they found the voting process and it turns out that, again, whether they voted in person or by absentee ballot, students found the voting process to be relatively simple. Ninety-four percent of those who voted said that they found it easy to vote, those were people who voted in person at a polling place, and 80 percent of absentee voters said that they found it was easy to obtain an absentee ballot and 90 percent said that it was easy to cast the ballot. So they clearly weren't having or at least weren't perceiving that they were having difficulty going through the process of casting their ballots.

But we wanted to take this apart a little bit more and explore the question to see if we kind of prompted people to think a little bit more about what happened when they voted, if indeed that they would think that they actually had encountered some
difficulties. So for those who voted in person, we asked them, first, a general question, as we did with registration, just did you run into any problems in the course of voting and again, here we see that only eight percent said that they did.

But we then asked them to respond to a series of possible obstacles that we enumerated, things like encountering long lines at the polling place, or people who are running the polling places not being able to find your name in the book and those sorts of things, and when we presented people with a list of that sort, half of them actually said that they had encountered at least one of these obstacles.

Let's take a look a little bit more closely at what these obstacles turned out to be, so you can see that when we asked the students specifically what obstacles they did encounter, 21 percent of them said it was long lines. Now let me say that these are people who voted so they were clearly undeterred by these long lines, they stayed, they voted, and this was kind of unsurprising because of the high turnout in this election, most people actually or many people, certainly those in battleground states, seemed to have encountered long lines when they went to vote.
Many fewer people clearly encountered things like poll workers who were impolite to them, or trouble finding their names on the rolls or having their IDs questioned, these didn't seem to be very prevalent problems. And then a bunch of people just didn't really know, at this point, if they had actually encountered any of these things, so clearly they weren't very dramatic experiences for them that really stayed with them, if they had encountered them.

Now although there was a group of student who didn't get deterred from voting because of the obstacles they faced, this group, there were students who were unable to vote as a result of the problems. And if you'll recall from the first slide, this is a very small percentage of people, it was only seven percent of the total respondents to the survey and actually, of the seven percent, most of them said that the reason was, the highest percentage of responses about this tended to be about the fact that people did not receive their absentee ballots in time to vote. A very small, small numbers of people here because, again, we are only talking about 69 people altogether, found that the lines were too long and they just ended up leaving or that they couldn't find the polling place.
in the first place. So, really, the biggest problem here seems to be a lack of absentee ballots arriving on time.

So clearly there is a lot of success here and this is not a bad story about students voting, they didn't have a lot of problems, but we were interested in seeing whether there were any differences among students that really stood out, and if there were some groups that had more problems than others or fewer problems than others and what we found were that there really weren't too many, that pretty much we weren't finding a lot of significant differences.

However, we did notice that Republicans were slightly less, somewhat less likely than the total sample to have had problems voting and students who voted in their hometowns were less likely than the overall sample to have problems voting. And we can speculate about why this might be, perhaps where large concentrations of students are all voting together at the same time, some of the issues about their transient nature and other things might kind of overwhelm polling places or there might be more town gown sort of antagonism that arises that causes students to feel uncomfortable where they are voting. So if they are
just kind of one of a larger group of people in their hometown, they may be less likely to encounter those sorts of issues when they go to the polling place.

Now one thing that we thought was interesting was that having actually received help with either registration or with voting actually seems to have made no appreciable difference in whether or not people experienced problems when they actually went to register, I mean went to go and vote. So although it was good to have the help, it didn't seem to have at least effected that aspect of the outcome.

So overall, we can certainly say that it seems that student voting in 2004 was a real success story, in terms of people's level of success in casting their votes. But we also wanted to know how the students felt about that, we wanted to know what their attitudes were about what their role have been in the election, so we asked them questions about those attitudes and about their engagement in the political process.

Well the vast majority of students believe that, as a group, they had an effect on the outcome of the election, 71 percent said that they thought they had either a large effect or some effect on who was elected president, so students were feeling pretty good
about their impact on the election outcome. We also wanted to know, as a result of the discussion we've all been having today about the negative stories that came out the day after the election, whether this had kind of seeped into the mentality of the students and made them feel like in fact they hadn't turned out in big numbers, that their peers, that their age cohort hadn't done what we all know that they did.

Well in fact you'll be glad to know at least this group of college students seems to have absorbed the counter message that came out after when all of you did so much work to reframe the issue, 76 percent said they believed that the youth vote increased in 2004 and only four percent thought it decreased, so that's good news for all of us there. We also asked them a little bit about some of the recent civic and political activities they had engaged in recently and as we kind of find in most surveys, with the exception of discussing politics, students were more likely to engage in more civically oriented, what we call might call civically oriented activities like volunteering for a non-political cause or making a contribution to a non-political cause, but 69 percent said that they had recently talked about politics. Which I think we can
only view as a hopeful sign that there is a high level
of engagement there that can be tapped into to possibly
courage more active, more in person types of
activities that students can become involved with.

And then finally, we asked the students what
they thought was most likely to encourage other young
people to go out and vote and interestingly, the things
that were mentioned the most frequently were the
candidates should focus more on the issues that young
people care about and that they would like to get more
information about candidates and issues. Things like
learning more about voting mechanics were way toward
the bottom of the list with only ten percent saying
that that would actually do something to get more young
people out to vote.

And this is really consistent with what
everyone has been talking about so far and certainly
with our findings that young people really didn't
encounter that many problems when they went to vote, so
there would be no reason for them to believe that
fixing that or mending that problem in any way would
encourage youth turnout.

So I think this sends a message to us, to some
extent, for those of us who are doing on campus
mobilization, whether it be for the political parties
or as activists, that we shouldn't let information and
education about issues take a back seat to the
registration and get out the vote efforts. And it
certainly sounds like, based on what Tobi was saying,
that that's really not the plan, that is the plan for
the future, to bring those things to the forefront, and
it appears that that's what students are looking for,
that they like more information and they believe that
young people will be motivated by more information
about the substance of elections and not just about how
to register and how to case their votes.

Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. SHARP: Well thank you very much. We are
going to make this session run until 1:30 and then take
five minute break at that point, so it's an opportunity
to ask questions of, there's a considerable amount of
data here.

But we're very pleased to be able to turn the
program over at this point to two folks that we were
delighted were willing to spend to their and help us
out here today, Rebecca Sinderbrand of Newsweek and
Kate Snow of "Good Morning America". In fact maybe,
Kate, you and I should just switch so the two of you can actually, does that make sense?

MS. SINDERBRAND: Do you want to start?

MS. SNOW: Journalists always have questions. Do you want to start?

MS. SINDERBRAND: Sure, absolutely. There was a lot of information and we have a lot of questions, I'm sure everyone here does. I had a couple of quick questions and I was hoping you guys could illuminate this for me. I think some of the confusion among some of my colleagues in the news media about what the numbers actually meant, what the turnout numbers actually meant. Could you just, as a baseline, tell me a little bit about, when you are talking about a rise in turnout among young people, those numbers that you are talking about, the percentage increase, is that adjusted for population increase? And since it was turnout among all segments of the population, how does this turnout compare to turnout among others segments, the increase among other segments of the population?

MR. DELLA VOLPE: If I could just take one stab at that. One of the reasons that people said that young voters did not increase was because in 2000, according to the exit polls, in 2000 and in 2004, 17
percent of the electorate were young people, 18 to 29,
so the first guess was that they would change, 17
percent and 17 percent. The flaw in the logic was
that, in 2000, I think it's 107 million people voted
and in the last four years, the society aged
dramatically, fairly dramatically, and yet, in 2004, we
had 119 million people vote. So 17 percent of 107
million versus 17 percent of 119 million is an
increase. So that's kind of, I think, the flaw in the
original logic, people looked at 17 percent as turnout
for both 2000 and 2004, whereas, the base number is 12
million people higher.

MS. SNOW: But has the population of young
people gone up or down--

MR. DELLA VOLPE: No, the population of older
people has increased, so the percent of 18 to 29 year
olds today, as relative to four years, is smaller, so
the increase is actually more dramatic than even that.
And just the other piece is, again, we saw from Jeff's
data and from our data, that about a third of young
people were not counted in the exit polls because of
the absentee issue.

MS. SNOW: A third of college students.

MR. DELLA VOLPE: A third of college students.
MS. WALKER: Yeah, I got really frustrated with that question about sort of as a share of the electorate because my whole thing, the youth voting movement has never been about getting old people not to vote, it's been about getting young people to vote. And so, to me, the share of the electorate question is sort of pointless. The question is did more young people, as a percentage of their numbers in population, vote?

MS. SINDERBRAND: That's the question.

MS. WALKER: And they did, they did dramatically. Now everybody's vote rose, absolutely, there was a greater level of turnout in this election cycle. But we've actually, as you compare 18 to 24 year olds to other percentages of the population, young people were, there was a slight, young people were more, there was a larger increase among young voters than there were among other segments of the population, except for 60 to 75 year olds. So on the whole, young people were voting at a slightly higher rate, when compared to the rest of the population, even though everybody's vote came up.

MS. SNOW: I think everyone would agree that it's an accomplishment but I wonder whether, and this
is really to, I think, everybody around the table, I wonder whether the expectation was that young people would increase even above and beyond. I mean they would increase over their past numbers but they also would increase their share of the voting pie because of perhaps some fault of ours, the media, for drumming up expectations and for talking about how much effort was being made to get out the vote, I wonder if there was an expectation set that they would go above and beyond even just increasing their numbers.

MR. LEVINE: I mean I think there was and part of it was that people thought, you know, you kept hearing people saying, well, young people are going to decide this election, they are going to be, and even though more people came out to vote, since they still ended up being the same percentage of the population, their influence, which everybody thought would somehow be greater, somehow they would turn the tide of the election, given that the percentage stayed relatively the same, it didn't have that kind of impact. Which I think partially accounted for the reason that people are saying oh, well, it was a disappointment.

MS. WALKER: I never heard one group talk about increasing young people, young people becoming an
increasing share of the electorate. Now if Mr. Kerry
had won, a totally different conversation, I mean we
would, it would have been the youth vote pushed
Mr. Kerry into office. Instead, because Mr. Bush won,
then you get the attention on the sort of religious
vote among conservative and evangelical Christians. So
in part, you are getting the story that's shaped by
what's happening in the external political
environment. I don't know if other folks want to--

MS. SNOW: I think Ivan had his hand up a
second ago, so let's--

MR. FRISHBERG: You're going to make the other
point which is that the gold points, so I'll leave that
alone--

(Laughter)

MR. FRISHBERG: On the question to Sherr and
the actual number, I think, John, you eluded to this
earlier, the idea that it was the same is, the jury is
out on that in a big way and I think most people
looking at the different exit polls and different
methodologies would suggest, in the larger exit poll,
the 50 state exit polls are aggregated together, it
actually does show an increase in the share of the
electorate over 2000, and that there is, I think it's
around the margin of error. But still, it's edging higher and then that doesn't take into consideration it's an even smaller, a very much smaller part of the population.

So I think this share issue we would contend is it's not the question anybody asked, it was not the one that we set our goal around but I think once the census bureau information comes out and we get beyond these exit polls, the sense is that in fact we'll have accomplished that as well.

MS. SNOW: Just for the record, does anybody on that table know what that figure is, if you look at the state data? Has that been done?

MR. LEVINE: Up two to three percent.

MR. FRISHBERG: I think it may be, there are so many numbers, but it may be that 18.4 share.

MS. SINDERBRAND: I had a question about a detail which I think gets to a larger point. I was looking at the numbers, the breakdown of young women versus young men, that there was a greater increase among young women voters than there was among young men voters, and I was wondering if that had anything to do with the fact that there are now more young women enrolled in colleges and universities than men, and how
matriculation status broke down, in terms of was there a greater increase among college student voters? I believe you talked about it a little bit. But on whether, long term, this speaks to maybe new ways that need to be developed to reach young male voters?

MS. WALKER: I think the jury is still out on whether the youth vote was driven by college students increasing or whether it was driven by non-college students increasing. CIRCLE hasn't released this analysis yet and so I'm going to say something I shouldn't say, that their analysis is showing that actually the increase in turn out was driven by non-college. If that proves true, then I think it forces all of us to kind of reshift our, I mean young college that vote, they've always had really high, comparatively speaking, really high voting rates.

Now if I was a Republican Party operative, I would be looking at white male young people and saying, boy, if we can increase their turnout, it's going to help our side. If I am a Democrat, I am looking at African American and young women and saying how do we get those people out to vote? So this is where you start talking market typing.

MS. SNOW: I think Ben had a --.
MR. FERGUSON: I think part of it is too that there has been a lot of the organizations that have gone after young women voters and there has been this ideology out there it seems that men are going to make their decisions on their own, they are going to take care of themselves and they are going to figure it out by themselves, maybe because that's the way we are sometimes. But I also think that when you see the women that, they came out and voted because people talk to women a young voters a lot more than they did the men. I mean our best thing we had was, so, you going to vote? Yeah, I'm going to vote. Who are you going to vote for? Well, I've got a buddy that's, you know, in the war that doesn't like it, so I'm not going to vote for this person, or I've got a friend over there. So that was about the most engaging conversation we had among men, whereas, women actually had issues that they were talking about.

(Laughter)

MR. FERGUSON: I mean real reasons to go to the poll and I think that part of what we are going to see in the next election is you are going to see both parties try to go after men a lot more on the issues.

MS. SINDERBRAND: Well that speaks kind of to a
larger issue, and I think you also had your hand up, but a larger issue in that we talk about young voters. Again, as if they are small, a block, and there is one way to reach all of them. But in a lot of ways, you need to start, microtarget your messages when you are trying to reach different parts of the young population, whether you are talking about college students or those who aren't enrolled colleges. Again, when you are talking about young men and young women, there are different issues that may draw them to the polls.

MR. FERGUSON: When we heard about it, I think even when the election, when it was Clinton against Dole, who was better looking? And the women vote was a lot higher on that, and you look at this one too, where was the women vote highest? And if you look at the issues that were up there, a lot of it was that you like the appearance of Kerry, you felt like he understood what you believed and he connected with you. When you look at Bush and what connected him with people, it was you knew where he stood on the issues. And I think that is something that guys can relate to a little bit more is I know where he stands and I respect that, whereas we such much higher turnout among women,
young people voting for Kerry because they felt like they connected with him on that level that seemed to bring them to the polls.

MS. SNOW: Okay, John looks like he is dying to jump in.

(Laughter)

MR. LEVINE: I mean with all due respect, I think that that's part of the problem sometimes with the people that around talk about young people care only the MTV question. How many years ago was that? Which kind of underwear do you wear? That was a generation ago almost. The fact is college students care tremendously about the same issues that I care about, that my parents care about and my grandparents care about. We just did a survey two weeks ago, we asked them how concerned are you about Social Security? Seventy percent were concerned about Social Security.

In the open-ended question, that was the number two voted issue behind Iraq. You know, we've had very, very serious issues that I think that men and women can relate to. I don't think the war is a female issue or a male issue, so I think that it's about some of the grassroots and some of the targeting that may be focus on women but I think both genders were spoken to as
MS. SNOW: Jordan, do you want to make one more comment about this?

MR. SEKULOW: Yes, real quick. From a campaign perspective, when you look at young voters, which both sides had top strategists, numbers folks, that's not what our job typically was to do. And when they looked at it, and even when we look at this time, that it did go up, more and more voting, it's still this percentage of the vote, 17 to 18 total percent, so how much more are campaigns going to spend? Well they'll pay for us to fly around the--

MS. ACKER: They paid for you to fly around?

MR. SEKULOW: They did.

(Laughter)

MR. SEKULOW: A lot of what we were doing is training volunteers and I think the difference has to be when can you say, and maybe if Kerry won, that would have changed. I really do think that the fact that we had that, that when you look at it, it's the same percent it's always been, and turnout was up so we did the same kind of thing. And it's not anyone's fault, it's just part of it and it's just showing the differences, I think.
MS. ACKER: I disagree because I think that the Democratic Party is very emboldened by the percentage increase of the electorate that we got given that Al Gore only won the youth vote by two points in 2000 and Kerry won by 10 to 12, depending on how you look at the numbers, I would say we look at that very differently.

MR. LEVINE: We do, but just to say one quick thing before we, it's not the campaign discussion. We looked at 19 states and it actually got down to eight that we cared about, and the other 42 states in the country, if we lost the youth vote by 70 percent it didn't matter, so--

MS. ACKER: So you didn't run the 50 state strategy then.

MR. LEVINE: We did, I mean we had activity, but, by the end of it, the volunteers, the supporters that we had in those states that were young people were in other states helping us.

MS. ACKER: I agree.

MR. LEVINE: So we weren't looking at national numbers and still wouldn't, it's about the battlegrounds.

MS. SNOW: Can I take it back to a research question, just for a second, before we move off of this
panel? And maybe this is my ignorance but I was struck
by the numbers I saw on the screen, the Rutgers study,
87 percent of your sample said they voted and I think
in your study, did I get that right? In your study, 73
percent said they had voted, reported having voted?

MR. DELLA VOLPE: Yeah, a marked difference
between the studies. Jeff's study talked only with
registered voters and mine was of the entire
electorate.

MS. SNOW: But then we know that the actual
turnout was about 48, what's the analogous--

MR. DELLA VOLPE: We were just talking about
college students, and in the past college students are
about twice as likely to vote as non-college students
in the same age group.

MS. SNOW: My question was is there is over-
reporting factor here of kids lying about having voted
or am I reading too much into it?

MR. DELLA VOLPE: There is some social
desirability effect when you ask a survey question like
that, but we've tracked it consistently over the last
year and there is a percentage of people who said they
turned out, the numbers seem to kind of add up and I
think that's about what it was. In the past, it had
been in the 60s, the actual turnout among college students. As I said, they are twice as likely as non-college students in the same group to turnout and vote.

MS. SNOW: Thank you.

MR. UZETA: Just a quick question on the social desirability factor, that cuts across all age groups, right? I mean that seems like--

MS. SHERR: That's because more educated people being more likely to vote, I mean it's just in the population generally.

MS. SINDERBRAND: I have a question which I don't know if you have the answer to but did you have any sense this year on whether college students in particular, I mean you talked a little bit about half of college students were voting on campus and a little more than half were voting either by absentee or in person in their home states or their home areas. Any sense as to whether the focus that was paid this year to swing states and battleground states had any kind of impact in where and how college students decided to vote, whether they decided to vote on their college campus if it was in a swing state or in their home town, whether that had any impact this time around?
MS. SHERR: Well, I mean I'm not sure exactly but I do know that, even from our discussions here at Harvard, that there has been kind of an emphasis on getting students to try to vote by absentee ballot. I mean with the, I would like to get some agreement from kind of around the table about whether that's true. But it is because there are some issues with some communities not wanting students vote there and those sorts of things that it is sort of a positive, right, Jennifer? To kind of encourage students to vote by absentee ballots, so that could have--

MS. PHILLIPS: They like to vote, they want to vote at home--

MS. SHERR: Right.

MS. PHILLIPS: --they feel connected, they know the people there.

MS. SHERR: It's kind of an interesting question though about how many people actually go home and how that works because I was a little taken aback by actually the high numbers of people who report voting in their home towns, so something we have to kind of go through further, I think we need to do a little more analysis on that.

MR. DELLA VOLPE: There was higher turnout in
swing states than non-swing states.

MS. SNOW: Has anybody looked at the difference between the number of people who download, go to forums or go to your websites and say yes, I am going to register, versus actually carrying it out? And do we have any idea whether the people that download the forms actually vote?

MS. WALKER: Oh, you just asked the big burning question.

(Laughter)

MS. WALKER: A lot of people are trying to answer it, and you can't answer that question until you get the voter files and a lot of states haven't reported their voter files out yet, but I think everybody is dying to know that, to answer that. I mean I have heard preliminary numbers of about 50 percent, that 50 percent of people who download their forms actually send the forms in and vote. But I just don't think we know the answer to it yet.

MR. FRIEDRICH: I just had a different question about the race data that Tobi presented. I want to dig into that a little bit because I think that until the census comes out next year, we don't really have those numbers solid, but that's the first real
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good data I've seen. And the story has been told around gender so much because people haven't been able to talk about race. But those were, even the drops in Asian turnout and Latino turnout, I think, talking a little bit about where that data came from and then just what reactions from the other presenters were to that data, I would be interested to hear.

MS. SINDERBRAND: And just following onto Ryan's question there, there was another question that I had, whether we talked about parental help and parental guidance as being a factor in helping people register, figure out how to register the first time, and get their data on where to vote and whether the fact that a lot of the Asian and Latino students and young people may be first generation or second generation, whether that had an impact. Maybe their parents aren't experienced voters.

MS. WALKER: So the race-based data uses the national exit poll, the national sample, so it's not the aggregated state sample, so always use caution because again, the sample size for young people is smaller and therefore when you start breaking it out by racial and ethnic groups, it becomes really small, and so it would probably be statistically impossible to try
to look at, say, African American women, given the national numbers.

But yeah, when I saw that data, it just blew me away because it really forces us, I think, to your question which is to recognize that young people are not a monolith, which we all know and we all give lip service to, but when you actually start to break it down, you really see the tremendous differences among groups of young people.

I think that we don't understand yet is kind of why it happened, why were African American young people so much more dramatically likely to vote than they were in 2000. Was it the mobilization effort? Was it the media-driven efforts? Was it, we know a lot of, at least on the progressive side, a lot of the grassroots stuff was targeted at African American young people. Was it the economic issues? I mean my whole theory on this is that young people are the first part of the population that feel an economic downturn and that's part of what drove the youth turnout this year and therefore, more young minority folks were even more likely to feel the economic downturn.

I don't think we know that but again, if you are a Democrat, you look at African American young
people and you say wow, if you are a Republican, you
look at white young men and you say wow, that's our
base.

MS. MCGILL: I know the end is really small, I'm sorry to jump in, but I know the end? is really small already on race, but did you have any ends on gender within race?

MS. WALKER: Uh--uh.

MS. MCGILL: It's my understanding this is some work that the Joint Center may be doing is that African American males between 24 and 36 actually drove up the African American vote, and some work that also came out of brilliant corners of Cornell Belcher and Donna Brazile also indicate that the African American vote was surprisingly, there was a surprising increase in it, considering the fact that African Americans are decreasing as a portion of the electorate, and that there wasn't significant room for the African American vote to increase because the majority of the African American voter population is already over 45, I think two thirds of African American voters are over 45, so it really would have been in that space, so I really am curious to see how that shapes up.

MS. WALKER: Jennifer, is there an e-mail list
that's going to come out of this meeting? Because one of the things, in the next couple of days, is get you this facts sheet, we'll send it out by e-mail.

MS. CAMPBELL: I would like to, just address that a little because we were on the ground intensely in 14 states, some battleground, some non-battleground, where we actually quantifiable precinct data, we know that there was a major increase in the African American youth, especially on the college campus where you have the ability to aggregate those numbers out. And there was a significant African American coalition that came together that focused on increasing the African American vote and just for clarity on it, for African American as well as the Latino community, that the actual numbers, as far as what is available to increase is youth, not the opposite.

Forty percent of young people and for African American, we looked at youth as 18 to 35. I almost fall in that category.

(Laughter)

MS. CAMPBELL: But on the serious side of that is that that's why, for the last nine years our organization has focused on it. But for the whole
effort last year and not just last year but over time. The other thing is too, when you are talking about young people or if you trying to deal with race, you also have to deal with cultural factors on what connects with people. And sometimes in this society we don't want to deal with race, whatever side of that you are on. But you then have to also look at the cultural aspects of how that impacts how somebody wants to get involved, and young people are no different that any other, I'm with you on that, John, any other demographic when it comes to that. So when you are focusing on it, and we've been focusing on it, many of us around, I still say Ivan is the granddaddy and I'm not quite the grandma--

(Laughter)

MS. CAMPBELL: Ryans's coming along.

Just a little on how this thing has played out, being involved with it myself from a student to now, someone who is actively running an organization around it, that that has always been the inconsistency factor plays into a lot of this too when it comes to young people, and listening to Jordan say they're only 17 percent, we're not changing our strategy, and there is a lot to be said about what that says about youth vote.
MS. SNOW: Can I ask just one last, very quickly, and then we are sort of out of time, but a variation on my question before about whether young voters tend to sort of misreport what they've done. This is a variation, when I was working on a story last fall for ABC about youth vote, I remember my polling department at ABC cautioning me that if I looked at intend to vote, you know, the question do you intend to vote? They told me that young people, in particular, were apt to say yes, I intend to vote, and then never show up, that traditionally, that historically they would report wanting to vote and then just never show up.

Did that happen this year or was it better in 2004? I mean was there a sort of change of heart where they were saying they intended and then they showed up?

MR. DELLA VOLPE: Well, yeah, I think your polling here was correct in terms of, yeah, in the past, it's always been over inflated on expected to vote and that's what people are kind of programmed to believe. But since 9/11, I think young people have changed dramatically. Politics is more of, in 2000, the biggest issue was education and crime, so I think if you look at the hard number, are you definitely
going to vote, they were consistent throughout the
entire fall where it was going to be about 70-75
percent. That's still six months after the percentage
of young people in college who said they voted, so I
think this was the year that turned the tables on that
old saying, that people say they are but they won't
vote.

MS. WALKER: Yeah, and I remember that the data
that I was using was exit poll data, so this is
actually talking to people in the polling place so,
unless they went in and didn't vote, then came out and
said they voted, which would really be kind of weird,
it's about as, which is not to say--

MS. SNOW: A couple of months beforehand which
is what you were talking about.

MS. WALKER: A couple of months before when
they say they are intending to vote and then they never
show.

MR. DELLA VOLPE: It was less so this year than
other years.

MR. SHARP: Well thank you very much, we
appreciate this session.

We'll take a five minute break, and Jennifer
will help with the logistics of how you the rest rooms
in this extraordinary building, but the designer forgot
the most important thing so you have to find them.
(Whereupon, at 1:33 p.m., there was a brief recess.)

(1:48 p.m.)

MR. KING: We'll move now onto, my name is
David King, I'm glad to join you, I'm sorry I was in
class.

Hey, Melanie, nice to see you again, welcome
home.

Do we have just about everybody here? Where is
Tobi?

MS. WALKER: Right here.

MR. KING: Hi, Tobi, nice to see you again. My
name is David King, I was in a class I had to teach and
I'm sorry that I missed the first panel, You were in
great hands, it was a terrific group of speakers, more
academic and wonkish than many of you but kind of
writing. I love the academic stuff, so I have a lot to
learn from the practitioners, non-partisan and
partisan.

We have two panels this afternoon and then I'll
close it up with a little look at political ideology a
little later on. So we start off now with non-partisan
efforts at voter turnout, what went well, what didn't
go so well, what can we learn.

Not only do we have, of course, the people who are listed on the panel in front of you, but a fabulous audience who you should all be ready to ask questions as well. My old friend, and colleague and co-author David Nickerson is here, Ryan Friedrichs who has done a fabulous job. Where is Ryan? Ryan, feel free, guys, to jump in at any time. Of course Chris Newinski from Smackdown Your Vote! got on the panel, but you guys can all jump in at any time. We have Melanie Campbell, Gary Davis, Ivan Frishberg, Jehmu Greene. Jehmu has just made it in in the terrible weather on the plane. Alexis McGill, Jennifer Phillips and Jaime Uzeta, so we'll be turning to people you have already met in one way or another.

You will know Kate Snow from "Good Morning America", she was asking questions a few moments ago, and of course Rebecca Sinderbrand from Newsweek. I'm going to turn everything over to Rebecca and to Kate. Thank you all, enjoy this.

Remember that if you are speaking for each other, you are speaking into these mics, when we are speaking for transcription, we are speaking into these mics over here. We want to make sure that we capture
what you say and for the purposes of transcription,
even though we know who you are, please give your name
before you speak so that we can have a good record of
what we've learned and what we still need to know.
Thank you very much.

We might as well start with the top of the
batting order, with Melanie.

MS. SNOW: I think we want to keep it a real
Q&A though so, if you guys don't mind, if you don't
mind, we are not going to go down the line and have
everybody give a ten minute thing because I think that
would take too long, but I'm really curious what
worked. I think we should just maybe start with what
did you do that you think drove some of the numbers we
were just talking about?

MS. CAMPBELL: Thanks, David, it's always great
to be back here, and I see the weather is still sun
shiny in Boston.

(Laughter)

MS. CAMPBELL: At least it was when I was here.

And one of the things that I think worked, Kate
and Rebecca, is that there was some, someone talked
about the perfect storm earlier, and there were a lot
of things, a lot variables to what took place last year
and I think that was the perfect storm, and it didn't
just start with this election either. But the main
thing, I think, that you had a major focus on young
people in a way, many of us around this table were
together in times that we had, I think, the coalition
efforts that were out there.

And for young people who we worked with, and
one sitting back here in the corner here, and maybe one
day, one moment she'll have the opportunity to share.
But feel free to ask her a question, that's Nicole
Ealam, who is sitting back in the corner, from my
office, who was on the ground, who has just finished at
DePaul last year and was on the ground with us for our
organization, can tell you what are the things, some of
the things, that took place.

But young people who we worked with, just two
weeks ago we had a conference in Washington, it was our
follow-up conference we have every year, and I was
mentioned to someone a few minutes ago that it doubled
in size, something we did not expect in a "off election
year" for us electioneering type folks, and the
conversation that was had, it was all about the issue
for them.
This is not something, I'll speak specifically of the African American young people and black youth, specifically, who the issues that are facing them, not just then but now, also drove it. So you didn't have the conversation that I had been working with young people for about 30 years, where I try to figure out exactly what it is that's going on. It's there, I know that the war impacts me, I know I've got to figure out now how to, when college rates are going up to a point I can't even think about going, so the issues that are impacting their lives are right there.

So the politics and so, when you see the trend, if you look at '92 when we saw the last spike, there were different things, Rock the Vote had just started, all these other kinds of things that were happening and all of that, and you have MTV and all of that that was going in '92. But this time that we are living, which is what John talked about, that's what we are hearing and that's, I think, what, so the perfect storm, the issues, and the fact that you had a very much focused approach on young people and a lot of collaboration helped as well.

MS. SINDERBRAND: I'm sorry, I just wanted to ask a quick question and it's something to keep in mind
when you're hearing from the panel, specifically the challenge facing non-partisan voter registration groups. I felt there was a sense this year, and you can correct me if I'm wrong, that we are seeing a bit of an evolution, we are seeing that perhaps the future of non-partisan registration is more like a loose coalition of partisan groups rather than strictly non-partisan in the sense that what seems to motivate people are, you know, like we saw, Independents are the ones who get left out.

You reach people with I'm telling you to vote for this, I'm telling you to vote against this, and this is what draws in people to the polls and this is what drew them to the polls in 2004. And there was already kind of a sense that there was an evolution towards more perhaps partisan groups working together but definitely that partisan edge, and how did non-partisan groups, how are you evolving to kind of meet that challenge?

MR. FRISHBERG: --non-partisan panel, so--

(Laughter)

MS. SNOW: We know as reporters that some of you on this table were, some of your groups, I think we can fairly say, were a little bit more, a little bit
less non-partisan than others.

(Multiple people speaking)

MR. SEKULOW: --Rock the Vote put out well
before the election President Bush wants to draft you,
now that is ridiculous--

MS. GREENE: But I don't think they put that
out, they definitely did not put that.

MR. SEKULOW: It was on the website, you sent
out fake draft cards, unless you didn't know Rock the
Vote--

MS. GREENE: We sent out a draft card that said
you have been drafted, show up to your polling place
and--

MR. SEKULOW: You were putting that out on TV--

(Multiple people speaking)

MR. SEKULOW: This is where our problem is with
working with a lot, this comes from the Republican
angle, they'll reach out to us, and we were going to
help and we wanted to work with them but when we see
this, and even if it didn't say the partisan things but
they are using the language so when we see it, we see a
fake draft card, we know the issue is coming up right
now about the president, and a man who never said a
thing about it and then came out and said no, we are
not going to do a draft. It was a Democrat who
actually mentioned it.

So what do we, why do we need to work with
these groups? I mean we won again, so why are we going
to go to some people who are going to treat us badly
every time?

MS. ACKER: That was a month out, when were you
making the decision about when to work with them?

MR. SEKULOW: We had been working, we had been
giving volunteers to Rock the Vote, busses working with
the bus crew, we had talked about Jim and Barbara at
the very end but, you know, when those kind of things
happened, it was over.

MS. SINDERBRAND: Well I don't know, I don't
want to pick on Ivan, but I don't know if Ivan has any
kind of special perspective, as somebody who has kind
of made kind of a move towards more of a from the non-
partisan, strict non-partisan, to more of a partisan.

MR. FRISHBERG: Well, in your question, there
are two pieces to it, there are the groups, which is
the basically what follows organized money, and then
there is young people, and I think it's important in
your question to separate those two because they are
different. And in the partisan world, my, in '99, you
know, there was a bunch of us who were planning the,
actually, probably `98, we were planning the youth vote
2000 strategy, and a whole set of efforts. And we made
a decision, as the board of youth vote, very early on,
to engage in a, we weren't just going to try and move
young people out to vote, we understood we needed a
political strategy to get the parties, these guys over
here, to pay attention to young people. And that we
had to think about our resources just as a way to
leverage that kind of attention because they treat us
badly, they treat us well, they never treated us
anything.

(Laughter)

MR. FRISHBERG: And the goal was to get their
attention which, I think, now that that's happened, you
have the people who are political consultants and money
will treat young people differently, and they'll start
to be more than, like before, it's the foundations and
those sorts of folks who invest in non-partisan civic
good, you know, sort of the Harvard approach, it's--

MS. SINDERBRAND: So is that the hope, that it-

MR. FRISHBERG: The hope is that it will
migrate into the political world because, as Tobi said,
that's a $3 billion political economy. If we wanted something to focus in on young people, it would be that, not the relatively small amount of non-partisan money that's in the civic pot. And then on the, just on the second part of your question for young people, I felt like being non-partisan and being very clear about that in how we presented ourselves to people was really a big asset.

I mean we were attacked by partisan groups, mostly on the left, for being non-ideological and not having an issue agenda, not talking about issues, that was part of our thing, we were attacked for that, but I think it was actually what made us effective, in terms of approaching young people on the street, just that one-on-one engagement. They were happy to talk about politics, about why the election was important or their participation was important. I think we did better at that than if we had been going out and being overtly or somewhat overtly partisan on either side of it, so I think being non-partisan helps with young people.

MS. SNOW: I think we should give Rock the Vote a chance to respond to

MR. SEKULOW: --against the President's current agenda.
MS. ACKER: But that's because the policy is not good for young people.

MR. SEKULOW: But then you are partisan, if you take a side, that's all I'm saying.

MS. SNOW: Jordan?

MS. GREENE: Will you let me actually answer a question? I think, one, it's really important to define what being partisan is and your definition of partisanship, right now, is basically having a stance on an issue and that's incorrect. It is absolutely important in a presidential election cycle when you've got issues of critical importance to young people at stake and they do have opinions on them, it's important to identify those issues, to promote where young people stand on those issues, to highlight how these issues are affecting them. And that is what Rock the Vote, I think, did really successfully in the 2004 elections.

I'm going back to the question about what worked. I think, for us, we started off with our online voter registration tool which really allowed us to build a list to be able to talk to about these issues. By the end of the election, we had over a million people on our list and were able to communicate to them about the issue of Social Security and continue
that engagement that we saw in the 2004 election. But really, the most successful thing for us was the online voter registration campaign.

From an issues standpoint, our draft campaign I think absolutely did make a difference. When you saw the members of Congress come out after Rock the Vote sent out our e-mail campaign and literally on the floor of the House say we are taking a procedural vote on this issue that is of critical importance to young people. Young people are fighting and dying on the front lines in Iraq, their peers back here in the States are concerned about who is going to provide the force that was needed for all of the troops and we addressed the issue of the draft.

It wasn't about where does the college Republicans, where do they see this issue falling? Is it partisan or non-partisan? Young people wanted to know where do John Kerry and John Edwards stand on this, where does President Bush and Vice President Cheney stand on this, where do members of Congress stand on this, this is affecting us. And that campaign I think was successful, you saw President Bush talk about it in two of the debates, you saw all of the political talk shows, Sunday talk shows start picking
it up, it became a part of the conversation and young people were drawn into this election because of it.

MS. SNOW: It seems like Rock the Vote, from my perspective as a journalist, like you sort of evolved, like eight years ago, when were you founded, eight years ago?

MS. GREENE: Fifteen, it's our 15th anniversary.

MS. SNOW: But it seems like you really got a lot of notice a couple of cycles ago and you were fairly, this is just from my outsider perspective as a journalist, it seemed like you were fairly neutral and in this round, you became more issue oriented, you became, is that accurate? Did you find that it was better, unlike what Ivan was saying, to try to stay out of things and be non-partisan? Did you ever find that it was better to engage on issues and take a side?

MS. GREENE: It's interesting because Rock the Vote was founded on the issue of protecting freedom of expression and actually fighting against Tipper Gore's PMRC initiative, so we have always been an issue oriented organization, then in the first piece of legislation we worked on was motor voter bill. We have always been about finding ways of doing election reform
to increase access and bring more people into the process. I think we have grown into being more 
provocative with our issues and have learned, from the 
15 year history of the organization, to really find 
ways of getting these issues front and center, national 
media attention, and that's what we did with the draft 
campaign, that's what we are doing with Social 
Security.

But again, even as the non-partisan groups are 
talking here, I think it's important to really have a 
solid definition of what it means to be non-partisan 
and what it means to be partisan. Just because you 
take a stance on an issue does not mean that you are 
partisan, that's one of the ways that, unfortunately, I 
think some of the parties try to segment groups and 
block them out. And at the end of the day, we 
registered more young Republicans than any organization 
in this country and that's something that members of 
Congress, that's something that the RNC recognizes, 
hundreds of thousands of young Republicans registered 
at rockthevote.com and are engaged in the process 
because of the work that we did, as well as the 
Democrats we registered and the Independents. Over 1.2 
million people downloading voter registration forms is
a great thing to get these first time voters in.

MS. SINDERBRAND: I was wondering, for anybody on the panel, as a group the constituency isn't Republicans, isn't Democrats, it's just young people, whether some of these legislative solutions that we have been hearing about, you know, the same day registration, no fault absentee and early voting, whether that's something that is going to be more and more part of what you do and more of what you are pushing in an effort to increase young turnout?

MR. UZETA: That we're pushing legislatively?

MS. SINDERBRAND: Yeah, I mean in different states. The states where turnout was highest among young people are the states with same day registration, states where you can walk up to the polls on election day and vote, where you don't have to think about it beforehand, is that something that people are looking at?

MS. PHILLIPS: We are. Just quickly, we went to the National Association of Secretaries of State and made some recommendation. We are looking at the college voter which, as we know, they are sort of easy pickings, they come register. The best year is an election year because their parents have already
registered them. We found that there was a lot of
confusion and this is anecdotal because Susan and Jeff
had good numbers on this, but about the whole process
of absentee registration. So a lot thought that once
they had registered, that they were all set, they would
get their ballot and we had to walk them through the
process.

But there are things that we are looking at
that will make a difference, there are still five
states that have laws that you have to either register
or vote for the first time in person, and obviously
when students leave, if they are going to another
state, that hamstring them and they can't go back.
Students here developed an interactive website for
getting information on absentee voting and we found
that there was a lot of conflicting information, even
when we called secretaries of states' office or
elections officials and we really want NAS to help
clear that up because you have a first time voter, you
have somebody who is already a little bit intimidated
by the steps they have to go through and this process
should be easier.

I know that some on the panel are working
towards same day registration, and believe that we
register in schools and things like that, we found that
students often want to register at home because that's
where the people they know are and who they can vote
for.

So those are a couple of ways, as well as being
aware that students and young people are computer savvy
and you can do a lot of things, give a lot of
information on a website, so making that accessible,
making that easy to use is really a good way just to
keep those phone lines clear, if anybody tried to call
into Florida a few days before the registration
deadline or some of the other battleground states, or
you had kids running around saying they needed to FedEx
something in.

I mean it was really people really wanted to
participate but got caught up a lot in the steps there.
It's not that they are not the top issues and I think
that what Jehmu and some of the campaign people are
talking about are real issues and getting the
candidates to talk about these issues, that's what's
going to drive things, that's the big number. But we
can still work on some of those logistical pieces that
will help young people get into the system.

MS. SNOW: I'm curious, one of the presenters
at the other end of the table said that getting
assistance, I think it was the Rutgers study, that
getting assistance with voting or getting assistance
with registration, you looked at whether it actually
impacted the voting behavior and it didn't make that
much difference.

MS. SHERR: It didn't make a big difference in
terms of whether people had trouble voting. We didn't
really see big differences in behavior either because
just mostly everyone voted and everything, so it's hard
to find--

MS. SNOW: So I wondered when you all heard
that, do you all feel like, I mean you can sort of take
that as a negative like, oh, wow, what we are doing
doesn't make a huge difference but I'm sure it does.
How do you all interpret that?

MS. CAMPBELL: Well I can't interpret it
unless I know what, when I look at polls, and nothing
against the academicians, I like them, I love you all,
I use your stuff, but also know that polls, you have to
look a little deeper to know what your over sampling
is, if that's what you are doing, what states were you
in, African Americans are still 55 percent of that in
the south. The south is not a battleground, other than
Florida, my home state, so you look at all of that.

And for us, we know, Nicole, I mentioned, was on the ground, Georgia, was a place, in Atlanta, where you had African American primarily controlled governments there, you had a lot of problems.

You had the mayor running around in the City of Atlanta trying to make sure that young people could vote, you had provisional ballot problems, you had polling problems in the State of Louisiana where they ended up having to keep the polls open until 11:00 or 12:00 at night. We had a war room where, the primary states that we worked, that we had the information, we did an exit poll from that to get people's experiences and the majority of the, it wasn't for young people because it was everybody. But the majority of the people who responded were, if I had a chance to really, I would have brought that with me, I apologize for that.

But the majority of the people who responded were young people who were first time voters. And so when you look at something, when you see seven percent that says it didn't matter, I didn't really have that many problems, seven percent, the partisan people know that can turn an election one way or the other. It
doesn't take 50 percent of the people who had problems to give the candidate an edge, it takes sometimes one percent, two percent, three percent, so that percentage number, you have to look at it from various perspectives.

MS. SNOW: Gary, go ahead, we haven't heard from you yet.

MR. DAVIS: I think what I found more important from the Rutgers study than the fact that assistance didn't make that much of a difference was the fact that the biggest issue for young people was the candidates focusing on issues that related to them, in a way that related to them is what I would add to that statement. And I think that's probably one of the best things we did in this campaign, more than anything else. We worked together as a team, we put out the first ever national voters issues newspaper. We were able to get both presidential candidates, Ralph Nader, other elected officials to respond to that.

We were then able to take that response, put it up on the Internet and get it out to college groups, get it out to non-college groups, use it as groups. We all put up, most of us put it up on our Internet sites and we were able to get information out, first of all,
that there is an easy way to talk to candidates, and candidates, there is an easy way to talk to young people if you want their vote because they are going to vote and at the same time, we were then able to take that information, get it out directly to everybody so that they could compare it with the reading of the media to what they could see online as what the candidates, what George Bush or John Kerry said about particular issues.

And then of course we encouraged them, you know, hey, if what's in here doesn't fit, do your own thing and I think that, as individual organizations, we did that. Different groups had different focuses, what they wanted to focus. And I think if we did one thing right it was better coordination, it was getting the candidates to talk to young people in a way that they related to, to get them excited about getting involved in voting. And I think something we all agreed worked, this is the new voter issues paper for 2005-2006, most of the same people have signed onto it, we are going to be getting it out to Virginia and New Jersey in a couple of weeks to get those gubernatorial candidates to respond.

We are going to be creating a network of state
legislators in 25 states who are helping to reach out
to young people because they recognize there is a
connection for them. So I think that's where, at least
from my perspective, we made the most ground, doing
that real connection. And just getting back to the
to the earlier point, we talked about Smackdown Your Vote,
about 18 months out, February of 2003, we announced we
are going to get many more young people to vote than
voted in 2000, nobody really paid attention to it.
Then in September of 2003, we together with the Hip Hop
Civil Action Network and all our partners and said
we've got to get two million more to vote in 2004 and
we got a little more noise.

Then MTV came out and that kind of manifested
into 20 million are going to vote in this election and
I think everybody was like yeah, right, And people are
going to increase their numbers? Sure. But then,
suddenly, because of a coordinated effort, the message
did get out, and so people started buying that geez,
maybe young people are going to vote. And so it was
very ironic that when actually we hit those targets or
passed them, probably beyond anybody's expectations,
the message was young people didn't turn out, when
actually they did, and that was the, I think Eric
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covered that issue with the percentages.

But I think all of us felt that we finally had turned the tide and what helped us turn the tide, at least in 2004, and now the trick is to continue that momentum in 2006, 2008, was that we were finding a way to get the candidates to finally talk to young people in a way that related to them. So I talked about the economy, we talked to an 18 year old or a 25 year old in a way that they said yeah, okay, now I understand it, now I understand what you are going to do for me, what you are going to do for my dad.

MS. SNOW: Do you want to follow on that? Or I have another question.

MR. UZETA: I'll stay on that line in terms of things that we did effectively, and then differences from previous efforts and this year's effort. The second one, the level of coordination, which is unprecedented, this was the first time, we had always had nonprofit partners, we do that with all of our pro social campaigns. But this was very, very closely coordinated in terms of weekly conference calls with everybody so that everything was sort of on message, with a focus on delivering the message of empowerment to young people, and really turning it around and
shifting the message from, you know, get off our butts and get out and vote kind of idea, from the 20 million loud, 20 million strong type message, which was much more, trying to dispel the myth that young people in the past didn't vote.

And a lot of this developed from these conversations that Gary was talking about previously, just with different groups, and then also conversations that we had with the different candidates, with the different campaigns, and finding that there had been this perception that when you actually asked people, even people in the campaigns focusing on young people directly, how many people they thought voted in the last election, people had been talking about the seven million range, two million range. People didn't have any idea it was in the 18 million level, so we really found that that was a big challenge for us and so that really guided the rest of our message.

And we see our role at MTV, in general, I mean obviously, these are the guys that are doing the grassroots hardcore work to actually do the registration, etcetera, but part of what we do is try to create, cultivate just the right message, and the right feel and the motivation with the culture in
general, so that young people realize the power that
they have in general. And we do that through a bunch
of different issues and that's what we did this year.
It was a shift in the tone of the campaign, I think,
and level of coordination so that everybody was really
recognizing all the power that young people had.

MS. SINDERBRAND: Speaking of coordination, I
don't know if we've touched at all on the New Voters
Project, which I know was a big part of the non-
partisan effort this year was trying out those
techniques that you are hoping, at some point, the
parties are going to pick up, and take the ball on this
one and it won't, you know, take it out of your hands,
and I was wondering if there was any kind of
preliminary data. I know we talked about this a very
little bit before the session started, Ivan, but a
little bit of data on how that worked, any kind of
anecdotes from the grassroots, people who were actually
out there on whether these techniques made any kind of
significant difference or whether it was just the
issues this year and the techniques themselves
weren't --.

MR. FRISHBERG: I mean we are in a frustrating
position, still waiting for a lot of the data, and to
get specific about it, but that's stuff is being worked
on and it will, I think, for a lot of groups here,
partisan, non-partisan that's waiting for all the state
and county voter files to be turned over, and to get to
the census bureau level of information and get beyond
these exit polls which we do a lot with but are kind of
crappy, you know, so--

(Laughter)

MR. FRISHBERG: There is more to come. I think
we have seen, in some county numbers that we
participated in and CIRCLE is doing an analysis of more
of these as they get the data, and are not just asking
the county but are going to actually get the data and
double check it too. But in the places where the media
has done that kind of analysis, in Iowa, huge increases
in registration numbers in counties that were both
campus and non-campus populations. Of all of those new
registrants, significant increase in the rate at which
they turn out. So it wasn't some people said, well, if
you get a lot of new registrants to the polls, that
many of them aren't going to show up because they are
not as motivated, you just stuck a card in front of
them at a shopping mall but they are not really a
motivated voter. That didn't seem to be true because
the rates of turnout went up very significantly.

Those registration and turnout rates were higher in those counties than for the age groups older than them, and so we kind of, or actually the newspaper did this, but looked at those. They looked at four counties and young people were kicking old people butt across the board and it was a great, great thing to see. The numbers are very significant and the preliminary numbers from CIRCLE suggest that that was true in a lot of counties across the country and they are looking at the places where we were organized.

This is a more theoretical answer to your question but I think it has to be that the registration efforts had an impact, it was a huge part of it. I think that Rock the Vote efforts and there were a lot of people that participated in online partners to Rock the Vote, the on the ground efforts that we did, there is no way that we could have gotten to any kind of significant increase in turnout without huge increases in registration. So I think that was like the number one thing that made a difference in this election cycle.

And then I also think, and we didn't know the answer from the panel earlier, definitively, but it was
the non-college students that I think probably made the difference and just from the logic of the kind of whole new voter model, that this of the non-voting population of young people, it's about 4 to 1, almost, that are non-college. And so if you are looking to get that kind of very significant increase in turnout, you can't do it by going to the people who will already vote in higher numbers. The only way it statistically plays out is if you go to the people you didn't have before. And that's what we did, that's what a lot of groups did and I think that will, when the census bureau, particularly, comes out, that hopefully, I think, I'll be proved correct in that and if not, then granddaddy--

(Laughter)

MS. SINDERBRAND: And just to kind of follow that very, very quickly, anything specific? I know the technology--

MS. SNOW: Right, it was a very innovative thing that you did.

MS. SINDERBRAND: Right, I mean the technology that came to the forefront in this election is technology that young people are most familiar with, most comfortable with, compared to the rest of the population. You're talking about Blogs, you're talking
about e-mail, whatever you're talking about, young people are more comfortable with it than any other age group. Was technology one of the factors or was it the person to person contact that was more, what of the methods that the New Voter Project was using seemed to be the most effective?

MR. FRISHBERG: For a lot of students, obviously it's person to person because that's how the vast, vast majority of our contact was. But you can't separate technology out from that because through Rock the Vote and Declare Yourself, we were able to get contact information for people. All the people that registered or downloaded their forms for both groups, which are very significant numbers in our states, we had contact information so we could call them, we could knock on their door, we could do that kind of contact.

The other piece of technology, which we all know and love here, is the cell phone and for us, being able to collect somebody's cell phone information when we registered them and call them back up on that cell phone.

We were nervous that people would react to getting calls on their cell phone, like many of us would, saying hey, it's primary day in Colorado, go out
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to vote. Like nobody has heard of primary day in Colorado, it's like --. But no one complained, I mean there was a very positive response from young people getting a call on their cell phone in the middle of no time, in terms of the political calendar, saying tomorrow it's caucus, there is caucuses and if you are a Democrat, you go here, if you are a Republican, you go here. People enjoyed that contact, so technology helped us reach more people with the person to person contact.

MS. SNOW: A little birdie tells me that David has some data on this, on what worked in terms of--

MR. KING: --sort of ask a different question.

We've been asked now sort of what works--

MS. SNOW: David, but do you have some, you were saying that you might have some empirical data about what works?

MR. KING: What do you have from experiments on what tended to increase turnout?

MR. NICKERSON: I have results from past elections but precious little from this election because people were unwilling to actually participate in evaluations but--

(Laughter)
MR. NICKERSON: You know, unwilling to participate and they wanted to wring out every last voter that any sort of control group you might set up, they were completely against it, or things were so pressed for time they are like we are not going to devote any time to this. So you are asking great questions like what techniques work? What works? And they are not going to tell you, say county-wide or precinct-wide is we're not, well exactly what part of it went up, whether it's because of registration --.

Which one of their multi-pronged attacks for registration worked? Was the cell phone effective?

MR. FRISHBERG: That's not what I was saying and the fact is we did do randomized field experiments with Don Green, and a lot of groups did and so there is that work that was done in this election cycle. Some of it, around registration, was quite frankly, it was too, for us, it was too hard to actually come up with a methodology where we could do this and still meet the goals that we were under to do. But with something like the cell phone thing, I know it works because if you can't call somebody and reach them, you can't have the impact that you've documented previously at five points or what have you.
So having a number and a name to call works and every piece of evidence that you've done, that Don Green and other people have done, that we were executing, shows that's the case and so you know it's going to be better if you have more numbers. And that's all I was saying in terms of what works is having greater access to names, and numbers and addresses.

MS. CAMPBELL: I was going to say this, David, is that as someone who was part of some of the experiments, this was a, and part of the, even then it was a very highly competitive situation also, so it kind of plays into some people's decision making. But the early vote, in a lot of cases, that's a what worked scenario, many places where we had early voting we partnered with BET, Rock the Vote, we worked with them. Tom Joyner, and there were a lot of the media elements to getting out the message and even utilizing the media in a way that was more the grassroots elements of organizing.

We set up a separate hot line, for instance, for people to register to vote, and Tom Joyner, through his show, reaches those millions, and so various things. But at the end of the day, as a practitioner,
and what has helped, and I'm saying that facetiously but seriously, is that the academic community has validated the fact that personal touch works, and so there are ways to do that and I think that part of it, in this off election time, I hope that, Jennifer, what we can do is to really have an opportunity to do more work session time with academicians and the people who do the work so that we can come up with ways when you're not under the gun, to quantify for a lot of the folks that need to have that quantified, for people who do it.

And whether you are on a partisan side or a non-partisan side, you know what works and it helps to be able to try to have some balance with that, with the academic community as well. But the early vote piece was something that we didn't have four years ago in a lot of places and you did have that. So if you were in Arizona, for instance, two weeks out, I think it was a week or two weeks out, you were able to do that, whereas, four years ago, you may not have been able to do that. And so you were able to, and when the numbers come out, it's not just election day, it's election days that you've got to get a way to analyze too, and those are some places, four years ago, who didn't have
MR. NICKERSON: I think early voting is a great example of this type of thing. So you've two weeks before the election, you spend the most energy trying to get out people to early voting. Is this going to be the best way to mobilize your constituency? Or are you better off like trying to collect cell phone numbers so you can actually get a hold of them the day or two prior to election day and figure it's too hard to actually get them to the polls before election day because all the media is focused on Tuesday. And so it's a series of tradeoffs, and unless you actually try to do this and evaluate it, you are not going to know the best way to place the resources.

I mean if it could be that you said registration is the biggest boost, and I bet you're right, in which case you should try to structure your campaign to get people registered in the months leading up to it and not put so much emphasis on the end part. Because every election campaign I've studied seems to have like this mass of people in the last week, which might be smart, it could be that the last week is all that really matters. But having some sort of evaluation and looking at it actually in a competitive
environment. I mean 2001 was great, some of the elections weren't at all competitive.

I mean if Jane lived in Ohio and she was contacted by 25 people over the course of the week, your marginal influence might be very little, and so actively trying to figure out a way to work with someone. It doesn't have to be an academic, it could be some campaign, keep it in house, but I think that's a challenge for the nonprofits and the partisan groups, moving forward, is how do you evaluate what you are doing so the next cycle around, you can be that much better. And setting your goals, I guess, not just the county-wide vote went up, it's this particular technology led to part of our success and if the technology isn't successful, we are going to shift our resources elsewhere.

MS. SNOW: Maybe this is a little more of a black and white question and easier to answer, what failed? What did not work at all? What were your biggest disappointments? Be honest.

(Laughter)

MR. UZETA: I was thinking about something we tried that's not as, to try to promote overall engagement, we were experimenting with two different
things, one was this concept of a pre-election, which I'll tell you about. But the other one was trying to ride the meet up wave, and you'll recall that that was huge in terms of Dean's involvement, way back, and we tried to see if we could take it to another level by, beyond just having it spread virally, complementing it with an on air component, so advertising to kind of promote it, and making it like an opportunity to meet other people and creating a different feel for it.

And the numbers just were not, as much as we tinkered with it every month and did it a bunch of different ways, they just were not what we expected it to be or wanted it to be. And even the meet up folks, who worked closely with them, they were thinking this would blow the Dean numbers out of the water just because nothing has been complemented on air, nothing is with, it just didn't work and we tried it.

So I don't know if it was not having, maybe that was the non-partisan, to the extent that we are talking about challenges on a non-partisan level, maybe that's it. Maybe it has to be a specific individual issue but anyway, that was something.

And pre-election was actually more successful, which was actually incentivizing the voting process
online. That vast majority of people that did click onto the Rock the Vote registration function that we had on our site came to this pre-election, and that was a sort of a mock election that paralleled the actual voting process, and we actually incentivized participation with pre-election. So when you registered to vote in this pre-election, that would represent youth votes' opinion, you would actually be able to just opt into the actual voter registration, so you could, we were complementing it, and that seemed to work in terms of--

MS. SNOW: Incentivized? What do you mean?

MR. UZETA: Incentivized meaning to participate in the pre-election, you could win a--

MS. SNOW: You had prizes.

MR. UZETA: Yeah, you had prizes--

MS. SNOW: Baseball hats?

MR. UZETA: --as an incentive to kind of participate in, right. So the idea was how do you hook them in, give them the message and then educate them, and hopefully create longer term voters and that was actually successful on our site.

MS. MCGILL: This is not a failure but I think a challenge that was faced, I think a lot of us used
culture to tap into, to normalize the conversation around why people should vote. And I think that, just in the conversation that we had post Tobi's presentation on the numbers of African Americans rising, the post conversation was okay, how do we explain that? How do we tap into that? And I think that for a lot of people that we were going after, and we were tapping into existing institutions, cultural networks, that they are more organic, they are more, you know, lifestyle, they are not things that typically have metrics unless they're tied to units of selling Sean-John, or selling records or something like that.

And that space, because we don't have, academically, we don't have, at least I think, metrics that we can now translate into why people turned out to vote or how they really processed that information, I don't think that we can say the things that we all feel we want to say. So a lot of us want to say, well, the reason why the vote increased in certain communities or among young people is because it was complemented with this air and this ground campaign where the air campaign really normalized and drove people into these grassroots organizations on the ground.

So it may have been peer-to-peer contact but if
that person heard about you know, Puffy saying Vote or
die, or someone else making that connection, and so
there have to be layers of understanding that I don't
think we really have enough data on. And I think that
one of the, just to back up because I was trying to say
one of the things that really did work for us was that
we tapped into institutions that already existed, that
already existed to sell records, to sell clothing and
ideas, and we used our street teams, we used our
underground mix tapes. We tapped into all the
technologies that already exist, so it wasn't like we
were inventing the wheel, we were just kind of
appropriating those structures for political
messenging.

And I think that that is a place where we can
start looking at, again, organically getting the
message out in a way that hasn't been done before, and
I think that we have to start looking kind of in ways
that people receive information. I think that a lot
of, someone used the example to me of, particularly for
someone who is a minority in whatever way, that there
is an office party and someone says, you know,
everybody in the office is invited to this party. You
may look at that and you may say, you know, I'm really
not part of this community so I'm not necessarily going to participate.

But when someone comes directly to you, they come, this is the peer to peer contact, they come on your show, they invade your space, they come into your home. All of a sudden you realize, okay, they are really inviting me to participate and there have to be ways and more questions about understanding how young people connected to that space.

MS. SNOW: Before we move on, does anybody else want to volunteer any candor about failure?

MS. GREENE: I think not so much from a turnout standpoint but a lot of the messaging that we all worked in coalition on to really show the impact that young voters can have. Looking at how we define success with our goal being 20 million voters and on election night and days after, how the media defined success as being what the percentage of the electorate was, I think that we failed, in a sense, to address that electorate percentage in our initial messaging. But if we had had something in addition to 20 million, had addressed the percentage part of it more initially, then we wouldn't have been hit so much on the back end. And so I don't think it's such a turnout thing but it
has affected what young people feel their generation
did in this election, significantly, and that's
something that we are going to have to deal with for
years to come.

So the meet up point, I would say that in
looking at the evaluation after the election, we put 25
percent of our organizational resources into meet up
for several months and that was obviously, as Jaime
said, something that didn't work. I think a lot of the
cultural points, connections with the election that
were very visible, that were very highly marketed, at
times, didn't have as direct connections to voter
registration as they should have. We are of course
really proud of the numbers we saw for our online voter
registration but I think there were so many different
things that didn't have --.

When we sent out, a project that we did with
Taco Bell and they sent out 16 million tray liners with
voter registration messages, their link for voter
registration was not as strong as it should have been.
When 7-11 had five million Rock the Vote Big Gulp
cups, their voter registration forms and what was set
up within those stores was not as connected as it
should have been, so I think a lot of the buzz and
excitement, of course we know, I guess anecdotedly, that it did have an impact but I think if we had had those direct connections to voter registration for a more extended period of time, we would have seen higher numbers than we did.

MS. SNOW: We don't know what all of you said but somebody failed to talk to the Associated Press on the night of election night because that's where that story, that's where it started, right?

FROM THE FLOOR: Oh, she got lots of calls after--

(Laughter)

MS. CAMPBELL: And on that, I don't know if you were going to say it too but, on that, because we were a part of trying to deal with that issue as well, is that, on the media side, there was not awareness, even with the facts to change. It was say the 17 percent and what's his name? Chris Matthews, you know, 17 percent, 17 percent, this never changed.

MS. SNOW: But the 17 percent is 17 percent--

(Multiple people speaking)

MS. CAMPBELL: No, no, no, my point is that you had people who handle the media well talking to the media and trying to break it down, you had academicians
who called the media to break it down too. And so I think that, we talked about this earlier on, it also had something with to do with the results and that young people didn't vote for Bush, they voted Kerry, Kerry lost, so you did have some of that in response. I think that if it had gone the other way, and young people voted and Kerry won, you would have had a different conversation. I am feeling pretty old, sitting here right now, just thinking about how many years I've dealt with this stuff--

(Laughter)

MS. CAMPBELL: --and the conversations we have, and so it just kind of evolves. And the whole conversation about young people, the jury will be out on whether campaigns take it seriously or not with this next midterm election.

MS. WALKER: I think one of the big failures this year, and this reflects on my community, the foundation community, is that foundations did not step up to the plate in a major way to support the youth vote, with the exception of Pew which made a huge grant in this area. The Carnegie Corporation, a couple of other smaller foundations made small grants but I don't know of anybody that put more than, I mean except for
Pew, I don't know of anybody that put more than $500,000 into the youth vote. And both from a civic engagement perspective, that's a mistake, but also from a political perspective. It's ridiculous and I think we did not do a good job of communicating the importance of the youth vote to that constituency and for this side of the table, that's huge. This side of the table actually.

(Laughter)

MS. PHILLIPS: I think the challenge, getting back to your first question, is where do we go from here? I know that we, as a group, tried to do some things around each of the conventions and while our framework and our ways of working together worked well to share information and make sure that we were all on the same page, especially dealing with press, and questions and putting stories together, there is a difference among the non-partisan groups in terms of some who are going to focus on issues, some who are focusing on registration and things like that. And we ended up, I think everybody did, with something a little bit different at the convention, which was great.

But I think that's really the challenge, when
we look at the next elections, is once you take care of
the mechanical stuff, what do you do with the issues
things? Where do you go from there? And do you start
to, you know, in some ways, I think we really want to
hand things over to the partisans and say come and
fight for this group, we are showing you, you know, we
want to talk about who they are, that they are not
monolithic, here is what they care about, here is what
the research says.

But from my point of view, I would love to
think that that's going to happen, that that turnover
is going to occur, but I thought that was a real
challenge for us.

MS. SNOW: Ryan?

MR. FRIEDRICHs: That's actually the point I
wanted to speak on, as somebody who worked for a number
of years in the non-partisan community and then moved
into the partisan community in 2004 with that exact
goal, to try and leverage, not indirectly, as you do,
but directly try and leverage resources into this on
this front, to reach out to young voters, and found a
tremendous amount of barriers, which we knew were there
but found them face to face as opposed to finding them
sort of indirectly over a long period of time.
I wanted to get your sense, strategically, as to how you want to move forward and if you see that as not necessarily on failure but do you see the response or the lack of a response of the political community to this issue, over a number of years, as something that's getting better, getting worse? I think getter better we would agree to, to a degree, but what, going forward, what is a strategy? With partisans sitting here and academics, what is a good way to move forward to get that $3 billion economy to really lean into these voters and not to just conveniently continue to maybe backslide or ignore them when the election is not as hot or to keep moving forward?

MS. ACKER: Can I just preface that answer really quickly by saying that I would also like to hear your response too, because I agree with you, but I also think that what we do would not have the impact that it has without non-partisan organizations laying the framework, so can you guys address that too because I'm very curious?

MR. FRISHBERG: I have a long list of things that--

(Laughter)

MR. FRISHBERG: And the parties would be one of
them, although that was maybe too grand an expectation. The voter file didn't work for us on election night, election day, I mean so there is a lot of technology problems still to be figured out. That's just like a personal thing for us. But I think a lot of campaigns experienced that and if you look at one of the things for the future, 2006, the statewide databases, that will help new voters, not just young voters, but anybody who comes to the voter file late. But it was a huge, huge challenge for anybody who was doing that last three or four week turnout push.

We tried a lot of institutional partnerships to do registration, businesses, schools, colleges and universities. That, I don't think, similar to the Move On, it was, for us, one of the things that we didn't get the bang for the buck out of that, just looking at how much resources we put into it and what kind of registrations we got out of it. Nevada didn't work so well, this is a tough place to organize for us, it was hiring people that didn't need our jobs because we were paying campaign wages and you can go park a car for $80,000 a year in Nevada.

(Laughter)

MR. FRISHBERG: So it's like there are some
places that are just more challenging to do this work.

On the partisan piece of it, I think this is probably one of the big challenges because I couldn't really answer your question earlier about what were the results, the very definitive data. We feel like it's all coming at different levels but by the time we get it, the parties will have had to have started to make a set of decisions and priorities, and so we are not in a position to very quickly go out after the election to the parties and say here is what you should do.

I mean we can point generally to the case, young people turned out, you should do more, but I think we are not very well equipped to do that, we need to do more. To be able to say, all right, here is your races, here is what the numbers are, here is what we think you could accomplish in those places, which I think there needs to be more of that kind of thinking, which is all we've got until we get real, harder results to put on the table, but I also think that the campaigns, there was more tension in this cycle than ever before, I mean it was historic from both sides.

But this is not the kind of success that we really need, where the democrats are sending out surrogates to reach out to young people and republicans
are organizing college students to go out and mobilize old people. That's not success, and we need to do a lot more and the campaigns kind of came to it late, when they started to see real numbers.

But I'm kind of interested in the partisan panel, to really hear about what they did because I think they did more than some of us know.

MR. SEKULOW: We spent more money than any other Republican campaign in history on youth voter turnout, and this is, I mean we spent, I'm not saying, money is not the only issue here but when you bring in the President'd daughters to a college, it costs a lot of money to a campaign because of the Secret Service you've got to pay for, the security, the room--

MS. ACKER: To a closed event you mean?

MR. SEKULOW: But because of security with the Secret Service, you are not understanding that, it's a little bit different when you are running a campaign where you have people that have to be followed around by ten bodyguards. The campaign has to pick up some of that. So when we committed somewhere, we really had, and this is the same thing with the president and all the way down, these guys were travelling with major entourages. It's a little bit different when you are
not the incumbent and I think that does help with your flexibility, but what we did was interesting, our first grassroots event of the Bush Campaign was a Students for Bush event. The first grassroots website of the Bush Campaign was the Students for Bush website.

We had 128,000 student Bush volunteers, all in college, we had all of their contact info, we knew exactly where they were, what year they were, everything about them, so we had all these things. Yes, we got our 17 percent and that's what the number, for you all, this is what you have to do, you have to tell us, okay, why, instead of one of us on each campaign, why shouldn't there be five?

MS. FLEMING: There should be.

MR. SEKULOW: Or why shouldn't there be one in each state? And somehow you all, we can't do it because we are not the numbers folks and it can come from you all too. I think people are misunderstanding what I was saying earlier, I'm looking at this from a campaign manager's perspective, 17 percent is 17 percent and there is a lot more older people that you can go after, so it's worth spending your money on older people, but if we can show --.

I think we have to show that but see you have,
someone has got to show it because this election really
didn't show it. I mean you all kind of agreed on that,
that yes, the numbers went up, all the numbers were up,
it's hard to tell yet, but if you can show that, hey,
you can go into one of these battleground states,
because that's what you've got to focus on, if we are
talking about campaign managers here. A big blue state
or a big red state, they are going to look at it and
say that's great that we can get five more percent of
young people there to vote for us but that's still
we'll lose by 15 percent.

If you can go into a few of those and say, wow,
if you really can put in some grassroots drive here,
and we did. What we did, as the Bush Campaign, is
targeted conservative groups. Well what's
conservative, fraternities, sororities, evangelical.
We went to Christian concerts--

FROM THE FLOOR: Don't get too far ahead of us

here.

(Laughter)

MR. SEKULOW: What I'm saying is that we did
things that we've never done before, the RNC did things
they never done before and we don't think it failed, we
actually thought our youth effort worked. We wanted to
mobilize young people, we knew in some places we couldn't win the youth vote, that's part of polling and we went from there.

MS. GREENE: Well I think it's interesting the Ken Mehlman said that they did, I think it was at a forum similar to this here at Harvard, that he said, well, we did everything right except for young people.

MS. SNOW: Let's save that for the next session.

(Laughter)

MR. FERGUSON: I was exhausted travelling coast to coast in the last 60 days campaigning.

MS. SNOW: This is a great discussion but we really think that it's sort of the next panel. Before we move away from the non-partisan world, just make sure we've got it.

MR. UZETA: Just in terms of moving forward and how we are shifting, the results of the election have actually prompted us to shift our strategy, and programming and the way we handle social issues. Whereas before we focused on off year elections, primarily on one issue per year, we are trying to seize on this increased interest that's happened gradually, post 9/11, and then really accelerated during the last
election, and actually have a multi issue approach to our social campaign.

So young people, in general, are going to hear a lot more from MTV on all the issues of concern, whereas, before they were just, like I said, it was an issue-based approach to try to say, look, you care about this issue, politics is connected with this issue, we feed them all this information, just that one issue. Now there seems to be an increased appetite and we are trying to really kind of pry that open and go a lot further with it, so we are covering several issues at once and we are starting to get a lot more air time on TV. So I think in terms of what young people are, to the extent that they are influenced by what they end up seeing on TV, or MTV or anything like that, they are going to start seeing a lot more on just social issues in general.

MS. CAMPBELL: For us, and one of the things that we would recommend and one of the things that's very, very difficult in politics too, because we focus nationally so much, just on the president, which is what we are here to talk about, but also to build on that a systemic way of having impact. So, for us, it's working on the state level and working on a local
level. And so with our young people, we have the 14 states that we are still in and that you are working through. So, after the election, you bring those young people together and you develop that leadership because part of it is, for politics, you find campaigns, and I hear this from people I know that work on the partisan side, looking for talent, looking for people who will be involved.

And when the systemic approach of public policy, when it came down to the voter, not voter registration but the community service, Americorps, whatever that bill that passed, and then you see 13 years later, now 12 or 13 years later, that you've got more young people who were volunteering for community service, it was no accident. I talked about this when I was here at Harvard and our study group was focused on this issue, and it was a policy decision that was made by Democrats, who were in control of the Congress at that time, to not allow working on campaigns to be considered a community service.

And so young people who come through this body or academic community know that most young people, they got it at high school, on a high school level, and so the policy decisions that are made have to be also
impacted, and that's been a very difficult thing to try to tackle because on the partisan side, if you're not voting for my, your people aren't voting for Republicans, I'd rather not change that, or it would be the same thing, so non-partisans, whether my group or any other, have to stay around. I love the partisan folks, there is going to have to, there has to be, for this country, because 50 percent of the people aren't voting in the first place, there has to be vehicles out here that keep driving it home. And so the working consistently outside of elections cycles that has driven up by the federal presidential campaigns is critical and so, for us, that's what we are doing.

MR. KING: I'm going to close up this session now. Thank you very much to all the panelists, especially to a wonderful journalist who we are not going to actually allow them to leave, they will be joined by Ron Fournier in just a moment.

One of the important distinctions to keep in mind between the partisan and non-partisan sides, and you can feel the heat from the partisan side toward the non-partisan side--

(Laughter)

MR. KING: --is that politics is way too
important to be left up to the partisans because the, and even just to the academics because turnout was much higher in the battleground states than it was in the non-battleground states. And children learn about politics when they are young, 12, 13, 14, 15 years old. After that, it will be much harder to get them engaged in politics generally and campaigns, the longer the campaigns are, are wonderful experiences for them to become active, lifelong participants. And if the parties aren't advertising in their states, if the candidates aren't visiting their states, if they happen to live in three quarters of the states, this campaign went by.

The partisans did a fabulous job of boosting turnout in the battleground states and it's the non-partisan organizations that have to continue to try and teach young people about the importance of civic engagement, as our schools are no longer doing a fabulous job, as our families are no longer doing an adequate job. What you all are engaged in, forget about partisan politics, what you are engaged in for the future of the democratic system, small-d, don't worry, is really very important. I thank you very much.
We are going to take a brief break, you should know where the bathrooms are by now, and we'll gather again in a few moments to hear from the next session on presidential campaigns and partisan influence.

(Whereupon, at 2:51 p.m., there was a brief recess.)

(3:03 p.m.)

MR. KING: At the journalist section of the table, Kate will be back, and Rebecca is here and joining us as well is Ron Fournier, who is the Chief Political Correspondent for the Associated Press, he's been out on the campaign trail covering every aspect of presidential campaigns for many years. We all know his work and now you know what he actually looks like. So let's try and maintain that image when you read his work. A terrific group, now talking about presidential campaign and partisan efforts. Alexandra Acker, Meighan Davis, Ben Ferguson, Jane Fleming, Eric Hoplin and Jordan Sekulow. The wheels start, who wants to start this time?

Here you go, Ron.

MR. FOURNIER: Thank you very much for having me. There is a couple of questions I would like to straighten out before we get to the end of this today, one is, with all the media fragmentation that's going
on in my business right now, the so many different ways people are getting their information, especially youngsters with the Internet and viral marketing, what new methods are emerging and will emerge to define, target and motivate youths. And secondly, which of these new techniques, these new methods, these new communications channels are particularly unique to young voters because of the communication?

Before we get into that though, we can come back to it later, there is one little bit of housekeeping. You were saying earlier that what matters is what happens in the battleground states, that's where you focus your, and that happens to be something that I subscribe to when I do my reporting, when I want to see how effective a turnout operation was or how effective an advertising campaign was. I look at the campaigns where the money was spent, where the campaigns were focused. Do you have any idea how you guys did in those states among young voters?

MR. SEKULOW: Well, I was talking about this earlier and kind of our goal for our effort, it was two pronged, our first goal for our youth effort, and I make no qualms about this, the campaign is over, and I'm not with the White House, I'm not with the
administration, was to produce volunteers for the campaign. When I was brought in, and Eric is going to agree with me from the College Republicans, we knew, looking at some states, we couldn't win the youth vote, states we were going to win. But at the same time, we picked up states, like Maine, where we lost, which was a battleground state that we won the youth vote in.

So there are interesting places now that our polling staff and our statistics people can go back in and look at. You know, I think different things played into this too, the height of the war came in right at the end. We started out very high in the youth vote, nationwide, very high. Harvard actually had a poll out showing us 60 percent versus any of the other Democratic candidates--

MR. FOURNIER: Let me ask you about this, overall, Kerry won 54-45, as you know. In the 16 top battleground states, Kerry won 56-43, there was only three states that the Bush Campaign had a higher percentage, although it's statistically negligible, basically it's even, that's Maine, Arizona and New Mexico. You got your butt kicked where--

MR. SEKULOW: That was not our goal of the campaign. I mean our youth outreach was to fire up
young people because--

MR. FOURNIER: I thought getting more votes was the goal of the campaign.

MR. SEKULOW: It is a goal but we used the young people that supported us, that we knew supported us, to get more votes for us, and we knew that sometimes calling a bunch of college students who we're pretty sure are just by, and you can look at micro targeting and knowing how people feel about a lot of different issues. Maybe it's better to use those college Republicans and Students for Bush to call likely Republican or undecided voters, instead of calling a bunch of liberal students, and you can look at that in each state.

I mean that's, our goal is to maximize our volunteers and our grassroots people's time, we are not going to waste time reaching out to people that are this far left. Now if they are in the middle--

MS. FLEMING: If we considered young people a waste of time, we would--

MR. SEKULOW: No, I'm not saying that.

MS. FLEMING: --consistently be in the situation that we are in.

MR. SEKULOW: I'm not saying that--
MS. FLEMING: Which is campaigns treating young people as a chicken and an egg--

MR. SEKULOW: That is not true. I mean that's what--

MS. FLEMING: But I do want to answer your question about battleground states that we were in because we do know--

MR. SEKULOW: I think this is the point, students in battleground states--

MS. FLEMING: There was a ten percent--

MS. ACKER: Let's go one at a time, one at a time.

MS. FLEMING: There was a ten percent different between Bush and Kerry on a national average. In the five battleground states that we were in, we had about a 17 percent difference, and that goes back to the model that we put into place for this cycle, which was we were no longer going to stand for sending all of our YDA kids to the campaign to volunteer and go knock on older people's doors. We actually did, for the first time in history, a youth coordinated campaign where young people were talking to their peers.

MR. FOURNIER: And that gets to the bigger point I want to get to in a minute, but I wonder if
maybe that points out a problem with the strategy. You did what your goal was, the next time though would it be better to try to get your folks to vote instead of just volunteering?

MR. SEKULOW: The next time we look at the same kind of things. Remember, I'm not talking from the Republican Party, I'm just talking about Bush Campaign. We knew where we stood, we did lots in those battleground states with different constituency groups, that doesn't mean young people's votes aren't important, but in a battleground state that has had ads run for a year and a half by us and the other side, people are pretty partisan, they are going to be likely voters who we're calling that last week before the campaign, and so we are not going to call the ones who are likely D, we are going to call the ones that are likely R or middle or undecided, and that can change things.

MR. FERGUSON: Part of it, I think, too is just that you look at us, we knew we could win battles but we knew we weren't going to win the war, and part of that was because that we knew that some of these "non-partisan" groups were partisan and they weren't on our side. You look at people like P. Diddy who said he
was non-partisan until he came out and ripped the
president. We knew that, he--

MS. MCGILL: --the president in March.

MR. FERGUSON: The bottom line is that we know
that everything, and the other thing is this--

MR. FOURNIER: Is the solution to complain
about what the non-partisans do--

(Multiple people speaking)

MR. FOURNIER: What I want to get to is if you
guys can tell me what you would do, what you are going
to do next time to get the youth vote up in
battleground states because that's the bottom line,
you've got to get that--

MS. ACKER: I would like to just jump in, in
concert, and say that the Kerry Campaign strategy was
completely opposite of the Bush Campaign. Not only was
my job to mobilize the youth vote and increase our
share of it, but we had 12 on the ground organizers in
battleground states, who were full-time youth
organizers, only three of three of them were so-called
full-time volunteers in that they were people who did
not need financial assistants. These were paid staff
whose sole job was to organize and mobilize young
people. And I would get completely thrown off my
rocker when I would hear about organizers on the ground using students to then go mobilize older voters.

MR. FOURNIER: So what do you do next time to have a higher percentage, to win the youth vote in battleground--

MR. SEKULOW: I think this is what we do, we have now seen and I think, like Jaime said, we know, Ken Mehlman said, he is the Chairman of the RNC, the youth vote is important. We didn't do our job, maybe, on the vote, turnout-wise, we still--

MR. FOURNIER: What do you to do your job better?

MR. SEKULOW: What do we do? I think we have to target those non-college. I think college students who are voting are pretty partisan, I think they know how they are going to vote. I mean unless you have a major thing right before, if a 9/11 occurred a month before an election, maybe it changes, but youth partisan, students at Harvard probably know how they are going to vote.

MR. FOURNIER: Let me ask the professor what the partisan breakdown is among college--

MR. KING: Well, for all intents and purposes, about 36 percent are Independent, about 33 percent are
Democrat, the rest are Republican, so the modal response of course is that I'm an Independent, and when we look at why they call themselves independents, they usually don't have a very clear idea about what it even means to be a partisan. They say things like, well, I don't want anyone telling me how to vote. Now when we also did a panel back survey, which is we go to students at one point and then go ask them a few months later who are you voting for now?

We found 20 percent of students, who had made an affirmative choice at time one, changing their mind from Bush to Kerry or from Kerry to Bush. Twenty percent who looked like solid votes, changing their mind in just a few months, so the youth vote is very movable, it's pliable, not necessarily liberal.

MR. FERGUSON: I think part of it was is we learned from this election that we know the youth vote is going to be tapped into more, and more and more. When the next election cycle comes up, I think we are going to have to go after them more than we did this time. The bottom line, when you look at it from a campaign perspective, is how much money are you willing to spend on a group that you just don't know about yet? Are you willing to spend the resources? Are you going
to spend the resources on a group that you just don't know about, or are you going to spend money on a group you know that you can target and they will turn out? Well now we know--

MR. FOURNIER: --change in four years.

MR. FERGUSON: And another thing was this too, it's that when you look at the War in Iraq, people assumed that that was going to engage my generation like never before because their friends are over there, they knew people that were that age. Did that issue, something that pivotable of an issue, bring that many extra people out? I don't think so.

MR. FOURNIER: Fifty-one percent of people under 30, who were talked to at the exit polls, said they approved of the decision to go to war in Iraq. Let's go real quickly and I'll stop talking, let's go to the other forms of communication. You mentioned talking to friends, the whole idea of viral communications, influential, connectors, fascinates me in politics and marketing, especially with all these different ways, the diffuseness of the way they communicate. Can both of you guys talk about what steps you took this time to communicate in ways other than national advertising? And how is it going to
change in four years?

MS. FLEMING: Actually, I have some concrete examples, and I brought plenty if people want to take them back, of the literature that we use door to door. And we went back to old school, we knew, based on actually the research, that Nickerson, Green and Garber, Ryan Friedrichs did, who was part of our national team, that the door to door, peer to peer, talking to young people where they lived and where they hang out was going to be the best thing for us to do in order to get them to the polls to vote for Democrats.

And we specifically did a pro Democratic message, everything that we did was here is where the Democrats stand on issues and here is where the Republicans stand on issues, and you are going to be better off with the Democrats. Your future is going to be better off, your families are better off and that's why it's important to vote for Democrats.

MR. FOURNIER: Were your kids talking to kids on--

MS. FLEMING: Young people talking to young people, we had hip hop kids talking to hip hop kids, punk kids talking to punk kids, and so we very much--

MR. FOURNIER: The Bush Campaign did this so
much better, so much better, generally, than the Kerry Campaign did. Was it something that--

MS. FLEMING: Well I also want to make the distinction that we weren't the Kerry Campaign--

MR. FOURNIER: Well I know, that's why I want to, I want to ask the Kerry and Bush Campaigns what you guys did because I know, nationally, the Bush Campaigns get a lot more credit for doing it better.

MS. ACKER: Sure. I will say, hands down, that the Bush Campaign website was infinitely better than our website was, and that was one of my biggest frustrations was I did not have any kind of direct control over the content of our young voter outreach website. There was a decision made nationally to kind of make all of our constituency websites, all of our state websites have the same kind of look and feel, which was a huge frustration of mine because obviously you can't talk to a young voter the same way.

Your website was amazing, I will totally give you that credit.

Our website, however, had three downloadable organizing manuals, which I think were a huge help, they were actually the number one hit on our website in the month of September, it was our campus organizing
manual. We had a campus organizing manual, a non-
student organizing manual and a voter registration
manual, all of which were directed at activists
teaching themselves and teaching other students how to
organize themselves, and I thought that that made a
huge difference.

We worked very, very, closely with the campaign
and the Democratic National Committee worked very, very
closely together in strategically reaching out to our
activists via e-mail. The campaign had 80,000 people,
the DNC had over 120,000 people and we called them our
e-activists, they received monthly and then weekly
e-mails with organizing suggestions. So, eight weeks
out, it was hold a voter registration drive on your
campus. Seven weeks out, it was identify supporters
who will be volunteers for you in organizing your
peers. Six weeks out, I am getting the calendar wrong
here but--

MR. FOURNIER: The first thing Matthew Dow did,
early in the campaign, was pass around the book,
Influentials, to Karl Rove and Ken Mehlman, saying
we've got to find out who the opinion leaders are in
the communities, get them talking to each other, get
them talking to their neighbors and friends about the
campaign. Did you guys use any of that stuff with the youth vote?

MR. SEKULOW: No. I mean that was our, if I could point out one thing in the campaign, we could not counter the surrogates that a Kerry Campaign could have. Now we had Barbara and Jenna, we had high, you know, people that--

MR. FOURNIER: Well I'm not talking surrogates, I'm talking about influential members of the community, the coolest kids in the high school and the--

MR. SEKULOW: We didn't, we kind of went for the opposite of that at a lot of big schools, if you looked at it, because we knew where our most likely voters were and our most likely voters were evangelical clubs, fraternities and sororities, so we went there, we found our leaders in religious groups. People that go to church more regularly vote more Republican more regularly, and we know that, so we did those kind of things, that's how we targeted and that's why I think you look at the Bush Campaign as micro targeted, it's not even about youth, Hispanic women, it's about person, we had the resources to do that.

Our students website, going back to that real quick, that was, the campaign spent more time on our
students website sometimes than we did on our regular because who uses websites every day? College students who have fast connections in their rooms or wireless access all over their campus and towns.

Our first big thing that we did was in March, way before the election, with March Madness going on, we launched March to Victory, so we took 32 states, put them in brackets, and this took a lot of building to do this kind of thing.

They were all going against each other and it was to sign up, who could sign up the most student Bush volunteers and get them on line like immediately, constantly? And in three weeks, we signed up 21,000 new students and for us, still a volunteer-driven campaign, going back to those points I discussed.

MR. FERGUSON: And I think that's the point of what I was saying earlier is we picked our battles. We knew we didn't have the high profile surrogates, we didn't have the national, per se, media attention that we knew we would need to win the youth vote, but we knew the battles we could win and the campaign gave us everything we needed to win those battles. You know, I'm not going to go to my alma mater in the south, where I know the state is, and go down there and hold a
big forum because it's not going to affect that
election.

And they asked me, they said will you come? I
said look, I need to spend my time other places where
there is battles that we can win that are up for grabs.
And it was more time management, it was more saying be
honest with ourselves, going is that really going to
work? No.

MR. FOURNIER: So you really don't think you
could win the youth vote in the battleground states?
You're giving that up?

MR. FERGUSON: No, no, I'm saying we picked our
places where we knew, this time around, we could do it
and I think that--

MS. FLEMING: Here is the tricky thing, I mean
the young Democrats took a risk, we had limited
resources, we raised $1.3 million. We could have gone
the safe route and did a snazzy website to get all
these volunteers and put them into Move On, or put them
into ACT or put them into all these other voter
mobilization efforts. But we took a big risk, we took
a risk on the youth vote because we knew that if you
invested in young people and you invested in a model,
which we created, called the New Voter Model, which
blended traditional door to door and direct mail campaign with non-traditional techniques, which is more like street teams, and grassroots marketing and viral marketing, that we would have a model that we could build upon, not only for the young Democrats, as an organization, but for state parties and for the DNC. Because right now, state parties, if you say what do you think about the youth vote? They'll be like oh, it's great, we think young people are our future.

But zero state parties give money to the young Democrats and zero state parties give money to local youth organizations. And it's time that young people in organizations, young people who lead organizations of young people, that we stand up, and really challenge the party system and challenge where resources are spent.

MR. HOPLIN: If I could just interject for one second, you know, the Republican Party, in a lot of ways, does reach out to young people, especially on the local level. For example, I represent the College Republican National Committee and I would say we have 20 or so Republican parties that invest in College Republicans. The State of Minnesota, for example, the Republican Party gave the local College Republicans...
$30,000. Why? Because the bulk of their volunteers
for the phone banks or knocking on doors came from
College Republicans.

And we had a similar focus to Young Democrats
in that we put out 60 full-time, paid field
representatives and what they did is they recruited
some 200,000 College Republicans who then organized
their friends. They went door to door in the dormitory
and they said hey, do you like George Bush? Do you
like the Republican Party? Hey, where are you on this
issue? Hey, are you registered to vote? And so I
think that while the Bush Campaign focused a lot on the
website and that was very helpful to attract a national
audience, what we tried to do is go into the dormitory,
talk to people one on one. And I think it was very
effective.

One of the things that Ivan said in the
previous session is something to the effect that it's a
failure if young people's times are spent going out
trying to get old people to vote. Well it's a failure
depending on what your goal is, and our goal is to win
the election and if there are many more citizens,
whether it's inside the youth demographic or not, that
can vote, by manning that phone bank, by going to that
door, by stamping that literature, by providing the
volunteers that provided the votes for victory, you
achieve your goal.

Now, at the same time, I will be the first to
say yeah, we wanted to win the youth vote, and we spent
a lot of our energy trying to get young people to vote
for Republicans and to get involved, but I would say
more of our energy was expended in getting them
involved in the campaign. And I think, for the
national media, one of the perspectives that maybe they
haven't thought of is they said they were waiting for
the young people to make the huge impact in terms of
voting, but maybe they did make a pretty big impact and
that is young people provided the volunteers that
produced the votes that led to victory, and I think
that's one thing--

MR. FOURNIER: How many people do you think
spent the time to go to a campaign and lick stamps--

MR. FERGUSON: If you look at the Republicans,
when we had one of our very first meetings, they said,
Ben, what is your objective? I said look, young people
don't have jobs, they are in college, their job is
college and you can get them in a campaign and they
will work for you until the wee hours of the morning.
MS. DAVIS: I don't know what college students
they are talking to that don't have jobs, that's the
not the case where--

MR. FERGUSON: No, I'm saying compared to the
older demographics. I mean I have a job but my point
is this, if you go after college students, and that's
what you did, and they are involved and they want to
work for you, they have so many more hours available.
They don't have to go home and take care of their
families or their kids, they live on campus, they live
off campus but they are going to work for you and
invest in it, and I think that's what we did.

MR. FOURNIER: --to the point that it's a known
fact that the way you vote your first two elections is
almost for sure how you are going to vote the rest of
your life and if you're not getting, if you're losing
the youth vote now, when are you going to get them
back?

MR. SEKULOW: --lost the youth vote last, I
mean yes, we've lost a little more this time, we also
had a war, but we've lost the youth vote a couple of
times now and we still won, and I keep coming back to
that. It's there is no youth vote, that's what I'm
trying to get to here, if you look at our perspective.
Look overall, for a campaign, there is, for voter registration, that is very different but for a campaign, if you know a young person that attends church regularly, shops at the store, you know they are more likely to vote. It doesn't matter if they are young or not, why do you have to always just keep looking at these people just because they are young people? Why not look at them because they are a voter and then obviously a campaign targets likely or undecided voters for their campaign. You don't have to use this young title.

MS. ACKER: Jordan, I would just counter what you are saying and say I think that you are seeing buyer's remorse on the side of the president now in how aggressively they are targeting young people for their Social Security plan. I think the Republican Party is saying oh crap, we didn't target this age group and it's going to come back to bite us in next elections, and they are right, and that is, I think, why you are seeing such an aggressive youth strategy on that issue.

MR. FERGUSON: I don't think it's oh crap, I think it's we know now that they can be mobilized, we know now that they will respond, and now what we are doing is taking the next steps to get them because now
we see I have leverage.

MS. SNOW: That's my next question. My next question is having covered, I'm in a unique position because I covered both Kerry and Bush for a time. And I talked to people in both campaigns, and I'm sure Ron will back me up, who said it's not worth our time, it's not worth our money, especially in the Bush Campaign who said, off the record usually, but said, you know, we are not going there, we are not going to even try. Is it changed now, given that we, going back to our discussion about 17 percent or the number--

MS. FLEMING: I say no, it's not changed.

MR. SEKULOW: I think there is a real big difference about this, I'll use an example, right after the campaign, now I decided to go work on another campaign, I passed up a job in the administration, fine. I got a call from the RNC, one of their directors, a senior staffer said can you come in? We want to really start talking about reaching out to young people. We know you are kind of moving on in your political career. And that's one of the problems with youth politics too is that everyone changes. Eric is not going to be the CR guy next year, I'm not going to be the Youth Director for the next campaign, Alex
isn't going to be either.

Can we use our ideas? Yes, but we are gone and our people are gone too, so there is shifts. I mean it's very generational, but the RNC is reaching out more so than ever before. It's not about votes, it's about issues and policy. It is something newer for us but I mean I think that's a good sign, I think that's a good sign for the Republican Party is that they are using the resources.

MR. SNOW: Alex? Can we just hear from Alex?

MS. ACKER: I would just say too that Jane and I had slightly different views of how the state party reacted to young voters because obviously being a 527, the state parties couldn't work directly with YDA this cycle. I would say that, out of the battleground states, there were only a handful that did not actively give money and engage young people in trying to organize young people. And in those states, primarily the two that spring to mind, New Mexico and Iowa, that did not have a specific youth program, those were the two states that flipped from Gore to Bush.

So I think that the national party and the state parties see a direct correlation now between young voter organizing and victory, and I think that
you are seeing that down the line. I also think we
couldn't, perhaps for young people, say what you say
about the rest of the party. You couldn't ask for a
better spokesperson than Governor Dean to be the
chairman of the party right now in speaking to young
people and addressing issues that they care about.

MS. SNOW: I just want to follow up on Alex,
I'm really curious about this, I'm sorry, or to Jane.
But for the Democrats, given what happened to you, you
lost, how are you going to keep both the focus on youth
vote and also keep voters on your side when they feel
disenchanted now, they feel discouraged?

MS. ACKER: I actually think that they don't
feel disenchanted or discouraged, I think that that's
been one of the surprising things coming out of this
election is that young people are still engaged. There
is obviously going to be a small percentage that drop
off. I think the work that's being done across the
table from me in organizations that are continuing to
do mobilizations around issues is very heartening, I
think the ideas coming out of the national, state and
local party is saying we have to keep doing this, young
people actually came out this time, we have to keep
engaging them.
It's huge because I think the problem that we saw in '92 was Clinton rode in on the youth wave and then the party did nothing to build a continuing infrastructure to keep young people engaged. We did not see Clinton reach out to young people in '96, Al Gore had like two weeks of talking about young people and then it dropped off the planet. Young people were not a targeted demographic for the Democratic Party since 1992. And I think we've learned from that mistake in saying okay, we can count on them to be Democratic voters because we saw in 2000 that you cannot count on them to be Democratic voters. And as a result, we also had a candidate who believed very strongly in reaching out to young people. This was a personal issue for John Kerry, he himself made it a point to address young people and their issues.

MS. FLEMING: I think it's important to just look at dollars and look at staffing within state parties, and so time will tell, at the RNC and the DNC, if there is actually a staff member who is dedicated to young people, not just college students and getting them to be volunteers, but actually mobilizing the youth vote, both non-college and college. And if it's not just one person, right because one person is not
going to, and all of us know that, being one person on a campaign or one person in an organization, that that's not going to mobilize this constituency.

MR. HOPLIN: But, Jane, I would say is there any Democratic youth group on any side that had 60 or more staff members on the college campuses?

MS. FLEMING: Yes, actually we did, yes.

MR. HOPLIN: For the entire, in the entire election cycle, we had 500 paid staff members worth $1.3 million?

MS. FLEMING: We had 500 paid, we don't pay as well as you do, and we had 36 full-time staffers.

MR. HOPLIN: I think if you have 36 and we had 60, but your point--

MS. FLEMING: But how much did you spend? And how many young people did you talk to door to door?

MS. SINDERBRAND: I have a quick question for you, I just wanted to follow something you were saying before about creating a model, that was one of your aims was creating a model that perhaps other people would take up, and that was something that Ivan and other people were talking about before in terms of the New Voter Project. When that data comes in and actually, for both parties, do you see a willingness,
if that data does confirm what he is thinking, that in
those counties where those methods were put into
effect, it had a real impact on the vote? Do you see a
willingness on the part of the parties to put resources
into those methods in the future?

MS. FLEMING: Well we put the same experiments
in place that Ivan did. I mean Ivan and the Young
Democrats basically ran parallel programs but ours was
partisan and his was non-partisan, and so we --. Now
do I think that that will change? Time will tell. I
think it's going to take a lot of election cycles for
us to prove ourselves, that when you target young
people and you talk to them about issues, that they
vote for the candidate and the party that you want them
to. It can't just be one election cycle. I would be
fooling myself to think that the DNC and candidates
across the nation now are going to pour millions of
dollars into the youth vote for their campaigns, that's
silly, so we have to take a lot of election cycles to
prove ourselves.

MR. FERGUSON: You've got two things that came
out of this last election, one is 20 somethings,
college kids, whatever category you want to put them
in, is the new minority and campaigns know that. They
have to talk to them and they have to get them to win an election on a national scale. The other thing is you are going to have, for all of us on this side of the table, is we now have legitimacy in what we are trying to do, which is get out the young vote. I can actually pick up the phone now and call someone in a majority position of political power, and they might actually listen to what I have to say about young people. Before this election, the chances of that happening are me winning the lottery twice, it's not going to happen.

MR. SEKULOW: I mean I think it helped show the Republicans, who are now in control, what happened to us. We did focus our our time on volunteers and yes, that worked this time, we don't know what's going to happen with the demographic 18 to 21, I mean they change a lot. Look back in history about the shifts between Vietnam, back to conservative, back and forth.

But at the same time, that's a considerable margin, so it gives our leaders, our fund raisers, the people at the top who make things happen that we implement, you have a reason to go after it and a reason to really spend not just resources but time and effort on making sure this is done right, and it's going to take more
than two people, one on each side, doing that.

MS. SINDERBRAND: Because we do have a model in place for young people, as you described, that was very similar to the model used in other groups, the model used with evangelicals, the peer to peer, the ground marketing, why do you think that that didn't come through?

MR. SEKULOW: For us? For this campaign?

MS. SINDERBRAND: For you. Was is just forces you couldn't control--

MR. SEKULOW: Yeah, I really do, I think there is a considerable, and especially in the battleground states where we spend our resources, you had pressure, obviously, on where you are spending your money. You have to realize what we were facing as well, we had the 527 groups on campus and they were more than just the young Democrats, Move On had one, ACT had one, so we were outnumbered. I mean the College Republicans, by itself, had more than any Democratic group, just focused on college campuses, but ACT still had 400 people in Pennsylvania, 400 staffers in Pennsylvania. They did their job there but then if you look at it, how well they did, why weren't they in Ohio? That's the kind of stuff, you have to think about these
things.

MS. ACKER: That's the question I was asking.

MR. SEKULOW: But see that was the problem.

This is the difference between the Bush Campaign and the Kerry Campaign, we ran our grassroots and they let the 527s run it, and I don't think it worked, I think they were mismanaged.

MS. ACKER: I love when you say let because we literally did not coordinate. Jane, Meighan and I were all friends before the campaign and I literally did not have a conversation with them the entire time we were on the campaign.

MR. SEKULOW: Well I'm not saying that but--

MR. FERGUSON: What you are talking about the reality is is that they helped you a lot.

MR. SEKULOW: Which is great if you are, if I'm on the campaign--

MS. ACKER: I'm not denying that.

MR. SEKULOW: --I'd be thrilled to have them. We didn't, I was frustrated that we didn't have them.

MS. ACKER: But you spent all your money on the Swift Boat ads.

MR. FOURNIER: Let me change the subject real quick.
MR. FERGUSON: Since some of the young people had so much cash, I'll give you that, you're right.

MR. FOURNIER: Can we start, the two campaign folks, why is it that when people under 30 were asked for the most important issue, 14 percent said Iraq, 16 percent said terror, 21 said economy and I think about a half of the youth that didn't vote put the economy as their number one issue, and 22 percent said moral values? I would have thought Iraq would have been higher.

MS. ACKER: Well I would love to address that question because I think this is something that the Democratic Party as a whole has not addressed. When people say moral values, you assume that those voters are Republicans and I would strongly disagree with that statement. To me, the War on Iraq is a moral issue. I am pro choice, family planning is a moral issue. And I would say that my opposition to the war in Iraq is because of my morals and my beliefs, so I don't think that you can clump moral voters into a conservative voting block.

MR. SEKULOW: I think it works both sides too, I think some of ours are mixed in with that 22 percent and some of theirs because our evangelical students,
which is a big chunk of voters, as you talked about,
how many students that are college campuses that attend
church regularly and that kind of thing. Those things
you can't just categorize, oh, those were all the
Republicans, there is all the Democrats.

MR. FOURNIER: I don't think you'll see that
phrasing on the next exit poll. How about economy?
Why was economy higher than Iraq? That one really
stumped me.

MS. ACKER: Young people are the number one
most unemployed demographic.

MS. FLEMING: It's actually one of out bullet
points, no health care, no WMD, no jobs.

MR. HOPLIN: I think a lot of people, we've
been told, our generation has been told, you know, in a
theory, go to school, get an education, get a four year
degree, get out and get a good job. You are living the
American dream and all of a sudden, you realize, when
you are getting out of school, some universities were
handing out bumper stickers that said go to grad
school, it's easier than getting a job, and I think
there is a lot of truth to that.

MR. FOURNIER: Did the Kerry and Bush
Campaigns, when you were targeting youths, use the
economy as an issue--

MS. ACKER: Absolutely.

MR. FOURNIER: --more than you did on the national level?

MR. SEKULOW: Yeah, and what we were trying to say is we talked about different growth options and things like that, and then I think the Kerry Campaign was saying the opposite, they cut taxes, they did different things, and I think we definitely used the economy as an issue. For us, at the time, looking at college students, it was a weaker issue for us to use, it was not one we wanted to just throw out there without having a real response and know what we were going to talk about. So we talked a lot about the future, a lot about savings accounts, personal savings accounts, Social Security reform, those kind of things, saying, listen, we are trying to do things for you in the future that will give you more money.

MS. FLEMING: And education as well--

MR. SEKULOW: Right.

MR. FERGUSON: Because I mean that was one of our strong points. If you look at how much money went into future college funds and education for young people, Bush had done a lot on that without it being...
publicized.

MS. ACKER: Like cutting Pell grants?

MR. FERGUSON: What did you say?

MS. FLEMING: Like cutting Pell Grants?

MR. FERGUSON: Cutting? Have you seen how much money he has given to education?

MS. SNOW: We are not going to get into a political debate here.

MS. ACKER: I would say the economy, for us, when John Kerry talked to young people about the economy, it was that all issues were essentially tied together. Young people didn't have jobs, they didn't have health insurance and they were dramatically in debt, both because of higher education costs and things like credit card companies targeting young people. I think you can tie issues of personal debt all together, which was a huge issue that the campaign addressed, especially in the last month.

MR. FOURNIER: That answers the question, thank you.

MS. SNOW: I'm wondering about local versus national, and maybe this is to the party people. Is it better to focus on national issues with the youth vote, do the campaigns think? Or is it better to micro, to
focus micro, to focus at home, to focus on things like Pell Grants?

MS. SINDERBRAND: Just following on that, by the way, sort of a question I was asking before about when you are targeting college students specifically, you are targeting college students who maybe are going to school in Pennsylvania but they are from, you know, they are from Rhode Island which is going to go Democrat, or vice versa. Is there a different way to reach those students?

MS. FLEMING: It's actually an excellent question, it's actually something that we'll be testing in Virginia. We are going into Virginia with our new voter model and we are testing state-based issues and regional issues, and the messages is that we do, both in our materials and when we go door to door, and we are going to be taking out adds in college newspapers and that thing, first it is what we did in this past cycle which was all national messages.

And so I have a feeling that the local messages are going to resonate more with young people because it's in their back yard and that's what's hitting them face to face, but I still think that we'll use, we'll still use some national issues, like Social Security
will still be an issue that we talk about in the campaign that we are going into in Virginia.

MR. FOURNIER: Are you guys going to use Virginia as a test case?

MR. SEKULOW: Well I'm working on a different campaign now, so I can't answer on Virginia. But what, I think the best point here is there is a difference between a national election though, too, and a gubernatorial race in Virginia, a big difference. It's a lot easier to go to just Virginia students--

MS. SNOW: I was actually asking when you are in a national year, when you are in an `04 or an `08, is it better to focus macro or is it better to focus micro?

MS. ACKER: I think it's always a combination of them.

MR. SEKULOW: You do both, you micro target when you can but you can't catch every student that might be going to school in a different state.

MR. FERGUSON: I mean when I went to some places at the end of the campaign, the first question I was asked was, you know, you have the forum, and the kids would walk up to the microphone and go why is President Bush for the draft? Well that's an issue
that, is it national or is it local? Well if we are in a military town, the question usually did not get asked because they knew the answer. But if you went to a place that wasn't, that's the first thing they wanted to know and I would say he is not, he never has been, he has never said that. Well we were told that he is for the draft and if he gets reelected, that we are going to have a draft. Well then you have to spend 20 minutes trying to convince them that wherever this came from, it's not a reality.

MR. HOPLIN: And I would say on the topic of issues, Ron, you had asked earlier if we didn't, if the Republican Party or the president didn't win the youth vote now, you are never going to have a chance to win them because traditionally they vote, I would say two things to that--

MR. FOURNIER: I mean this age group, as it gets older.

MR. HOPLIN: Right, it gets more difficult. But I think issues are going to play a big role in that and I think as young people graduate and depend on a full-time salary to support their families, when they are paying more in taxes, they are going to start to wonder which party they should be a part of. When you
have important national issues, like the president's leadership and the War on Terror, people think, well, he is keeping us safe.

And so I think that issues are more important than mechanics of registering people to vote and things like that. And so this was a snapshot in the 2004 election and I don't know that it can portend where all young people are going to go in the future because of the issues.

But another thought on the other side I would like to mention about it is there were several polls, a month or two before the election, that were showing it neck and neck, amongst the youth vote, between Kerry and Bush. And I honestly believe that I noticed a 100 percent turnaround when the issue started to become the draft. I think a lot of young people just got scared, they were misinformed.

Well, when it became a big part of the debate, the president was mentioning it in the presidential debates, I think a lot of support eroded with that and I don't think that's a permanent erosion. I think, since there is no draft, since no one is being drafted, I think young people are not going to say, well, I'm a Democrat--
MS. SINDERBRAND: Let me, I'm sorry but just on the issues, the question of moral values was one of the number one issues, and you look at the polling on specific issues like gay marriage, where young people are markedly more progressive, more liberal in their views than their parents are, and I'm curious to what extent either of you think that that played into the result?

MR. SEKULOW: Well we had to look at that, that goes back to my question. We knew young people were more likely to not support the president's initiative against gay marriage and because of that, and we knew, I mean the percentages were really high. You are not going to just mass target young people, you have to really go micro target the ones who have got views like that or are more likely to be persuaded to that side or we are wasting our time as a campaign.

As a voter registration group, you're not. There is a big difference here between the two of us and I think that's the important thing to point out. I'm not against voter registration, neither is the camp, but when you are looking at it from a campaign aspect, Alex doesn't want us to go register a bunch of people in the pro life group.
MS. SINDERBRAND: In terms of those long term trends that you are talking about, I mean you are talking about when young people grow up and economic concerns come to the forefront. But looking at the long term trends, you are looking at this group coming up where their social views are very different than the generation that came before them.

MR. HOPLIN: On that issue and it depends on how active they are in that issue, how important that issue is to them. Will they weigh that against tax cuts? Will they weigh that against protecting American and global security? Will they weigh that against Social Security and will it be around for them? And so maybe that one issue is not going towards the Republican Party but I think there are other issues that are.

(Multiple people speaking)

MR. KING: I have a question that is related to something you just raised and that is knowing what kind of voter was interested in what sort of thing. We heard earlier that the voter files were hard to work with, to say the least, they may be better after HAVA is fully implemented. Could you all describe for us how you came up with student addresses, phone numbers,
the database collection on things such as church
attendance, magazine subscriptions, television viewing?

We know that you all had sophisticated models to try
and predict the likelihood of different kinds of votes
and activities, how were those gathered? Who did them?

And what did you do with them?

MS. ACKER: Do you want to start?

MR. SEKULOW: Sure. We did it a few different
ways. Much like our church directory program, which
was very controversial, we had college students collect
their directories. I'm sure any student at Harvard can
probably get a full directory, or at least the school
they are in, and all the people's, now it might not
have the right phone number, it might have a dorm room,
but it at least gives us their e-mail and it at least
lets us know where we are. Then we can voter vault
names, and things like that and check --.

Micro targeting, which is very, very expensive
and pretty new on campaigns, which we used in only a
few states, lets you know hundreds of things about a
person whether they are a college student or not. I'm
talking what magazine subscribe to, if they go to
church regularly, what car they drive, all of these,
but the list is gigantic of how you can sort it, so--
MR. KING: Walk through how you got that data and how you used it.

MR. SEKULOW: It's a corporation that has it, it's the same that you do with direct mail.

MS. GREENE: It's from a variety of sources.

MR. SEKULOW: I mean you can get it. It's like if you were a credit card company and wanted to send out your credit card to targeted folks.

MS. ACKER: That's one of the lessons that we've taken from the campaign. We've actually just partnered with Info USA, which is the largest direct mail company, to look at how we can micro target young people, and match them up to the voter file and pull those ones out that are not registered to vote. Thanks to the great work that the Republicans did with it, we want to follow in their shoes.

MR. SEKULOW: You've got to be very well funded. It would be very hard for even a statewide campaign to do it in their state.

MS. ACKER: I would say too just the differences in state voter files alone is a huge obstacle to any kind of national campaign in that the Wisconsin voter file is nonexistent versus some state that have state of the art, enhanced voter files that
go down to things like magazine subscriptions. Ours was very much state by state, our state parties would determine what kind of information they would add into the voter file and then our young activists, including young activist and campus activists would then enhance that data with whatever names they were able to get by going door to door in dorms, doing voter registration drives on campuses, etcetera. I would say it was probably very similar, except I think that we probably left a lot more up to the state discretion.

MR. KING: What should we expect in the near future in terms of voter ID? How are you going to use these databases? What's going to surprise us?

MS. ACKER: I mean voter file technology is a newfound passion of mine, simply because I've realized how important it is, and I think that you're finding more and more innovative technologies. And this was the really the first year that the Democratic Party used voter file enhancement data from the private sector to be able to help us target voters more effectively. I would say that the advent of being able to collect cell phone numbers, and e-mail addresses and include that in voter files is huge, especially for this demographic.
MR. SEKULOW: Well if you are talking about youth, a phone number, unless it's a cell phone number, it isn't going to last six months.

MS. FLEMING: And the voter file is an issue for young people because even with the 527s that we are working in, because we bought into the America Votes table which gave us access to the big voter file, but young people get cut off of all these voter files, and so it was significantly harder for us to really talk to young people at their doors or to append our nontraditional contacts that we got at clubs, and bars and coffee shops back to the big voter file that everybody was using because they thought that that would somehow make the data non-credible.

And so young people, once again, faced this barrier of we got their cell phone, we got their e-mail, we got their new address, but we can't put them back onto the voter file because of this system that's in place.

MR. FOURNIER: There is no way to fix that system?

MS. FLEMING: Not during the election cycle there wasn't, and so we actually had to, Ryan knows this firsthand we had to create this whole separate
voter file system, outside of what we paid for when
what we thought we were going to be able to use this
sophisticated voter file system, so it's something that
we are working with other progressive--

MR. FERGUSON: Part of it is it changes. I
mean you almost have to start anew in four years
because I don't have the same e-mail address, I don't
have a .edu anymore. I'm done with that part of my
life and we know that, and so you are going to see,
that's why you are never going to see, in general, the
Republicans just go out and just register anyone, we
are going to figure out where we are going to register
people that more likely are going to vote for us. I
mean yes you want people to vote but you are not going
to just go out there and be blind to your mission, your
mission is to get the people that are going to vote for
you to vote for you.

And so that's why I think you see what Jordan
and I were talking about. We went where we knew the
people we could get would vote for us, we are not going
to go register, in a sense, the enemy, we are going to
make sure we are going forward and not just we are
going to register everyone we can.

MS. ACKER: And conversely, we asked our campus
activists to look at past voting behavior on their
campus and if their campus voted 60 percent or more for
a Democratic candidate, we encouraged them to do what's
called a blind poll where you essentially go door to
door in your dorm and encourage everyone to vote.

MR. FOURNIER: I'm just wondering if your guys,
if the Republican advantage in this election was your
ability to micro target and like you say, find the
people who would vote for you or who are more likely
to. If because those people are harder to collect this
data on, if that's one of the disadvantages you had and
if so, how do you improve that next time?

MR. FERGUSON: I think one of the things you
can look at, as far as campaign is part of it, when we
were in New York, is the question came up why has
President Bush not done MTV? The first candidate in
history not to do it. Well, the bottom line is, from
my opinion, after the fact, is why would I want him to
do that? Because two reasons, one, that's not his
constituency overall; two, we thought we tapped into
the people that would be watching MTV that would vote
for us; and three, it gives some legitimacy to the
whole issue of the non-partisan, which we really didn't
think was that non-partisan. I mean whether you
disagree with it or not, I think that's how we felt. That's the micro targeting--

MR. FOURNIER: Is it hard to microtarget this?

MR. FERGUSON: It is. In what we do, our micro targeting for youth is different than the micro targeting for a 40 year old. What we do is we micro target a group. Evangelical students, you go right to all those groups in a big school, in a state school with 30,000--

MR. FOURNIER: But you don't micro target the youth vote?

MR. FOURNIER: Well it's very difficult because--

MS. SINDERBRAND: --targeting evangelicals or as evangelical students, is there a specific way that you target these groups, if there are young people, as opposed to--

MR. SEKULOW: Well you can go into the clubs--

MR. FOURNIER: Do you view them any differently? Is there a way to micro target--

MS. SINDERBRAND: Yeah, differently?

MR. SEKULOW: Well, right now, you can't because of the voter file problem, they are moving too much.
MS. FLEMING: You can, it's just more complicated, right?

MS. SINDERBRAND: So you are basically getting them through their parents' church?

MR. SEKULOW: No, on their campus--

MS. SINDERBRAND: --student council groups--

MR. SEKULOW: There are Christian clubs at like a state university with 4,000 students with 4,000 people on their e-mail list--

MS. FLEMING: We're not talking about non-college young people, we are talking about young people who are working class folks who may not have gone to college or who are out of college, so--

MR. SEKULOW: Well I was just talking about once instance that--

MR. FOURNIER: So you are saying even when you had them, it was harder to target them because you couldn't append them to the--

MS. FLEMING: Right, and then when you are talking about developing walk lists and all this stuff for a field campaign, it was--

MR. FOURNIER: So where do we go from here? How do this look four years from now?

MR. FERGUSON: Well, one, I think that I know,
for us, we realized we've kind of figured out how we
are work college campuses, now it's figuring out how
you are going to work young people that aren't in
college. I still think that's a major thing for, I
mean for both parties.

MR. SEKULOW: We've got, people talk about
NASCAR dads, what about the NASCAR 20 year old? I
like NASCAR too and I went to college but it doesn't
matter, there is a large, very large voting segment out
there, that doesn't go to college, that is maybe still
not voting and I think both sides kind of have them up
for grabs. They are different depending if you are
urban, or rural or what state you are in and I think
that's a new area for us because, again, I get back to
the college students in a lot of these battlegrounds,
minus a few schools, you kind of know how people are
going to go.

MR. FRISHBERG: It seems to me the whole debate
to me is like the Al Gore's stump speech things, like
what's up is down and what's down should be up. Because
the Republicans have, for a long time now, won
elections, not a long but a relatively long time, won
elections through a new voter model, a 72 hour project
going out and engaging in registration, which is not
micro targeted. You could say it's how they live targeted, so you go to places but you are not doing it from the voter file, and but you've been using a new voter model.

Democrats come late to the game in 2004 and go we've got to do that to win and they did it successfully with youth, Republicans did it successfully with every other part of the population and now you are kind of switching around. I mean in terms of Jane saying Democrats aren't going to be able to keep pulling this off and you're kind of going, well, maybe we will, maybe we won't.

But the micro targeting debate, I think, is a really dangerous one for young people because it cuts totally against the new voter model and the Democrats are going you've got to reach out and do a 50 state strategy, you have to go out there and find these people and talk to them, and that's not something you do from the voter file.

And the voter file and micro targeting I think for a long time will be problematic for young people and that the success of this election was that kind of the old model for how you target in campaigns, which is if they never or rarely vote, you never ever talk to
them and reach out to them, that the success for Democrats, for young people, was that they abandoned this. And I think a lot of this has to do with getting out beyond the micro targeting thing and really talking to people who, you know, you've got to engage them and win them over. And most young people, as David is pointing out, early on in their life, are not predisposed to being one way or another. There are people at this table who had--

MR. FOURNIER: When I'm saying micro targeting, I'm not talking about just going after certain voters because you get the channels, new channels to go after to the voters who you think you can touch.

MR. FRISHBERG: Maybe it goes to the definition of micro targeting but that's maybe just those--

MR. FOURNIER: I'm not saying--

MR. FRISHBERG: --worth pointing out is how they lived then.

MR. FRIEDRICH: My question was on an outreach to Hispanic and Latino voters, I wanted to hear both sides talk about that. It seems like one of the few groups that you buck the trend of young people who move to the left to a degree and they seem not to, and clearly you can get into micro aspects of this,
Catholic Hispanic males, etcetera. But in general, one of Ron's points earlier, that is a booming population, that is a big part of the future in politics, just like this generation is, and their first vote matters a lot. So this aspect of it I think is really interesting and I would like to hear people's thoughts on that.

MS. ACKER: We were not able to do as much overlapping with our Hispanic outreach program as I would have like, we faced a barrier in resources, to be frank, in being able to produce a lot of our young voter materials in Spanish. It was the wheels were turning and then, at the end of the day, the money wasn't there, which was very disappointing to me. But I am curious about the Hispanic numbers, I would like to know in what areas, I'm just interested in what areas those were in, I would be curious to know of those were also areas where there were high voter suppression tactics against Hispanics as well. But in general, our--

MR. SEKULOW: No comment, I mean this --.

MS. ACKER: In general, our Hispanic outreach program, like a lot of our youth program, was run through surrogates, and we just had an advantage in having a lot of young Hispanic celebrities and young
Hispanic members of Congress, like the Sanchez sisters, who went out and did surrogate programs for us.

MR. FOURNIER: Did the Republicans do something more novel than that?

MR. SEKULOW: We did. What we did, and this is the interesting thing about it in the way, I saw next to our Hispanic outreach director for a lot of the campaign, before we kept getting moved around inside the building, and we did it two ways and one is if they are a college student, which kind of fell under me, we would outreach through that way, we would have Hispanic outreach tiers in some campuses with large Hispanic populations, so we did try to micro target. They also found with the Catholic, we would have Catholic outreach folks in places that had high Catholic populations on their college campus.

But then again, the Hispanic community as well, we did better it, and I think that that's a strong family unit there, so they have very strong family bonds, it's known for that. So if your parents are moving one way, I think that's another group too that might move that way as well, especially with the Catholic vote, it's kind of over-arching.

MR. HOPLIN: We spent a long time on it as
well. We have a national program called My Party, Manny Espinoza is my national first vice chairman and leads that. We had several of our 60 field staff members were Hispanic and parts of the website are in Spanish, we had a lot of our recruiting materials in Spanish.

But more than the Hispanics, we really spent a lot of time focusing on women. Half of my field staff, of the 60, were females because we wanted them to know that this is not the party of rich, old white guys and that they have a place at the table, we want them to be involved.

And when I started this just a few years ago, we had one state leader that was female and now we have about a third of our state leaders are female because I think we've done a good job reaching out to them, and we are going to continue to push both Hispanics, African American outreach and women.

MS. SNOW: Can I switch a, just slightly switch topic? Meighan, we haven't heard from you and I'm really curious, you are with Move One, right? Or you were with Move On?

MS. DAVIS: Yeah.

MS. SNOW: 2008, as you look ahead, I mean
somebody called it a perfect storm this past year.

There were issues that young people cared about, there
were candidates that they obviously cared about, a lot
of them cared about Kerry. If you look to 2008 and
it's an open field, do you think we are going to have
the same sense of excitement, or is it going to be an
uphill battle for the parties, or for Move On or a
group like it to get people as involved, if we don't
have the same perfect storm?

MS. DAVIS: Well I can say, well, first off,
our program was not part of the Move On PAC program
where we had 500 field staff. But one thing that Move
On is doing now for 2008 that I hope the DNC does in
and the party learns is they are trying to create that
permanent field and they are going to be hiring more
people to be out in the field talking with the voters
and setting up the precinct captains and the
neighborhood captains right now and continue that
through the next presidential.

So, hopefully, in terms of the youth vote,
garnering that excitement, the one thing it's, it's
great that we are on this panel, and we are learning so
much and our side won, but we're battling for money
right now to stay alive so that we are not doing this
every for years and that we are not being, it's great
that we did all this work in '04, like peace, we'll see
you in '08--

Laughter)

MS. DAVIS: We're not--

MS. SNOW: Well that's what I'm wondering, how
do you sustain the excitement?

MR. FERGUSON: It's hard because your voter
block changes, the people that are going to be
possibilities are 14, 15, 16, 17 now. How do you even
know what a 14 year old is going to care about in 2008?
Or a 15 year old or a 16, you just don't know. And
the thing is I think why people were so secure with
money is because it was a perfect storm. I mean how
much more intense could it get than this election to
get young people involved?

And the bottom line was it wasn't a massive
turnout, so if I'm a guy that has politically, you
know, whatever, and I'm looking where I'm going to give
my money, am I going to give my money to a huge
question mark, basing it 14, 15, 16, 17 year olds? No.
And I think that's a problem all of us are going to
have is, yeah, we have some legitimacy now but can I
get big bucks? I don't know.
MS. WALKER: I have a question and I have a comment and let me just say that, Ben, this is directed at you. Let me just say I had no dog in this fight, I didn't care who won, the project we ran didn't care who won and I think anybody that worked on it will tell you that we never once had a partisan conversation.

I find it though highly problematic that you wouldn't want the president to go on MVT, not a) because you are assuming that MTV viewers don't care what the president has to say; but b) I think it's, I mean MTV is as close as we get to having a national platform to talk to young people and it seems really important for the legitimacy of young people but also just for the legitimacy of American politics that the president is speaking directly to young people. And so I just make that editorial--

MR. FERGUSON: I'm glad you made that comment because, and that's my own personal, first, I was going, why isn't he? But then, when I think about it, I mean the bottom line was when I looked at the coverage from MTV and I look at the people that were out there, by and large they were not for us. And when I see that, I think the president said I'll make my own agenda, I am the president and I'm going to talk to
them directly, and he'll send young people people to
talk to them directly and that's what we did because if
you went there, did it help? No. So if he talks to
them directly, then at least he gets all of his side
out there and he doesn't have to worry about, I mean
dealing with things like--

MR. FOURNIER: What's more direct that him
talking on MTV in front of a group of kids than talking
to them? How was what you did--

MS. GREENE: --the most amount of young people
in this country than to use MTV?

MS. FLEMING: Republican kids watch MTV, I mean

Republican kids watch MTV.

MS. ACKER: The campaign cared enough to send
John McCain as a surrogate but didn't send the

president.

MS. WALKER: Can I actually ask my substantive
question which is what are the three things that you
would need, whether it's information, whether it's
research, whether it's analysis, whether it is, I know
you are going to say dollars, so let's take dollars of
the table, but what are the three things that you guys
would need in order to make the case in 2006 and 2008
to your bosses that it's worth spending real dollars to
register and mobilize young people?

MR. SEKULOW: You know what I think would be a really cool thing for you all to do and I think you should, like places like Virginia where there is going to be a lot of attention coming up soon, is do some research into it, see what the young people are and then show the two campaigns this is how many people you have, this is who has kind of decided, this is who has not. And that's a good way, you've got to start small, you can't go right to the national level. It all starts, people that worked our campaigns worked on another campaign before, so they just see it work on a small level. 72 Hour, I worked on in its first year, was done in only ten states, now it's done in every state, and the RNC does have a 50 state program, the Bush Campaign was different.

MR. FOURNIER: What's the answer to--

What is the argument you would make?

MR. SEKULOW: That I think the groups here, the non-partisan research groups should do some research into just some local statewide races, get them to those campaigns and then really show the campaigns, make a presentation --.

(Whereupon, at 4:00 p.m., there was a short recess due to a
(4:22 p.m.)

MR. KING: So the dirty tricks campaign was effective, I'm not sure which party did it but congratulations, it was well timed. And we'll spend another five minutes or so on partisan aspects, turn to Rebecca or to Kate?

MS. SNOW: I would love to ask the same question that I asked of the non-partisans. Don't think I'm cynical but I would love to ask the failure question, the what did you do, and we sort of touched on some things, but what failed? What didn't work? Just in the interest of honest disclosure here.

MS. ACKER: I would just say, as kind of part of the larger Democratic Party/campaign organizing structure, it was very disconnected. It was very hard for us to be able to know what actually was going on on the ground in the state unless we were there or unless we had a very involved campaign person on the ground there. And similarly, the funding was so disconnected that I still can't get actual hard numbers on how much money was spent on youth organizing in various states, I can't find out how much money was spent on ad buys in various states. So I think that's more a nature of how
the campaign as a whole was run and we just consequently suffered from it as well.

MR. SEKULOW: We did two things, the RNC implemented, and I think it started off working well, it was just a big thing, we hired College Republican field staff and it did a really good job. I think if we would have hired them earlier, we would have had a lot more help, that we hired them a couple of months before, and Hugh was part of that program and we all helped out and tried to find the right people, but we didn't have the resources to hire the folks until a couple of months before the election, so our best people were already in school, you know, you lose your scholarship if you try to, but that's one thing.

The other thing is I think we could have spent more resources on the youth vote in general and I think looking back now, looking at the poll, looking at the numbers and the youth vote, it would have been great to do that. I don't know if the money was there that time, I wasn't at that level in the campaign, so I couldn't make that call but, from my personal experience and the same kind of things. Once you build a big organization, it can be very hard to keep everything on track because everyone is in different
states, and there is hundreds of people an point staff
and I mean it's the same kinds of things at every
campaign, but technology is getting better and I think
that's going to help a lot.

MS. ACKER: I would also echo that I wish we
had started earlier, and something that I think I
touched on with the Hispanic outreach question was just
extended outreach in general, just based on resources,
we had to narrow who we targeted and we targeted campus
students overwhelmingly more than non-student youth and
I wish we had more time and resources to be able to
reach out to non-student youth. We targeted young
African Americans and young women.

MS. SNOW: You both need to make sure that a
transcript of this is available to your successor,
since you are both leaving the position.

MS. ACKER: And to our current party chairman.

MS. DAVIS: Well I mean we had $300,000, I mean
we weren't like that day at Move On, with millions and
millions of dollars, and we had three 23 year olds who
had laptops. So I think we accomplished a lot in terms
of what we did, we vetted out 50,000 volunteers to ACT,
we sent 10,000 of our campus volunteers to the Young
Voter Alliance and to 21st Century Democrats. But the
biggest problem for us was we did get that late start, we didn't launch until like the second week of September so we only had about two weeks, in terms of deadlines for voter registration, to get that happening and for folks to sort of implement this Tammy Baldwin model where they were doing the dorm storms and the vote mobs.

But I think one thing a lot of groups we're trying to build this year, that didn't quite happen, was this political friendster, everybody was spending like $50,000 to $100,000 to build that technology. We had this vote multiplier where people could load up their face book addresses, and they could load up their Outlook addresses and then send them an instant message, send them a flash movie and an issue card, reminder e-mail on the day of and also a text message.

And out of the 250,000 people on our list that we worked with, we only had about 4,000 unique users who only uploaded about 40,000 e-mail addresses and only sent about 7,000 of those persuasion cards, so that was a huge loss for us in terms of our budget.

MS. FLEMING: But what people did download on your website were the organizing documents.

MS. DAVIS: Yeah, that goes back to we spend
our time creating tool kits because all we did, we
didn't have folks out in the field, all we had was our
partners, so we wanted to engage the self-organizers,
the folks out in Omaha, Nebraska, who weren't being
talked to by anybody, and get them the tools that they
needed to run their own campaign.

And then also one thing that we saw, in terms
of student organizing, was there weren't a whole lot of
resources. Like you might find an organizing manual
but where are you going to find that poster that you
can download instead of sending a dollar into the Kerry
Campaign to get a bunch?

So we uploaded just posters that people could
print off from their computer in the dorm room and then
plaster their campus, and we used all of those sort of
really just old hat things that we should have done
effectively.

MR. FERGUSON: And I don't know if it's so much
what didn't work, it was more of not having enough time
to do what did work better, do more of that, and I
think part of it is, what I hope doesn't happen in four
years, is the people on both sides that were involved
with the youth side had gumption. I mean we were at it
one, and that's one reason why I can respect some
people in the other campaign is because we both believed
in what we were doing so much that I hope it doesn't
become a career, where you have people that are a lot
older that try to say okay, I can bank some serious
cash on this, and I'm going to run this organization
and I'm going to act like I know. Because I'm probably
not going to know in four years what young people care
about near as much as I do now because I am young. And
so I hope that you see that young people keep it going
and instead of having a 45 year old pollster come in
and try to start it all, which is what I'm afraid might
happen in four years from now.

MS. FLEMING: For us, the voter file was a big
lesson for us, it's something that we are continuing to
work on, making sure that that technology that we have
is going to be useful and that we are able to print
walk lists in time, rather than spending a lot of
resources and time on creating walk lists by hand and
things like that.

And then the other thing, I think, is training
our canvassers better. We thought we did a good job
but when we spot checked and things like that, and the
nature of the new voter model that we created during
the election cycle, I think that we have to do a better
job at training our canvassers with issues and things
like that.

MS. GREENE: One of the things that we had
hoped for was that the partisan organizations were
going to purchase our list at a higher rate than they
did. I think the Republican side, again, those
hundreds of thousands of young Republicans that we
registered should have been contacted by the campaigns,
and that list was not purchased. I'm not really clear
on the details with Democrats, how they used the list,
but I think that it could have been done more
effectively for Democrats.

When we first sat down with both of the
campaigns, there was a big openness or more of an
openness from the Bush Campaign than I would say we
initially received from the Kerry Campaign. The way I
describe it is that the Kerry Campaign went from
rolling their eyes --. Not to point anyone out but
Steve Elmandore sat in a meeting with me, Alex, I think
you were there, and rolled his eyes and had nothing
really that he wanted to say or hear about what we were
doing. And then a few weeks out from the election,
it's not rolling your eyes, your depending on the youth
vote and so I do think that Democrats really came to it
late.

There was a shift I think Jordan mentioned that happened within the Bush Campaign where they may have been more open than less, as they got closer to--

MS. SNOW: He was rolling his eyes because he just didn't believe, because of all the things we talked about earlier in terms of people not showing up to vote?

MS. GREENE: It was one of probably the most like offensive meetings I've had in a long time, where it was very clear that he did not believe or have any interest in what numbers we were showing him, what our effort was going to be for that cycle. And then it completely changed, all the way to how Senator Kerry responded to Rock the Vote weeks before the election. I think they came really late to the--

MR. FOURNIER: He was a political director on the Kerry Campaign the, right?

MS. GREENE: Yes.

MR. FOURNIER: When was this meeting?

MS. GREENE: Alex, do you remember when that was?

MS. ACKER: I believe it was like right when we started.
MS. GREENE: It was definitely pre-summer.

MR. FOURNIER: Who did you meet with on the Bush Campaign?

MS. GREENE: We were dealing with Jordan and--

MR. SEKULOW: There was a whole, there was a big meeting, I think it was--

MS. GREENE: I was not in that meeting so it was our deputy political--

MR. SEKULOW: And we were very open, I mean early on, and it wasn't, I don't want to keep saying this about Rock the Vote, I think Rock the Vote, I mean I went to a Rock the Vote thing once when I was 14 outside the Republican National Committee, so I've seen it since I've been growing up in politics. But with the campaign, we don't make all decisions here.

MS. ACKER: Right. Oh, no, we don't.

MR. SEKULOW: Or where the money is spent, so we had to deal with what's done and when they say okay, I just think they've gone over the line--

MR. FOURNIER: I have a 15 year old daughter, is there a technology to start touching her now?

MS. ACKER: Instant Messenger.

MR. FOURNIER: And why isn't anybody doing it?

MS. ACKER: They are.
1 MR. FOURNIER: Who is doing it now?
2 MS. DAVIS: Well we used it but the problem
3 that we had with Instant Messenger was the fact we had,
4 and we all, I was amazed to hear about what Rock the
5 Vote did with text messaging because it was really
6 hard for us because we had to know if it was a Sprint
7 phone or an AT&T phone and what the folks, what company
8 they were with.
9 But in terms of text messaging, they hadn't
10 figured out yet how we could just load up all their
11 screen names and just mass IM them, so all of our
12 people had to like individually do that and it didn't
13 quite work out, but it seems like that technology is
14 being developed more so that we can just upload all of
15 those screen names.
16 MS. GREENE: --having Cingular Wireless--
17 MS. DAVIS: Yeah, that was an amazing deal.
18 MS. GREENE: --do the back end.
19 MR. FOURNIER: I wonder what party you are
20 going through.
21 MS. FLEMING: We are actually working with a
22 company that has the back end figured out, that they've
23 developed this technology for Third World countries and
24 we'll be testing in Virginia.
MS. ACKER: But college Democrats also collect Instant Messenger names and use that as a regular communication method, and we had a downloadable carrier, an end carrier Edwards IM icon, but I still don't know how you do it, but somehow you download it and it pops up when you send the message.

MS. SNOW: But Ron is asking about now, right? You're not asking about--

MR. FOURNIER: Yeah, who is touching my daughter right now with the voting--

MS. SNOW: Right, who is doing it now? Because she is going to vote in four years.

MS. GREENE: I think it's that--

MR. FOURNIER: And who would know how to get her--

(Multiple people speaking)

MS. FLEMING: --MTV's new issue platform is how they are shifting from just focusing on one issue in the off years, but that is definitely for a 15 year old.

MR. FOURNIER: I wonder why the parties don't?

(Multiple people speaking)

MS. FLEMING: That's an excellent question, and why aren't we? It's a shame that parties do not have
programs in high schools and in middle schools where we go in together and teach young people about what the party is, and the history of the party and what the party stands for. It's a shame that we don't do that.

MR. FRISHBERG: The main thing, we are asking the wrong people though because it's not campaign operations who do this stuff, it's elected officials, and that I think goes back to the point the president is out there talking about young people and Social Security, there has been a lot more attention paid to Pell Grants and to higher education issues. I mean we were--

MR. FOURNIER: Howard Dean has the technology and the know how to do this as well, and he is the head of teh party?

MR. SEKULOW: I think there might be a question to have a reminder. I mean have you contact, you know, if I instant message a 15 year old girl, that could come out as very bizarre, even it's about political. I'm being stalked. That's the truth, and that's what we are talking about here, so--

(Laughter)

MR. SEKULOW: --and if I call your house and say is your daughter there?
MR. FOURNIER: Are there ways that you can do that?

MS. FLEMING: We do have Young Democrat chapters on high schools and so we often have young people in high school, and even in middle schools, to contact us, and ask us how to start a chapter and--

MS. ACKER: I think what Jordan was getting at was that it has to be opt in.

MS. SNOW: The bottom line is is it because there is no money or is it because there is no infrastructure, no technology--

MS. ACKER: No money, no infrastructure, I would say.

MS. FLEMING: I would not say the interest, I would say that it's a combination of those three things.

MR. FERGUSON: And part of it is money, there isn't a whole lot of money right now.

MS. GREENE: On the right, there is $39 million spent a year in youth leadership development. That maybe is not coming from the groups that are represented right now and I know on the left. This is from a study that people from the American Way did and PFAL has just launched a left effort to try to combat
that so, again, but maybe just a different set of people who are doing that right now.

MR. KING: I think Melanie had the answer a little earlier when she was talking about the importance of community service and the prohibition in almost every jurisdiction, 14,000 school boards in America have decided that anything political smacks of politics and you can't count that towards community service. If that changes, that will make a difference and young people will be, people will be investing their time in trying to get young people involved. If colleges start to ask on their applications, so, what have you done in terms of politics lately? That will make a difference.

MS. CAMPBELL: Just to piggyback, that's one of the things that the Carnegie has been supporting and some of us have been trying to work through that, the civics in schools, the whole trying to make that from being an academic conversation to being more of a movement and getting how you impact it, that's one, but still that's policy. Policy decisions impact why your daughter isn't being touched.

The other side too is on the community side. For us, we had a project we started almost the same
time we started with Black Youth Vote, called Black Youth Vote Kids. And so when we had our conference two weeks ago, a 16 year old, who was a nine year old at the time when we started in Georgia, were working on environmental issues that were in the community, environmental pollution and things like that.

So here this 16 year old, as I briefly mentioned to Ivan, challenged the congressperson the first time we took the kids on the Hill. We actually added a high school track because you're going to have to get young people to these folks sooner, for the various reasons that we talked about. because you're not getting it in school, and if we want someone from various ages around this table, and so you ask yourself the question, well, what made me get involved? Was it when I was in school that it touched me? When I was in high school, did we have, what are the things that are going on? So, for the young people who are coming up, who aren't of voting age, this 16 year old could ---.

She challenged these congress folks and when he came up behind her, he had to address what she said, not the 18 year olds who had voted. This young person, who he knew, who says that she's tired of hearing speeches, she's tired of hearing about marches, she
wanted to know what you're going to do about my issues, in a polite way but very, very, very powerful, and that same 16 year old has been all over the world focusing on, so there are ways but it's going to have to also come from the community aspect.

I beat up on the partisans all the time but they are in the business of winning elections and I don't know that that's going to change.

(Multiple people speaking)

MR. SEKULOW: We have two groups within the Republican party were recognized, the teenage Republicans, which is a group of high school teenage groups and they are very active. In some of these battleground states alone, they volunteered just as much, they can still drive, so they can get to headquarters and they can get out there. If you are a teenage Republican at 16, it's a pretty good, you can guess how they are going to vote 20 years later, unless there is some major shift with the party.

So there are groups out there, the home school community is a very new community for the Republican Party, volunteer-drive, community-driven, activist-driven, so there is lots of new things. I think the more technology we have, the better.
MS. ACKER: There was a Kids for Kerry program but we didn't have the resources to get them any money, it was organic.

MS. MCGILL: One other thing is I was approached by both sides, post election, in trying to understand really the market aspect, how do you market to young kids? And I think that that's something to me that shows a lot of interest, like there may not be the kinds of resources dedicated to the more traditional connecting to young people in the way that we are trying to prime the 15 to 18 year olds but there definitely has been a lot of interest on both sides of like how do you, this is the most marketed to generation, and so how do you get to them in that way?

MR. KING: The other thing, a couple of things we've been thinking about at the IOP, and this is, we all ought to care about the next generation. You have a 15 year old, I have a 14 year old, and a 13 year old, and a 12 year old, and a 9 year old and an 8 year old and--

MR. FOURNIER: And the fact that they'll all be voting is depressing.

MR. KING: Well they all voted last time, I don't see any problem with that.
MR. KING: We'd like the schools to care more about politics and not in a partisan way, by the way, just what are the facts and are you empowered? It's shocking, disturbing that the number of school-based organizations with internal student governments has been declining over 30 years, not going up, not kind of staying flat, but declining, and declining most rapidly in poor communities. It's disturbing that parents are less and less likely to vote because those are the GenXers, and some baby boomers who are still having kids and they weren't all that big on voting in the first place.

So we would like to see, for example, maybe questions about politics on the SAT, kids are taught about the SAT all the time. If we add just a few questions, and it's going to make a difference between having an 800 or a 720, about politics, we think the schools are going to pay more attention, but there are all kinds of innovative things old school, like the SAT, or new school, like Instant Messenging my daughters, that you all have to work at.

MS. FLEMING: We hope that politics is seen as
a vehicle for social change, once again, so hopefully when your daughter is growing up, that's the case.

MR. KING: My job now is to briefly describe a little bit more of the survey. I know you heard from John Della Volpe earlier on the survey, I'm going to describe a little bit about this young generation and how they view politics, mainly around the concept of political ideology. I'll give a little bit of a political science lesson on the final payoff slides, near then end, and that's where I show you what we think the political ideology actually looks like. So the outline is a description of this young generation, will touch very lightly on youth and political participation, then talk about the new political ideology.

The first thing I want you to be aware of is that these young folks are personally responsible and more spiritual than my generation ever could imagine being. High school kids today are going to church at the highest rate that we've seen since the mid 1950s, high school children today are more likely to be attending churches than their parents are to be attending churches and it's the first time we've ever seen that since the data was starting to be collected
in 1938. They are a spiritual generation, they also, by the way, are far less sexually promiscuous than my generation was, certainly than Ron's generation was. The teenage pregnancy rates have been dropping, it's the lowest they've been in 27 years. The percentage of 13 to 15 year old females and males who say that they've had sexual intercourse from 1995 to 2003, not that entire period but the drop over that entire period, has gone down by about a third. So different kinds of behaviors among the youngest, they are more likely to be attending churches, they are more optimistic, they are more personally responsible.

There are several ways of thinking about this generation. They've been called the Bridger Generation or the Generation 2K, Generation Next, and the most common name, of course, the Millennials. It's no surprise that these books are all about religion and trying to reach the young people, the churches have been especially good about reaching out to young people and it's not just the Christian right or the evangelical churches, or however you want to define it, are pretty good at reaching out to young people, so are the Catholic Church, especially with young Hispanics, it's been very successful in terms of
church attendance in the last four years.

Millenials, this group tend to be socially liberal on many dimensions. We heard earlier, oh, well maybe we ought to shy away from this concept of gay marriage when we are talking just to young folks.

That is true, although for those who believe that gay marriage is morally wrong, it's particularly intensely held, they tend to reject liberal and conservative labels, maybe because they are not entirely sure what those labels mean in the first place. So to call a young person a social liberal, those are fighting terms. Social conservative, oh, those are fighting, even though they may not know entirely what those labels mean, although they tend to be more socially liberal.

They are fiscally conservative, this is surprising. We found, in our survey, recently, that they do support private accounts. Our survey of course does not look like Jehmu's survey but it's, well we have, who knows why. They tend to support private accounts more than older people tend to support private accounts. They are also, high school and college students today are saving at a higher rate than high school and college students 10, 15 and 20 years ago.
Now this is surprising because you would think that all
the money is going into I-Pods.

(Laughter)

MR. KING: But it's not. They don't plan and
don't expect that Social Security is going to be there
in the long run and they are saving more for their
future, so socially liberal, fiscally conservative and
they are also, as I mentioned earlier, personally
responsible.

Now I mentioned that we talked very, very
briefly about political participation, these are, just
of college students, the attitudinal barriers, which
are one major barrier in terms of getting yourself
involved in politics have been changing, so these are
the questions that were asked of a national random
sample of college students.

You see that we have two in 2001, just before
and after 9/11. You see that politics is more relevant
to people's lives, just before the election 2004, than
it has been in the past, even right after 9/11.

Elected officials seem to be motivated by
selfish reasons, this is a very large decline from 74
percent agreeing to 58 agreeing in a four year period.

And finally, we know from the community service
literature that young people are involved in community service, to a large extent, because they believe that they can make a difference right here and now, the results are right there are your fingertips and political involvement rarely has to any tangible results. Well 51 percent agreed with that in 2000 and only 26 percent now. That's a very dramatic decline by any polling standard.

So these attitudinal barriers to participation declined and we know, thanks to the folks on both sides of this table, that the structural barriers were also much better this time, we saw a much higher turnout, as you know, a higher turnout among 18 to 29 year olds than 65 and older, so congratulations. So they are engaged and they are participating, but what do we make of their political ideology? They tend to defy the traditional labels and we are going to argue that attitudes towards social and moral issues are defining this generation.

So a little history lesson here now, the political science part of this, David Nickerson, professor at Notre Dame, hop in at any moment now.

What is ideology? Well ideology, as a separate field of study, really began in 1964, although ideology
existed before this. This is with an important article called "The Structure of Belief Systems in the Mass Public", a belief system is a way that the constellations of ideas constrain the choices one may make. So someone with a fairly constrained belief system would be able to have a fairly efficient way of handling new information, they would have a world view.

Someone who has a loose belief system or an unconstrained belief system would take in information, not know quite what to make of it, not have a standard way of sort of efficiently working through it. Early scholars largely imposed their own view on what ideology would mean. So they would have in their minds a left/right dimension, so liberal or conservative, and they would force things into the left/right divide. Now I don't know why that is actually moving ahead slowly on its own.

There were two types of issues that they would do, they would correlate issue to issue, so something that looked like a left leaning issue would be correlated with something else that would look like a left leaning issue, so you can see a correlation coefficient on responses, say, to do you care about whether or not negroes are going to be bussed in the
1960s? And that would correlate to questions about other social welfare issues in one time period.

Second, they would look at correlations of issues over time, so do you care or do you think that negroes should be bussed, yes or no, in time one and then time three? And you would find that lots of people would really change their mind. And so the political scientists ended up saying, you know, it's a very small sliver of the American public that has a well constrained and consistent ideological world view, and they tend to be left and they tend to be right.

Now people who have an ideologically consistent world view, important for politics, are overwhelmingly more likely to be engaged in politics, far more likely to vote, far more likely to contribute to a campaign, far more likely to tell their friends how to vote, so on and so forth. Now that helps to perpetuate, it helps to amplify the political world views of the people who have views of the left or views of the right, so moderates are far less likely to become involved in politics.

What we did this time, we started a year ago, we repeated it this time, is we asked a series of 11 questions of all college students in our sample and we
were not trying, in any way, to impose a left/right dimension. There are statistical techniques, we use one called discriminate analysis, in which the correlations among answers would tell us whether or not there was some unobserved variable out there, whether or not there was some unobserved thing out there called ideology. So the 11 questions were fairly timeless questions, these questions come up all the time in American politics.

One of them was the best way to increase economic growth and create jobs is to cut taxes, we see 11 percent disagree, strongly disagree, and so forth, and you have a lot of students sort of in the middle, neither agree nor disagree, usually because they don't particularly know.

And I'll give you another example of this here, our country's goal in trade policy should be to eliminate all barriers to trade and employment so that we can have a truly global economy. That was question 34, question 33 was the one you saw previously and we see that the correlation between those two questions is .1679. So if you agree with this at a high rate, you are also more likely to have agreed with this previous question.
So the goal is to try and ask a bunch of questions that will surround something that's unobservable, which is a person's basic ideology, without its imposing on top of it what the structure would be ahead of time. Let me show you just a few more of these correlations.

There are some of the correlations and you see a few will kind of stand out as high and positive, a few as kind of high and negative. For example, the relatively strong correlation between the desire to cut taxes to stimulate the economy and the sense that religious values should play a more important role in government. These are positively correlated at .2490.

Here we have a positive correlation on what amounts to affirmative action and the desire to have health care cover everybody as a right, also positively correlated. So this matrix of underlying correlations should be a way to tease out something along a dimension.

The discriminate analysis comes up with two dimensions and therefore, four quadrants, and we find one that is fairly easily described by the typical left/right dimension and the second one that is religious and secular. Now this is interesting because
when we did this survey as well on adults last summer, they don't fall so clearly into these dimensions, older Americans fall much more clearly into just a left and a right dimension, younger Americans you have this additional dimension of religious and secular.

So one question we need to ask ourselves is whether or not there is a cohort effect or an age effect. It could be that young people always start off as sort of liberal, and as they age and have to pay taxes and worry about their daughters being IM'd, they--

(Laughter)

MR. KING: --become a little more conservative over time, that's entirely possible, that's an age effect.

A second effect is a cohort effect and this would be when they are young, there are experiences in society that shape their world views, that shape how their belief systems are constrained, that will structure them, say, in a liberal way for a long time or in a conservative way for a very long time. Now it's generally accepted that there is a lifetime effect, as you move from liberal to conservative, over time. College campuses are often described in that
way, but we believe that there is also a strong cohort
effect, that the experiences of 9/11 have had a deep
imprint on the millennials.

The experience of growing up in a unipolar
world, a world in which there was no boogeyman, the
Soviet Union, has had a strong effect in shaping their
own self-confidence. Growing up in an environment, in
a world rich with information technology, it's very
difficult to keep anything hidden from them, has shaped
how they view access to information and individual
freedom. Growing up in a world in which it has been
accepted and expected that there would be a highly
homogeneous, I'm sorry, a highly hetero, I'm not going
to give that away yet, a highly heterogeneous
environment, meaning blacks and whites are going to be
together, Hispanics are part of, it is not the world
that I grew up in in rural Wisconsin. Young people
today expect there to be heterogeneity.

In fact, when we first tested questions and
asked about affirmative action, with college kids,
these are almost nonsense syllables. The words
affirmative action next to each other don't make a
whole lot of sense, you have to ask the question
differently because they expect that there will be
diversity and they notice the lack of it. So these are the kinds of things that would lead to a cohort effect as opposed to an age effect.

Now when we do the discriminate analysis, we do indeed find some interesting tendencies. College students are far more likely to be liberal than any other category, liberals are more likely female than male. Each one of these points, by the way, is the location of an individual respondent along these dimensions. They voted overwhelmingly for John Kerry, they are against the war, they believe that health insurance is a right, they support gay rights, they don't support private investment in Social Security and liberals were the only group that gained significantly from our numbers last year.

Now many of the folks who were sort of secular last year became more liberal. We can't actually say that because we didn't go back to the same people but the characteristics of them seem to indicate that those who were more secular last time are now more traditional liberals and that's because campaigns helped to define things, make choices very clear for voters. But 43 percent is not at all a majority and you'll notice that all of the other centroids, central
points in each of these clusters, are to the right, so
43 percent are liberal and both the secular and
religious groups, that are going to come up here in a
moment, are further to the right.

Traditional conservatives fall along the
dimension you would expect, 14 percent on college
campuses. And we have a secular center, mostly male.
The secular centers have lost some numbers, they
shifted both to the left and to the right, they voted
for Bush by a 2 to 1 margin, they were supportive of
the war in Iraq, they would tolerate further casualties
for continued progress. They also look, in many
respects, libertarian, without having gone to church.
And this very interesting group we call the religious
centrists, I'm sorry about the little-e that's cut off
here, it happens over and over again, I couldn't fix it
yet.

Half of the religious center voted for Bush and
the other half went to Kerry, this is a very
interesting group because it's the largest
concentration of minorities, Hispanics and African
Americans, about 22 percent of the folks in this, the
students in this group, the religious center, are
minorities. They are very concerned about the moral
direction of the country, they are supportive of the
role that religion plays in politics.

So this is a picture of the ideological world.

Now I want you to focus on this and think about it in
terms of parties. The least likely to vote were people
who called themselves secularists or secular centrists.
They didn't call themselves that, they ended up being
described as secular centrists by the correlations of
answers. Liberals and conservatives likely to vote.

By the way, traditional liberals, this is where a lot
of political independents are. These are not all
Democrats, these are people who say, oh, I'm an
Independent. Among conservatives, almost to a person,
they are all Republicans and the religious centrist is
the real interesting battleground.

We had this data, data that looked very much
like this, a year ago, it was clear that this was where
the battleground was going to go. It was befuddling to
all of us that the parties didn't begin speaking to
young people with more of a religious message earlier
on.

But please remember that the parties themselves
can change. If you think of the constellation of
interest groups that support the Democrat and
Republican parties now, they will be different in the future. Take, for example, 1954, if you, sorry, we'll just hope we can stop it here. Look at this as it goes along.

Take, for example, 1954, somebody who was a regular church attender in 1954, holding everything else in the models constant, was equally likely to be a Democrat or a Republican. Someone who believed in civil rights for African Americans, negroes in those questions, in 1954, holding everything else in the models constant, was more likely to be a Republican. The truth is the parties have changed, the coalitions are dynamic and young people should not accept these coalitions of the old left and the old right as stacked. The religious center and the secular center are very much up for grabs and it's up to young people, who have a different ideological cluster of beliefs than older people, to try and take on their own parties and make a difference. The parties will not necessarily change all their own, you, as voters, have to say these are the issues we care about.

This religious center group is very interesting because they are conservative, in many dimensions, yet they are very supportive of the environment over jobs.
If you have to make a tradeoff between the environment and jobs, the religious centrists say please take care of the environment. They believe in strong national health insurance much more than the secular centrists and certainly the conservatives. So as the parties change, I mean you ought to never accept the party platforms, the party ideas, as themselves, fixed.

And this is just a way to look at things, it falls large in the way you would expect. Democrats far, liberals, they are far more likely to be Democrats, conservatives far more likely to be Republicans, and the religious center is here in the center, as we would hope. So we would hope that we don't think just, among young people, about the religious right, those who are also religious, many of them are centrists. Democrat, Republican, liberal, conservative, many of them were active.

This is an interesting dimension, of course this is something you have probably seen from other surveys. People who are liberals tend to be pessimistic about just about everything in life.

(Laughter)

MR. KING: They are more likely to be pessimistic really about everything. Well do you think
you are going to be able to find a job? No, and other
groups say yes. Do you think your marriage is going to
survive? No, other groups say yes.

A message of optimism is a message that
resonates with the swing voters, the centrists who are
religious or secular, and liberals and Democrats need
to be well aware of that. These fall in ways that you
would expect.

This is also an interesting distinction on
foreign policy, part of this was whether or not we
should strike before somebody strikes at us, the role
of the United Nations and so forth. The rest of the
groups are more conservative and on gay rights, a very
sharp divide.

And I want to underscore that parties can
change and it's up to you to change them, and then I
want to say thank you and take questions.

(Applause)

MS. MCGILL: I was just going to ask a question
about the traditional, the ideology, just using your
framework, how much of it is also adding in what the
role of government should be? I mean like,
traditionally, we think of the parties as Democrats
think big government, conservatives think small
government, I mean Republicans think small government, how is that mapped into some of the work that you've done? Or is it?

MR. KING: I think that doesn't apply so much. Whether people say government should be big or it should be small, I think often it breaks down on specific issues, so state's rights looks good on some issues but not on others, but I haven't looked at the data on that question specifically so we would have to get back to you on that.

MS. MCGILL: I mean it just seems like, it just seems that maybe big government/little government is the wrong dichotomy, it's more like what's a government responsibility versus an individual responsibility? And the religious discussion around that is compromising, not compromising but it's challenging some of our traditional notions of it, so it would just be an interesting place to --.

MR. KING: Well the question of religion is so interesting because it does pack into this question of individual responsibility. Americans are rugged individualists in the sense of John Locke, we are born Lockian, we think differently than people in the rest of the world.
A set of surveys called The World Values Survey asks two dimensions of this, very interestingly, one dimension, they say, I don't have the question wording directly in front of me, so it is the role of the government or the state, depending on the country, to take care of very poor people who cannot take care of themselves.

So the percentage of respondents who agree with that, that it's the role of the government or the state to take care of very poor people, in Latvia, Lithuania, Russia, so forth, it's in the 70s. In Germany, Spain, in the 60s. In England it's a 51-52 percent. There is only one western democracy in which the answer to that is no, it's not the role of the government or the state to take care of very poor people who couldn't otherwise take care of themselves, it's the United States, and that answer is 26 percent. So half of the next closest country in The World Values Survey.

The second question was about success, success in life is pretty much determined by forces within your own control. The United States is a dramatic outlier in that way, people in the United States, this is not age specific, tend to believe that success in life is something that's determined by us, and those in non-
Lockian countries, everyone else, seems to believe that, you know, there is somebody else to blame. If I'm not getting ahead in life, I've got someone else to blame.

All of this speaks toward the desire in the U.S. to have a fairly small government, we believe in small government and as a percentage of our gross domestic product, we are a small government, our taxes are small, our social welfare spending is small and so forth. So there is a very interesting dimension to this.

Now if it's not the government that takes care of those who are poor and can't take care of themselves and if people should be taking care of themselves and be to blame if they can't get ahead, who takes care of them? Well, the churches, fraternal or sorority organizations, local communities and so forth, that's the traditional answer in the United States. We have, overwhelmingly, the largest not for profit sector in the world, nobody is even close. Our not for profit sector is about three times the size of the closest country, as a percentage of the work force, it's the percentage of money, the GDP.

So there are non-governmental institutions that
provide for this, it makes the United States a very peculiar place for the rest of the world ever to try and understand. So even Democrats who believe in "big government" are operating in an environment in which we don't really believe that government ought to be involved in our daily lives, and that is very clearly mapped into religious traditions.

We are going to have dinner too, so I want to make sure that --.

Jennifer? How many questions should I take?

Oh, okay. And anyone else wants to jump into this, you just jump in.

Yes, ma'am?

MS. ACKER: I'm wondering if liberals have historically been pessimistic or if it's a reflection of the kind of general--

MR. KING: That's a good question. Yeah, it's a good question and an easy answer.

MS. ACKER: I would guess no.

MR. KING: No, the answer is yes, they have been historically pessimistic and I don't know why.

MS. ACKER: That's very interesting to me.

MR. KING: Yeah, the national election studies, surveys, go back to, the first decent one was 1952,
they had a first, there are some surveys that go back to 1948. Democrats have just been a little bit more sour, a little bit more pessimistic about things.

MS. ACKER: That's so interesting. Any particular reason why? I mean when you think of like the candidates who ran on optimism, it's Kennedy and Clinton. Am I crazy?

MR. KING: Well that's right, Kennedy and Clinton ran on optimism and they won.

Yes, Mr. Nickerson?

MR. NICKERSON: So how much of the variance do you get by adding the second dimension? Typically, historically, the unidimensional explain 89 percent of the variance. It's slavery explained another five or six points or race during the 60s explained five or six points.

MR. KING: Well you are talking about the DW nominee scores, right?

MR. NICKERSON: Yeah, but even like NES.

MR. KING: No, it's much higher than that. With young people, it's much higher than that. I'll give you the data.

Ryan?

MR. FRIEDRICH: How much change do you think
is possible outside of a major event, like 9/11 or something, do you see within generations? I mean clearly parties change but that's because people change and generations grow old and die. How set do you think trends are within a generation by the time you are 29? This group that just voted and just established, made a statement this last election, how likely is that to actually change?

MR. KING: I think it's highly likely to change because the old socialization patterns have broken down. Before this election, I know you've heard me say this before, that if you look at children before the election in 2004, so not including parents who voted in 2004, children living at home, birth up until the age of 18, a majority of them lived in homes in which no parent present in that home had ever voted. So it's an astonishing figure, but there you go, and it's because intergenerational transfer.

One result is intergenerational transfer, party preferences and of the tendency to vote have been breaking down.

We asked students, in our most recent survey, whether or not they think that maybe they are going to vote for another party next time around, 67 percent
said, yeah, I'm open to voting for the other party.
Four years from now in the presidential? Yeah, you
bet, I'm thinking, 67 percent of those who actually
voted said yeah, I think I may vote for somebody else.
So the framework for socialization was not
particularly laid down solidly when they were 12, 13,
14, 15 years old, a lot of kids were just now
socialized as college kids or as young working adults
into this voting.

It's not necessarily the case, as Ron mentioned
eyearly, how you vote the first two times you are going
to vote the rest of your life. That was true when Ron
and I were young, it's not necessarily true anymore and
I think that the student vote, the youth vote is very
much up for grabs in 2004.

MS. ACKER: Was that question worded as are you
going to vote for a candidate of the other party or was
it worded as are you open to voting--

MR. KING: Are you open, I think it was are you
open to vote. Yes?

MR. FOURNIER: Is part of that because of a
change in all the information kids are getting now as
compared to what we did?

MR. KING: It might be that they are getting
different forms of information and it might be that
they are--

MR. FOURNIER: In particular the information
they are getting?

MR. KING: I don't know, I don't know. This is
the kind of question you have to ask David to study,
David Nickerson to actually do a survey.

I'm going to make sure all of us stop and thank
Ron, Kate and Rebecca.

(Applause)

MR. KING: And Jennifer is going to tell you
how the rest of the night works and if Jennifer is not
going to tell you how to get all the vouchers and
things paid for, that will be Christian or Laura's job.

MS. PHILLIPS: I have cab vouchers over here.
So we have cab vouchers over there, we have ??? Feel
free to stay, we have this room, stay and talk. If you
want to get on the road, you can grab some food to go
and we'll give you a voucher to the airport.

We are going to e-mail all of you, we will give
you everybody's e-mail addresses and we'll e-mail you
the reimbursement forms so that you can just put
everything together, and send it to us and we can
reimburse you for the cabs.
MR. KING: And finally, thank you to the folks that put this together, Laura, Jennifer and our students--

(Applause)

MR. KING: Particular thanks needs to go to Carrie Anderson and Kristin Blagg, who did all the rough work for getting this together and were responsible for really the whole idea generation, so thank you to them.

MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you very much.

(Applause)

(Whereupon, at 5:14 p.m., the session was adjourned.)
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