

THE MAKING OF A SENATOR:
BARACK OBAMA AND THE 2004 ILLINOIS SENATE RACE

By
John S. Jackson
Visiting Professor

An Occasional Paper
Of the Paul Simon Public Policy Institute

Southern Illinois University
Carbondale, Illinois

August, 2006

The Making of a Senator: Barack Obama

And the 2004 Illinois Senate Race

by John S. Jackson

Introduction

The 2004 U.S. Senate race in Illinois may prove to be one of the most significant in American history. Perhaps not since the Senate election of 1858, when Stephen Douglas defeated Abraham Lincoln, has one Senate election had such an impact on the national leadership cadre. Although Lincoln lost the election, his speeches and debates with Douglas over slavery and the future of the Union ensured his place as a national leader of the young Republican Party and then as a leading contender for the Republican nomination in 1860 (Goodman, 2005).

Although Barack Obama is one of one hundred Senators, and a freshman at that, he has quickly become a much sought after speaker, and his influence has spread far beyond the usual parameters for a first-term Senator. Obama is the first African-American male Senator to be elected since Edward Brooke of Massachusetts. He is the second African-American elected to the Senate from Illinois following former Senator Carol Moseley Braun, who was elected in 1992 and then defeated in 1998 (Kenney and Hartley, 2003, 203-209). With the exception of the post Civil War Reconstruction Era, Brooke, Braun, and now Obama are the only three popularly elected African-American Senators in American history.

The status of being the only African-American in the U.S. Senate alone is enough to guarantee Obama a significant platform in American politics if he chose to use it. It is clear that he has been willing to accept the challenge and tries to realize his special

opportunity for leadership. Obama became a very high-profile, national political figure at the time of his keynote address to the Democratic National Convention in Boston in late July of 2004. The speech was extraordinarily well delivered and well reviewed and it helped to catapult Obama to national prominence even before he was elected to the Senate in November.

The Senator reportedly now receives an average of 300 invitations per week for speaking opportunities. In the Senate, he is sought out for co-sponsorship of bills by colleagues on both sides of the aisle and he has made common cause with several Republican Senators on legislation that cuts across partisan boundaries. In addition, Obama is now widely mentioned as a potential presidential or vice presidential candidate for either 2008 or 2012, even though he is still a first term freshman (Zelney, 2006). The Obama phenomenon is worthy of further study and analysis by serious scholars.

This paper provides a descriptive account of the 2004 Senate campaign and an analysis of the foundation upon which Obama's victory was built. In so doing, the paper can provide some clues as to what kind of support and opposition a future Obama candidacy may face. It also has some implications for the futures of the Democratic and Republican parties in Illinois and nationally.

The 2004 Democratic Primary

We focus in this paper particularly on the demographics and geography of Obama's two races in 2004. The story properly begins with the Illinois Democratic primary held on March 16, 2004. In many respects it was the more competitive and politically the more "normal" contest and by far the biggest hurdle Obama faced that year. After he was

nominated, things turned really abnormal on the Republican side of the ticket and the result was that Obama enjoyed a relatively easy road to victory in the general election. It is now largely forgotten that the primary started out as a very competitive race and the ultimate winner was far from certain. Obama had been a community activist in Chicago since 1991 and a State Senator since 1997. He was a young man with an interesting personal background since he was the son of the marriage between an African graduate student from Kenya and a white mother from Kansas. He was born in 1961 in Hawaii and partially raised by his grandparents there and by his mother and step father in Indonesia (Obama, 1996). This childhood seemed to produce an unusually cosmopolitan background and perhaps a high level of tolerance and an ability to see both sides of an issue and empathy for the views of others. Obama was also obviously very capable, graduated from Columbia University in New York, and he became the first African-American President of the Harvard Law Review. After considering a number of possible job offers and career paths, Obama settled in Chicago where he became a community activist and where he taught constitutional law at the University of Chicago. He was first elected to the Illinois State Senate in 1996 from the 13th District, which encompasses part of the south side of Chicago and part of the Hyde Park community including the University of Chicago as well as the poorest areas of the south side. He was known in the Illinois Senate as someone who got along well and who tried to work with all factions. It is also worth noting that Obama's road to success was not completely smooth. He ran against an incumbent congressman, Representative Bobby Rush, in the First Congressional District in the Democratic Primary in March of 2000 and lost rather decisively by a 61:30 percent margin (State Board of Elections, 2000, 8). At that point

some critics regarded Obama as a young man with more ambition than good judgment. It is a long step from a failed Congressional primary to the kind of national prominence Obama attained in 2004.

Obama returned to the Illinois Senate and to the projects he cared about to wait for another and better opportunity for political advancement. The opportunity to run for an open seat presented itself in 2003. First term Senator Peter Fitzgerald, a Republican who had defeated Carol Moseley Braun in 1998 and facing a tough reelection fight, announced that he was giving up his Senate seat and returning to private business. Many observers thought Fitzgerald was vulnerable and that he might draw a Republican challenger in the primaries as well as several Democratic opponents. Fitzgerald's withdrawal produced one of the few open seats for the Senate in 2004 and it elicited a large field of candidates in both the Democratic and Republican Primaries. There were five major candidates and three minor candidates in the Democratic Primary and four major candidates and four minor candidates on the Republican side. When he announced for the U.S. Senate race in 2003, Barack Obama was hardly a figure powerful enough to frighten away potential opponents, and he had serious opposition.

The most prominent and proven political figure in the Democratic Primary was State Comptroller Daniel Hynes. Hynes already held a statewide office and had the advantage of fairly high name identification and having run and won a statewide race already. Although he was a young man, Hynes was a member of a prominent Chicago political family and his father, Tom Hynes, had been a State Senator, President of the Illinois Senate and later Cook County Assessor, which is a powerful position. Daniel Hynes was

also known as a serious and capable office-holder and his record as Comptroller was well regarded even though the office itself is the lowest profile constitutional office.

The most flamboyant of the Democrats was M. Blair Hull of Chicago who had made a fortune as an investments expert and stock trader. This was Hull's first try at elective office and he started out unknown statewide. Following the model of other wealthy business people who entered politics in mid-life, Blair Hull started his campaign very early and spent a considerable amount of his substantial personal fortune, which was reported to be in the range between \$131 million and \$444 million (Fornek, 2004, 6). In 2002 he helped to support and finance a number of state and local candidates in preparation for 2004. Hull also started his own 2004 campaign with a very early and very large media buy bringing up his advertisements in the summer of 2003. If personal wealth can buy one's way into the U.S. Senate, and there is evidence that it can certainly help as in the case of the Maria Cantwell of Washington, Jon Corzine of New Jersey, and Peter Fitzgerald in Illinois, Blair Hull had as good as a chance as any other candidate. He certainly garnered the most early publicity.

The other two major Democratic candidates were Maria Pappas who was Cook County Treasurer and Gery Chico, who had been Chief of Staff to Mayor Richard M. Daley and then Daley's appointment to be Chair of the Chicago School Board. Nancy Skinner, Joyce Washington, and Estella Johnson Hunt rounded out the field and proved not to be significant factors in the outcome. Overall, then, in handicapping the candidates at the outset of the Democratic Primary in 2004 an analyst might have ranked Hynes as the potential favorite because of his statewide experience and name identification, coupled with the support of the regular party organization throughout the state. Hull was

probably the most likely outsider to catch on simply because he was so well financed and had started so early in building up a campaign support infrastructure. Obama was the most interesting new face for a statewide office and had a compelling Horatio Alger-type personal story; however, he was also largely unknown and untested outside his Senate district on the south side of Chicago. Either of the other two major Democrats, Gery Chico and Maria Pappas might have been Chicago machine candidates in an earlier era; however, they were largely unknown outside the city and would have to struggle to gain any statewide traction, which they ultimately failed to do (Chicago Sun-Times, March 1, 2004, 6-7).

The early polls also reflected this general line-up fairly well. The following poll results are very indicative of the progression of the race:

*Chicago Tribune/WGN T.V. Poll Conducted February 11-17, 2004:

- | | |
|-----------------|-----|
| 1. Blair Hull | 24% |
| 2. Barack Obama | 15% |
| 3. Dan Hynes | 11% |
| 4. Maria Pappas | 9% |
| 5. Gery Chico | 5% |

Published in Chicago Tribune on March 9, 2004, p. 1.

*The Daily Southtown Newspaper (Suburban Chicago) conducted February 19, 2004:

- | | |
|--------------------|-----|
| 1. Blair Hull | 27% |
| 2. Barack Obama | 17% |
| 3. Dan Hynes | 17% |
| 4. Maria Pappas | 14% |
| 5. Gery Chico | 5% |
| 6. Nancy Skinner | 2% |
| 7. Joyce Wasington | 1% |
| 8. Undecided | 16% |

Published in Rockford Register Star on February 29, 2004, p. 1-H.

*Chicago Tribune/WGN T.V. poll conducted February 23, 2004:

- | | |
|-----------------|-----|
| 1. Blair Hull | 24% |
| 2. Barack Obama | 15% |
| 3. Dan Hynes | 11% |
| 4. Maria Pappas | 9% |
| 5. Gery Chico | 5% |
| 6. Undecided | 34% |

Published in Rockford Register Star, February 29, 2004, p. 1-H.

*Daily Southtown/Chicago Sun-Times poll conducted March 3, 2004:

- | | |
|---------------------|-----|
| 1. Barack Obama | 28% |
| 2. Blair Hull | 23% |
| 3. Dan Hynes | 22% |
| 4. Maria Pappas | 10% |
| 5. Gery Chico | 3% |
| 6. Joyce Washington | 3% |
| 7. Nancy Skinner | 1% |
| 8. Undecided | 11% |

Published in Chicago Sun-Times, March 5, 2004, p. 9.

*Chicago Tribune/WGN T.V. poll conducted March 3-6, 2004:

- | | |
|-----------------|-----|
| 1. Barack Obama | 33% |
| 2. Dan Hynes | 19% |
| 3. Blair Hull | 16% |
| 4. Maria Pappas | 8% |
| 5. Gery Chico | 6% |
| 6. Others | 2% |
| 7. Undecided | 16% |

Published in the Chicago Tribune, March 9, 2004, p. 1-A.

It is notable that the last Chicago Tribune/WGN poll was published just one week before the March 16th primary. It is also clear that this last poll got the order of top five finishers correct, although the poll results underestimated Obama's final winning percentage considerably. All the news accounts in the last two weeks before the primary were about the late momentum Obama had gained and the "surge" in his support. This surge was powered by a number of factors. Obama received a number of high-profile endorsements in the last two weeks of the campaign. He also brought up a significant number of television ads featuring those endorsements and recounting his life's story. These ads were widely credited with helping Obama to the front-runner status. He benefited from the story that most of the late momentum was going his direction.

Most important of all in the statistical story told by those poll results reproduced above, however, was the near collapse of Blair Hull's campaign. At the outset Hull promised to spend up to \$40 million of his personal fortune on the Senate race and by the time of the primary he had spent a reported \$29 million on the primary. His television ads were aired early and often and were very effective in establishing his name identification and making Hull the initial frontrunner as the polls above showed. However, one can never anticipate all the unexpected events and twists and turns a campaign might take. Sometimes the unexpected events overwhelm the planned and anticipated. In February the media revealed that Hull's divorce from his ex-wife, a Chicago real estate broker, had been messy. The divorce paper revealed that she had obtained two restraining orders against him and that there had been a minor physical altercation (Lawrence and Fornek, Chicago Sun Times, March 5, 2004, 10). Although Hull admitted the marital problems and the essential facts, the story, coupled with the

negative media coverage of it, seemed to stop Hull's campaign cold. He went from leading the horse race polls to a weak third place in a period of about two weeks. No amount of pleading extenuating circumstances, pained explanations, and mea culpas appeared to gain him much sympathy. In the end, Hull finished a very distant third with just under 11% of the vote.

The clear beneficiary of the Hull collapse seemed to be Barack Obama. His poll numbers rose in tandem with Hull's decline. For whatever reason, Dan Hynes, the State Comptroller, seemed unable to take advantage of the same volatility in the electorate. It seems evident in retrospect that Obama received the benefit of the initial Hull voters who switched during the primary campaign plus more than his share of the undecided voters. Obama received several high profile endorsements, including Sheila Simon, daughter of the late Senator Paul Simon, and Michael Jordan. Simon made a very effective television ad for Obama and Jordan donated a well publicized \$10,000 check. The more endorsements he received the more the media covered him and the more people noticed Obama. The more people learned about Obama, the more they appeared to like him. His 53 percent victory, over better known and better financed and more experienced opponents, was an impressive victory given the broad field he faced. Some candidates appear to wilt in the glare of the spotlight. Obama seemed to grow and thrive in it. When the primary was over, Obama was in a good position to mount a very competitive campaign for the general election. He still had to face a very serious Republican opponent and the Senate seat was currently held by the Republicans. The Republicans were determined to use their national party power and resources, including President Bush, and the resources of the Republican National Committee and the National

Republican Senatorial Committee (NRSC) in an attempt to hold onto that Senate seat. The Republican who emerged from the primary, Jack Ryan, at that point was a strong candidate. He had won a hard fought race and had defeated three other very creditable challengers.

The Republican Primary

The Republican Primary drew four major candidates and four more minor candidates. The four major candidates were generally well regarded and each could claim to be a very competitive choice to replace Senator Peter Fitzgerald. Jim Oberweis was a Kane County businessman, the owner of a dairy which bore his family name, and the champion of the most conservative wing of the Republican Party. Oberweis had run for Senator in 2002 and had finished second to the Republican nominee, Jim Durkin, that year; with 32 percent of the statewide vote in that race. Through that race he managed to get his name recognition widely established. His very aggressive use of television ads, especially ads attacking illegal immigrants, became a source of controversy; however, he was also very appealing to the most conservative wing of the party. Oberweis also pledged to sink a considerable proportion of his personal fortune into this race.

State Senator Steve Rauschenberger was from suburban Elgin located in Kane and western Cook counties, a Republican stronghold. He had been a leader in the Illinois General Assembly for years and was very highly regarded by his legislative colleagues. Several downstate legislators endorsed him in the primary and lent assistance to his campaign. Rauschenberger was also later the Chair of the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) which was another mark of his colleagues' respect for him.

Andrew McKenna Jr. was a Chicago-area businessman and community activist. He was also the son of a widely respected business leader and philanthropist in Chicago. He held a Master's Degree from Northwestern University, worked at Kraft foods, and then in 1981 became President of Schwartz Paper Company. McKenna was later elected to be Chair of the Republican Party statewide after losing the Senate primary.

Probably the most interesting and charismatic of the Republican candidates was Jack Ryan. He also was a graduate of Harvard Law School and held a Master's Degree in Business from Harvard. After college, he went to work at Goldman Sachs as an investment banker and became a multi-millionaire from his investments. His net worth was estimated to be between \$38 million and \$96 million. Ryan then quit the investment banking business to teach in an inner-city school, Hales Franciscan, between 2000 and 2003. Several of his former students actively campaigned for Ryan. He had also been married to a movie and television star, Jeri Ryan, with whom he had a son. Ryan himself had movie star good looks and presence. He started out as the leader in the early polls and was still the leader when the campaign closed. (Biographical material obtained from campaign biographies and the media, especially Fornek, Chicago Sun-Times, March 2, 2004, pp. 12-13.) Ryan just seemed perfect for the part and he led the race from the start to finish. For example, the last Chicago Sun-Times poll before the primary had the following results:

- | | |
|-------------------------|-----|
| 1. Jack Ryan | 44% |
| 2. Jim Oberweis | 18% |
| 3. Andy McKenna, Jr. | 10% |
| 4. Steve Rauschenberger | 4% |
| 5. Other | 6% |
| 6. Undecided | 18% |

Published in the Chicago Sun-Times, March 5, 2004, p. 9

The last Chicago Tribune/WGN T.V. poll before the primary found the following:

1. Jack Ryan 32%
2. Jim Oberweis 11%
3. Andy McKenna,Jr. 10%
4. Steve Rauschenberger 8%

Published in the Chicago Tribune, March 9, 2004, p. 1-A.

It should be noted that both polls got the order of the top two candidates correct, although Rauschenberger ultimately came in third and McKenna fourth. Ryan got 36 percent of the vote, Oberweis 24 percent, Rauschenberger 20 percent and McKenna 15 percent. Just as importantly, while it was a hard fought race, the Republican primary did not appear to be so internally destructive that they would fail to unite in the Fall in an effort to hold this Senate seat.

Thus, Ryan came through at the end with a solid plurality victory in the Republican Primary, although it was less commanding than the majority vote Obama obtained. Nevertheless, at the end of the vote count on primary election day, it appeared that both parties had nominated very strong candidates. Neither had the kind of divisive primary that precluded attaining party unity in the fall and every indicator pointed toward a very competitive race in the general election. In addition, the race held promise as a potential forum for a great debate on important philosophical and policy-driven issues. The Chicago Tribune wrote the following about the Barack Obama vs. Jack Ryan race for the fall:

“Democrat Barack Obama and Republican Jack Ryan are both Harvard educated, loaded with charisma and sport made-for-T.V. good looks, but that’s about where the similarities end between the nominees who won their parties’ U.S. Senate primaries on Tuesday. The two are defined by sharp ideological differences, pointing to a general election

campaign that harbors the potential to evolve into a sophisticated debate on the future direction of national policy.”

(Chase and Mendell, March 17, 2004, 1-A.)

The Unfolding Campaign

At the outset of this campaign all of the indicators pointed toward a very competitive race. The race featured two articulate, capable, even charismatic candidates. The two parties have been competitive over a long period of time in Illinois. The Democrats have enjoyed a slight advantage statewide since 2000 and elected all the constitutional officers statewide in 2002 except for the Republican Treasurer. The current division in the Congressional delegation is ten Democrats and nine Republicans, although in 2004 it was ten Republicans and nine Democrats. At the time of the 2004 election the state’s senior Senator was Richard Durbin, a Democrat, and the junior Senator was Peter Fitzgerald, a Republican; so the Republicans were trying to hold onto the Senate seat Fitzgerald had won in 1998. Based on past performance the national Republican Party could be expected to match or exceed any funds the Democratic Party could raise to assist Obama. In addition, Jack Ryan was personally wealthy and could help finance his own campaign. At that point the candidates had not attained any national stature and the race would have to be rated as competitive.

An examination of the voting returns from the March 2004 primary indicates where the candidates were strong and where each candidate showed potential weaknesses. By extension these results also indicate a great deal about the traditional strengths and weaknesses of the two parties in Illinois. At the risk of slight oversimplification it is generally true that Ryan and the Republicans enjoyed some advantages in their wider

geographical distribution of the vote and Obama and the Democrats enjoyed significant advantages on population and numbers of voters. Put simply, Obama won a total of 655,923 votes which was 52.77 percent of the total of 1,310,129 ballots cast in the Democratic Primary while his closest competitor, Dan Hynes won 294,717 or 23.71 percent of the total. On the Republican side Ryan won 234,791 votes which were 35.48 percent of the total of 702,658 votes cast in the Republican Primary. Ryan's closest competitor, Jim Oberwise, received 23.54 percent of the total Republican vote, which was almost identical to the Hynes percentages as the Democratic runner-up (Illinois State Board of Elections, March 16, 2004, 8). (See Appendix A.) Based on primary votes alone, the results leaned toward Obama and the Democrats; however, the Republicans in Illinois can be quite competitive with the right candidates in statewide races. They controlled the Governor's office for 26 consecutive years until Rod Blagojevich defeated Jim Ryan in 2002. In addition, Peter Fitzgerald won this Senate seat in 1998 by defeating the then incumbent, Carol Moseley Braun. Although party loyalty is an important initial foundation, the race in Illinois usually goes to the party which presents the strongest candidate with the most effective campaign.

Part of the story on just how competitive a statewide race can be in Illinois is told by the geographical distribution of the vote. In recent elections the overall pattern has been as follows:

1. The Democrats dominate the City of Chicago by winning very large percentages of the total vote. While suburban Cook County outside the city formerly produced substantial numbers of Republican votes, those numbers have been

- declining in recent years. The 2000 census showed Chicago only contained 23 percent of the total population in Illinois while suburban Cook County contained 20 percent for a total of 43 percent of the Illinois population (Jackson, 2004, 5).
2. The Republicans formerly dominated the ring of five large suburban counties around Chicago. DuPage County is the largest of these and has been the backbone of the Republican Party in Illinois. The five collar counties contain 21 percent of the state total and coupled with suburban Cook's 20 percent, the suburban total is 41 percent of the state (Jackson, 2004). More recently the Democrats have made significant inroads into these suburban counties and have been winning statewide races partially on the strength of these suburban increases (Green, 2003).
 3. The remaining 96 counties are loosely termed "Downstate." In the 2000 census, Downstate held 38 percent of the total population. Political scientists Peter Colby and Paul Green originally pointed out that these 96 counties could hold the "balance of power" because they determined the winner when the vote was closely split between Democratic Chicago and the Republicans in the suburbs (Colby and Green, 1982). More recently, however, the suburbs have held the balance of power compared to Downstate and the suburbs, especially suburban Cook County, have become more diverse (Green, 2003).

The distribution of Barack Obama's vote in the Illinois Primary compared to all his Democratic competitors gives a good indicator of where his original strength lay in Illinois. These results are displayed on Map 1 and Appendix A. This map displays

Obama's bedrock strength and his potential for challenges in future campaigns. It is clear from this map that Obama's core constituency originally was in urban Chicago and in the suburban collar counties. He won the city of Chicago handily and won all five of the collar counties, plus Kankakee County which is just south of the suburban ring. This is where he piled up insurmountable vote advantages. It is also notable that outside the urban and suburban ring, Obama only won four other counties downstate. These were Champaign County, the home of the University of Illinois' main campus; Jackson County, the home of Southern Illinois University's main campus; Sangamon County, the seat of state government and the home of one of the University of Illinois campuses; and McDonough County in western Illinois, the home of Western Illinois University.

It is notable that the regular party organization's favored candidate, Comptroller Dan Hynes, won a total of 83 counties out of 102 total. His strength was spread across all of Downstate Illinois; however, he simply did not do well enough in his hometown of Chicago to be competitive with Obama. As an interesting footnote to a failed campaign, Blair Hull actually carried seven counties, two in far northern Illinois, a nest of four deep in southern Illinois, and Hancock County standing alone in far western Illinois. A campaign which once held great promise, and which cost millions of dollars, ultimately foundered on the rocks of personal and marital difficulties.

On the Republican side Jack Ryan won both the population and the geographic races. Ryan took a total of 86 counties and these were spread evenly across Illinois. He won big in Chicago, Cook County and the suburbs. He also ran well downstate. Oberweis came in second in the popular vote and won five counties including DeKalb and suburban Kendall, St. Clair in the metro-east area, and Franklin and Union in southern Illinois

where his rock-ribbed conservatism had more appeal. Rauschenberger won eleven counties including his home turf of Kane County and a scattering of downstate counties, especially in southern Illinois, such as Jackson, Washington and Jefferson, where his legislative colleagues were helpful. McKenna won a single county, Warren, deep in northwest Illinois. (See Appendix B.)

In summary, the primaries produced strong and competitive candidates for each party. Each party had reason to believe they could win the general election. Ryan had run well Downstate and Obama had done extremely well in the city of Chicago. Both candidates had run well in the suburban collar counties. The decision would presumably hinge on who could conduct the best campaign and especially which candidate could appeal to the Independents and the growing suburban vote. Certainly based on the returns from the primaries there was ample reason to believe that either Jack Ryan or Barack Obama could exhibit such appeal.

The readers of this paper are likely to know that the story took a dramatic shift shortly after the primaries were over on March 16. Before the primary there had been persistent rumors about the Jack Ryan divorce case. The court files on Ryan's divorce from actress Jeri Ryan had been sealed at Jack Ryan's request. His explanation was that he was concerned about protecting the privacy of the couple's son. Some of Ryan's Republican primary opponents alluded to the sealed file and made vague reference to it in debates before the primary, but nothing specific came out. Then shortly after the primary a court in California ordered that the file should be unsealed. The file contained rather damaging allegations by Jeri Ryan against Jack Ryan regarding incidents related to their sex life. The story became an explosive one and an overnight sensation among the media. Here

was another divorce file, and another set of charges by a former wife coming into play in this Senate race. It was very reminiscent of the situation which had effectively derailed Blair Hull's candidacy before the primary; however, this all came out after the primary. The timing could have hardly been worse for the Republicans.

After much public pressure from various Republican Party leaders, Jack Ryan announced that he was giving up his place as the Republican Party nominee for the U.S. Senate. The Republican State Central Committee, which had pressured him to resign from the ticket, accepted his resignation and met to choose a successor. After much debate and internal wrangling committee members decided to nominate conservative commentator, Alan Keyes, who had run for President in 2000 and who lived in Maryland. Indeed, Keyes had earlier also run for the U.S. Senate from Maryland. At best it was an unusual decision which proved to be highly controversial. Many critics asked why no worthy Republicans could be found to run for the Senate out of a state of more than 12 million people.

Editorial opinion, for example, throughout the state's newspapers was almost unanimously negative. The only explanations for this extraordinary decision were that the Republican State Central Committee wanted someone who was already well-known and who could take the fight to Obama aggressively in the fall. As a prominent African-American activist who was very outspoken on a variety of conservative social agenda causes, Alan Keyes seemed to fit that job description. Others speculated that the conservative legislators from Downstate felt that Keyes could have a coattail effect in some marginal races in their districts. This reason had some plausibility to it as well.

Whatever the original strategic plan in bringing Keyes to Illinois from Maryland to campaign against Obama, it did not work out well in execution (Long and Parsons, Chicago Tribune, August 20, 2004, 1). Keyes did mount an aggressive and outspoken campaign on behalf of several of his social issue causes. He was strongly against abortion, against gay rights, and in favor of increasing religion's role in the public square. When it came to his rationale for being Senator from Illinois, to the bread and butter concerns of many voters, and plans for bettering the economic status of the people he would represent, the Keyes campaign faltered. He appeared stuck in radio talk show mode. He seemed never to gain much traction in presenting himself as a viable and creditable candidate for the Senate from Illinois. When Keyes made strongly worded charges against his opponent, Obama largely ignored him.

Obama did not conduct a Rose Garden strategy however. He mounted a very energetic and high-profile campaign for the Senate even if little of it was aimed directly at Alan Keyes. He campaigned aggressively from the date of his nomination in March, all through the spring and into early summer, and then came his moment in the national spotlight as Keynote Speaker at the Democratic National Convention in Boston in late July. By virtually all assessments Obama rose to the occasion and took maximum advantage of the opportunity that had been offered to him. The speech was graceful stylistically and thoughtful substantively. It was extremely well reviewed by almost all commentators. The national media certainly took note and gave him massive free exposure. Here was an articulate young African-American, presenting mostly mainstream and moderate views, with an engaging personality and an attractive wife and family. Americans in general are attracted to candidate images more than the candidate's

specific issues. They want someone they feel they can relate to and that they can trust and who seems to have the ability to understand people like them and the lives they live. Obama seemed to project those qualities.

Obama quickly took command of a national stage after the Democratic Convention Keynote. Invitations to speak virtually all over the country, to be interviewed on all the talk shows, and to campaign for fellow Democrats poured in rapidly. Simply sifting through all those opportunities and deciding where to use Obama's limited time and energy became a major problem for him and his staff. Obama appeared to keep a good attitude and to stay well grounded and focused on his Senate race. He frequently pointed out that his first obligation was to campaigning in Illinois and that his first objective was to winning the U.S. Senate race. In self-deprecating humor, Obama joked that he had not accomplished anything yet of national significance and that if elected he would be #100 in seniority. While some people were already talking about his inevitably running for President someday, Obama for the most part confirmed himself to the mundane details of his Senate campaign in Illinois. Obama adopted the strategic decision largely to ignore Alan Keyes unless there was absolute need for a specific rejoinder or face-to-face encounter. For instance, on one occasion Keyes claimed that Jesus Christ would not vote for Obama (on moral grounds). Obama declined to answer even when reporters pressed him for a response, a decision he much later said he regretted when he gave a much noted speech on religion and politics in June of 2006 (Obama, [Chicago Tribune](#), July 18, 2006, 11). Nevertheless, Obama mostly stayed focused on his own Senate campaign and winning the race in the fall despite his growing national recognition.

The published polls certainly seemed to validate the wisdom of Obama's strategy. All of the published polls consistently projected a wide lead for Obama (McDermott, St. Louis Post-Dispatch, October 28, 2004, 1-A). As far as the polls were concerned, the only question remaining was how large Obama's winning margin would be. The Keyes campaign replied when asked about the polls that, "the only poll which matters is the one taken on election day." This is, of course, the standard response for the candidate who is trailing badly. The actual vote came soon enough on November 2, 2004. Barack Obama won the U.S. Senate seat by a margin of 69.9 percent to 27.05 percent, one of the largest margins in Illinois history. His statewide victory included an extraordinary level of support in central city Chicago, a very large lead in the suburbs, and a substantial victory Downstate. Map 2 shows the results in geographical terms. As is evident from Map 2, Obama won 92 of the 102 counties in Illinois. While Obama's victory margin was deep and wide it is worth examining where Alan Keyes succeeded. This will provide some clues as to where the Republican bedrock is in Illinois as well as clues as to where Obama could have problems in the future. As one can see in Map 2, there was a block of counties in deep southern Illinois which Keyes carried. These include Effingham, Jasper, Clark, Clay, Richland, Wayne, Edwards, and Wabash counties. These are rural and small town counties where cultural conservatism has always been strong and where religious fundamentalism is growing in its impact on politics. They are also counties where the loss of high paying union jobs is felt keenly and stress from the pressures of a global economy is great; however, for a variety of reasons the Democrats have failed to capitalize on this domestic issue area which traditionally favors them especially in southern Illinois. This nest of eight counties was joined was joined by Massac County in

deepest southern Illinois across the Ohio River from Kentucky and by Iroquois County in central Illinois. Both of these are places of traditional Republican Party strength. It should also be noted that all ten of the Keyes victory counties are represented by Republicans John Shimkus and Tim Johnson in Congress, and they are counties which President George W. Bush won handily in 2000 and 2004.

So, Keyes won where Republicans have traditionally won in Illinois. He also captured and perhaps even enhanced the viability of running a campaign based almost exclusively on morals and values issues and religious fervor. While that strategy was not nearly enough in the 2004 Illinois Senate race, it nevertheless has a powerful appeal to one of the Republican Party's most crucial core constituencies. That constituency of very conservative voters has not been dominant in the Republican Party in Illinois; however, it is vital and growing in many other states.

In most of the South and in many congressional districts in the Midwest, the Mountain West, and the Southwest the question of morality and family values are the major driving forces for people's vote. Their translation of morals and values is usually in terms of where the candidate stands on the litmus tests of abortion, gay marriage, prayer in the public schools, and appointments to the Federal courts. Keyes was right and Obama was wrong on those issues from the perspective of this category of "values voter." In some parts of southern and central Illinois where Keyes ran well, in most of the white south today, and in much of rural and small town America today, the Democrats have lost elections based on the cultural and religious values appeals of the Republicans. The Democrats have proven incapable of countering that appeal and using their own traditional strength on economic and bread and butter issues, or the legitimate

role of governmental services, to appeal to many of the people who need these services and economic development. The Democratic Party has experienced very little success in expanding the definition of “morality” to larger issues that gay rights, abortion, and the Pledge of Allegiance and flag burning. They have not found a voice of reason on the relation between religion and politics. Barack Obama was able to overcome those historic limits of the Democratic Party and appeal to a broad and diverse range of Illinois voters. He became an extraordinary coalition builder in the 2004 campaign and that ability may be transferable into other settings, however, the 2004 race featured some special circumstances.

Concluding Observations on Obama’s Future

Obama’s reputation seems to have continually improved since the 2004 election. He is widely sought out as a speaker and a guest on television talk shows. He re-released his biography and it became a best seller (Obama, 1995). He signed a very lucrative book deal which made him an instant millionaire. He is an active member of the Senate who is enlisted as a co-sponsor for legislation by Democrats and Republicans alike. He has traveled all over the United States and to several nations overseas and his travels are widely covered when he is in any state or country.

In July of 2006, when he accepted the invitation of Iowa Senator Tom Harkin to attend his fish fry and speak in the rural area outside DesMoines, speculation about an Obama run for the Presidency as early as 2008 increased, although others thought a run in 2012 to be more realistic. Talk of a joint ticket with Senator Hillary Clinton or another prominent Democrat also ran rampant well over two years before the 2008 presidential

election. Obama had clearly become a national figure with a significant national reputation quite apart from whatever his legislative record in the Senate might ultimately prove to be.

There are two lessons to draw from the Obama results in the Illinois Primary of March 2004, well before Obama became nationally famous. First, Obama is remarkably appealing to the core constituents of the Democratic Party and he unites the party in ways that few candidates can claim. He ran extremely well among African Americans and other minorities, white urban dwellers, liberals and the young. He also did well among Independents and suburbanites, which accounts for the margin of his victory and proved that he can broaden the Democratic base. Second, Obama also encountered clear and persistent opposition from the Republican Party's core constituencies. That is, there is evidence of a lack of support in the small towns, the rural areas, and among those who are voters compelled by their religious morality. Dan Hynes, the party organization candidate took 83 Downstate counties in the Primary. Party organization and labor support was crucial to those victories. George W. Bush took 88 counties Downstate plus all five of the suburban counties in the 2004 general election. (See Map 3 and Appendix D.) Many of these were the same counties Dan Hynes (or Blair Hull) won in the Democratic Primary in March of 2004. Even Alan Keyes, who ran about as hapless a campaign as Illinois has witnessed in its recent history, took 10 counties in small town and rural Illinois. Numerically there are far more of these rural and small town counties in the United States than there are urban counties. Of course, the balance of power is now in the suburban and, increasingly, the "exurban" counties and it is there that national elections will be won in the future (Judis and Teixeira, 2002; Phillips, 1969).

Geography and population both count in American politics. Both qualities are important in the aggregate in Senate and House races in terms of who will control the majority of the Congress. In running for the American presidency, geography and the popular vote also count in unique ways through the Electoral College. The disputed results in 2000 taught us again that while the popular vote and the Electoral College vote are both important, it is the Electoral College vote which ultimately counts the most. The Electoral College is heavily driven by geography since it is a winner take all vote at the state level for all but two states, Maine and Nebraska and they are winner-take-all at the Congressional District level. Thus, one has to win the Electoral College vote to win and it is based on winning states. Since each state gets two votes automatically based on the Senate formula, and since the small states get a bonus from this formula thus ensuring that their voters are worth more proportionately than the voters of the large states, the Electoral College emphasizes geography over population.

The same is even more obviously true in the U.S. Senate where each state has equal representation. This means that Wyoming with 498,703 residents has the same Senate representation as California with 35,116,033 residents and this is a defining feature of the U.S. Constitution. The implications of this geographical base are not entirely well recognized. The political scientist, Gary Jacobson, has argued that the Republicans have a “structural advantage” in assembling a majority in the House or Senate. Their votes are spread more evenly and more widely across more states and more Congressional Districts compared to the Democratic core voters who tend to be more clustered in the cities (Jacobson, 2005). This means that the Democrats “waste” more of their votes because they are piled up in Congressional Districts where Democrats win by very wide margins.

Many of these are the “Majority Minority” Districts constructed in the urban areas and compelled by the Justice Department and by the Supreme Court’s interpretation of the Voting Rights Act. The Republican vote is spread more evenly and more efficiently across the nation. Thus, the Republicans were able to take a very narrow popular vote plurality (48.7 percent) in 2000 in the House and convert it into a larger percentage of House seats (50.8 percent) and the same margin became a tie in the Senate. They were then able to increase their margin of House and Senate seats in both 2002 and 2004 based on only very narrow victories in the popular vote totals (Stanley and Niemi, 2006, 44-45). This emphasizes the crucial role of geography and importance of the spread of one’s partisans as counterweights to the widely recognized standard of “one person, one vote” and an emphasis on the popular vote.

All of these considerations simply indicate that a candidate with aspirations for national office must have broad-based appeal. That candidate first must hold onto and mobilize his or her partisan base constituency and mobilize them by an effective “get out the vote” effort. They also must reach out and expand that base by appealing to moderates and Independents and by mobilizing new voters, particularly among the young and among these groups who were formerly non-voting and disenfranchised. Barack Obama has taken some initial steps toward doing exactly that in building coalitions during his first Senate race in Illinois, which is a large and diverse state. He successfully appealed to virtually all parts of the state in the general election against a controversial opponent. However even against Alan Keyes, Obama lost ten counties in areas indicative of the places where Republicans have recently won nationwide recently. The results in his first primary against Dan Hynes and Blair Hull indicate that rural and small town

voters in Middle America are not his most natural constituency. Whether he can use that experience, build on it and take it to success on the national level is an intriguing question at this point. The fact that people are even asking the question about a first-term, African-American Senator is truly a political phenomenon with potentially historic implications.

Bibliography

Chase, John. 2004. "Voters Have Distinct Choice in the Fall." Chicago Tribune. March 17, 1-A.

Colby, Peter W. and Paul M. Green. 1982. "Downstate Holds the Key to Victory." In Illinois Elections, 2nd edition, edited by Caroline A. Gherardini, J. Michael Lennon, Richard J. Shereikis, and Larry R. Smith. Springfield, Illinois: Sangamon State University, 2-6.

Fornek, Scott. 2004. "Campaign 2004 U.S. Senate Republicans: Profiles in Brief" and "Up Close, Real Life Guide to the Dems." Chicago Sun-Times. March 1, 2004, 6-1, March 2, 12-13.

Goodman, Doris Kearns. 2005. Team of Rivals: The Political Genius of Abraham Lincoln. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Green, Paul M. 2003. "Illinois Governor: It was more than the Ryan Name." in Midterm Madness: The Elections of 2002. edited by Larry J. Sabato. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 209-217.

Herrmann, Andrew and Scott Fornek. 2004. "Obama Leads Pack for Dem Senate Nod." Chicago Sun-Times. March 5, 9.

Illinois State Board of Elections. 2004. Official Vote Primary Election, Springfield: March 16, 2004; General Election, November 2.

Jackson, John S. 2004. Illinois Politics in the 21st Century: Bellwether, Leading Edge, or Lagging Indicator. Carbondale: An Occasional Paper of the Paul Simon Public Policy Institute. January.

Jacobson, Gary C. 2005. "The Congress: The Structural Basis of Republican Success." in The Elections of 2004, edited by Michael Nelson. Washington, D.C., CQ Press, 163-186.

Judis, John B. and Ray Teixeria. 2002. The Emerging Democratic Majority. New York: Scribner.

Kenney, David and Robert E. Hartley. 2003. An Uncertain Tradition: U.S. Senators from Illinois 1818-2003. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Lawrence, Curtis and Scott Fornek. 2004. "Hull Says He Struck Wife to Defend Himself." Chicago Sun-Times. March 5, 10.

Long, Ray and Christi Parsons. 2004. "GOP Gives Keyes a Tepid Reception." Chicago Tribune. August 20, 1.

McDermott, Kevin. 2004. "Obama Keeps Huge Lead Over Keyes in Senate Race." St. Louis Post-Dispatch, October 28, 1-A.

Obama, Barack. 1995. Dreams From My Father: A Story of Race and Inheritance. N.Y.: Kodansha America, Inc. Times Books.

Obama, Barack. 2006. "The Religious Divide." Chicago Tribune. July 18, 11.

Pearson, Rick. 2004. "Obama, Ryan Out Front." Chicago Tribune. March 9, 1-A.

Pearson, Rick and Jon Yates. 2004. "Keyes Reportedly Set to Accept GOP Nod." Chicago Tribune. August 6, 1-A.

Phillips, Kevin. 1969. The Emerging Republican Majority. New York: Arlington House.

Stanley, Harold W. and Richard G. Niemi. 2006. Vital Statistics on American Politics. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press.

Sweeny, Chuck. 2004. "Who Are These Chicago Democrats?" Rockford Register Star. February 29, 1-H.

Zelney, Jeff. 2006. "Obama in '08?" Chicago Tribune. May 28. 1-A

U.S. SENATE ELECTION ILLINOIS 2004 DEMOCRATIC PRIMARY RESULTS (by county) MARCH 16, 2004

Map 1



2004 Dem. Primary Results	
	Hynes N = 82
	Hull N = 7
	Obama N = 13

PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

ILLINOIS 2004 GENERAL ELECTION RESULTS (by county)

NOVEMBER 2, 2004

Map 3



2004 Presidential Election

Kerry N = 15

Bush N = 87

APPENDIX A
U.S. Senate: Primary Election
March 16, 2004

Democrats

COUNTY	OBAMA	HYNES	HULL	PAPPAS	CHICO	SKINNER	WASHINGTON
Adams	743	1,870	1,138	839	32	136	87
Alexander	400	607	285	53	24	32	28
Bond	142	450	349	14	6	33	15
Boone	528	887	976	199	59	85	43
Brown	29	181	60	24	1	6	3
Bureau	518	1,213	804	223	65	102	33
Calhoun	30	461	84	4	3	12	2
Carroll	109	362	284	62	7	24	15
Cass	183	737	199	30	6	26	15
Champaign	7,354	2,187	1,034	517	133	227	164
Christian	693	2,694	781	195	28	107	46
Clark	79	348	344	26	7	50	35
Clay	101	663	514	29	15	91	34
Clinton	155	668	428	22	9	28	8
Coles	759	861	559	118	12	68	19
Cook	464,917	122,998	37,003	44,508	40,382	4,765	7,171
Crawford	77	441	330	25	12	49	20
Cumberland	138	491	255	47	8	42	25
DeKalb	2,996	964	694	294	171	130	40
Dewitt	229	624	430	104	16	52	31
Douglas	162	424	188	53	0	25	7
DuPage	35,824	11,541	5,512	5,323	3,184	1,129	585
Edgar	141	320	285	30	8	36	19
Edwards	21	85	117	8	4	27	9
Effingham	417	1,551	656	146	24	108	52
Fayette	151	838	417	19	7	54	17
Ford	111	178	100	22	3	17	10
Franklin	1,054	3,885	1,581	263	34	132	68
Fulton	948	3,012	1,873	301	31	200	74
Gallatin	366	886	314	52	10	72	30
Greene	160	788	569	39	17	75	20
Grundy	890	1,103	491	309	89	58	24
Hamilton	137	1,011	412	41	7	40	10
Hancock	184	286	348	128	11	36	14
Hardin	52	450	154	29	7	24	11
Henderson	30	204	159	17	5	13	8
Henry	248	1,260	817	253	40	63	33
Iroquois	320	307	197	82	8	38	19
Jackson	2,791	2,298	1,009	205	51	130	63
Jasper	32	468	334	9	3	29	16
Jefferson	575	1,260	764	50	19	52	20
Jersey	192	627	391	16	7	60	25
JoDaviess	258	465	266	100	21	72	42
Johnson	160	583	255	47	11	20	10
Kane	12,090	3,706	2,242	1,264	1,683	411	210
Kankakee	3,122	1,809	763	487	188	127	119

Kendall	1,516	798	379	221	153	63	24
Knox	690	1,695	912	193	37	144	56
Lake	29,644	6,001	4,735	2,914	1,714	737	371
LaSalle	2,137	3,506	1,210	516	176	214	69
Lawrence	38	280	409	14	5	36	28
Lee	461	602	496	130	19	73	37
Livingston	480	678	388	105	25	61	21
Logan	268	527	240	43	13	30	7
Macon	2,937	4,350	2,079	544	38	152	136
Macoupin	1,111	3,062	2,273	181	58	223	79
Madison	4,593	10,758	5,082	624	138	371	188
Marion	548	1,860	1,440	63	22	120	53
Marshall	174	299	233	39	3	22	11
Mason	274	906	805	53	9	44	28
Massac	166	370	332	63	8	16	21
McDonough	966	227	308	90	7	44	23
McHenry	8,301	3,777	2,079	1,991	522	630	168
McLean	2,824	2,975	1,391	438	111	204	173
Menard	151	351	76	7	4	16	3
Mercer	151	1,029	561	170	24	50	22
Monroe	130	733	351	20	13	29	9
Montgomery	349	1,654	570	51	20	78	35
Morgan	390	688	169	40	7	38	17
Moultrie	159	456	291	46	5	23	9
Ogle	590	819	755	137	38	58	31
Peoria	4,614	5,476	2,643	574	126	169	217
Perry	319	1,688	622	71	13	37	23
Piatt	296	384	250	77	3	25	6
Pike	84	610	384	78	13	60	17
Pope	57	297	141	35	5	6	8
Pulaski	175	182	177	22	4	14	20
Putnam	160	560	263	65	18	44	19
Randolph	558	2,270	1,360	67	19	99	38
Richland	63	396	574	19	9	40	30
Rock Island	2,386	6,095	4,010	1,465	648	284	216
Saline	644	2,525	844	126	30	81	39
Sangamon	5,548	5,317	1,507	287	77	186	152
Schuyler	60	211	128	31	4	9	3
Scott	37	199	90	16	2	11	2
Shelby	323	1,421	567	127	13	63	21
St. Clair	8,305	9,005	5,942	436	388	391	390
Stark	72	131	74	14	1	5	3
Stephenson	651	901	776	204	35	53	58
Tazwell	1,470	3,682	2,351	399	52	176	90
Union	639	2,031	1,099	234	29	115	52
Vermilion	1,063	1,613	891	249	30	126	64
Wabash	43	327	473	39	9	104	51
Warren	132	433	308	75	11	25	12
Washington	125	643	540	24	9	39	22
Wayne	60	494	348	16	8	24	13
White	183	734	422	27	5	60	35
Whiteside	537	1,118	912	222	66	119	58

Will	19,648	9,529	4,445	3,302	1,765	657	365
Williamson	885	2,581	743	125	22	57	36
Winnebago	6,753	5,661	6,871	1,157	326	383	325
Woodford	369	750	369	85	26	47	22
TOTAL VOTE:	655,923	294,717	134,453	74,987	53,403	16,098	13,375

Source: Illinois State Board of Education, Official Vote, March 16, 2004.

APPENDIX B
U.S. Senate: Primary Election
March 16, 2004

Republicans

COUNTY	RYAN	OBERWEIS	RAUSCHENBERGER	McKENNA
Adams	2,608	1,374	531	2,161
Alexander	115	43	11	43
Bond	262	94	469	61
Boone	2,532	1,562	919	929
Brown	125	63	27	68
Bureau	1,134	403	297	586
Calhoun	92	31	19	16
Carroll	692	272	312	298
Cass	388	123	85	147
Champaign	5,406	2,579	2,560	1,823
Christian	729	189	125	295
Clark	243	125	474	99
Clay	312	149	184	112
Clinton	364	345	381	121
Coles	1,139	489	610	357
Cook	50,326	32,310	32,955	17,923
Crawford	398	182	324	92
Cumberland	316	109	155	122
DeKalb	2,385	2,930	2,240	899
Dewitt	1,531	468	160	489
Douglas	894	542	316	269
DuPage	25,332	22,866	22,043	11,376
Edgar	621	271	393	166
Edwards	227	199	248	44
Effingham	912	516	450	349
Fayette	468	194	594	163
Ford	609	230	183	235
Franklin	415	461	148	190
Fulton	927	296	144	467
Gallatin	110	36	5	23
Greene	323	113	51	94
Grundy	1,438	1,359	414	390
Hamilton	219	162	71	95
Hancock	715	276	209	351
Hardin	200	85	27	117
Henderson	166	57	28	131
Henry	902	523	410	579
Iroquois	1,201	634	483	399
Jackson	592	507	740	234
Jasper	146	95	149	69
Jefferson	330	367	485	194
Jersey	418	174	107	95
JoDaviess	1,404	532	1,047	474
Johnson	544	503	125	243
Kane	6,959	10,032	13,803	2,614
Kankakee	2,060	880	380	671

Kendall	1,758	2,427	1,205	889
Knox	1,085	731	308	652
Lake	15,829	11,569	8,659	6,590
LaSalle	2,082	1,659	879	993
Lawrence	222	198	129	143
Lee	1,328	438	564	400
Livingston	2,028	912	1,325	942
Logan	1,122	428	164	441
Macon	3,262	792	544	1,434
Macoupin	929	358	176	292
Madison	2,670	1,937	1,229	917
Marion	603	282	343	171
Marshall	456	173	123	285
Mason	317	134	54	223
Massac	497	307	90	426
McDonough	1,763	570	411	471
McHenry	10,690	9,503	5,026	3,472
McLean	6,824	2,928	2,214	2,948
Menard	1,280	532	191	483
Mercer	452	224	144	326
Monroe	286	234	355	258
Montgomery	663	256	144	210
Morgan	2,209	630	292	744
Moultrie	471	174	142	233
Ogle	2,576	1,246	1,073	1,045
Peoria	4,997	1,575	1,972	2,439
Perry	289	259	254	93
Piatt	693	296	199	258
Pike	433	220	137	221
Pope	180	158	48	145
Pulaski	249	129	26	102
Putnam	307	80	62	62
Randolph	258	155	173	177
Richland	348	262	197	103
Rock Island	1,254	772	235	1,107
Saline	714	491	90	173
Sangamon	6,554	2,194	1,451	2,583
Schuyler	213	100	61	113
Scott	279	130	49	132
Shelby	482	174	189	302
St. Clair	2,396	2,491	702	2,129
Stark	242	79	54	73
Stephenson	2,378	1,010	997	896
Tazwell	3,485	1,467	1,340	2,362
Union	272	314	141	102
Vermilion	1,956	816	403	809
Wabash	273	175	142	64
Warren	620	336	90	717
Washington	376	212	437	100
Wayne	506	307	279	334
White	357	228	124	107
Whiteside	971	362	522	531

Will	12,980	11,873	6,038	5,026
Williamson	860	821	237	307
Winnebago	7,397	3,211	3,651	2,921
Woodford	1,841	705	680	1,089
Total Vote:	234,791	155,794	132,655	97,238

Source: Illinois State Board of Elections, Official Vote, March 16, 2004.

APPENDIX C
U.S. Senate: General Election
November 2, 2004

COUNTY	PLURALITY	DEM OBAMA	REP KEYES
Adams	2,179 (DEM)	16,036	13,857
Alexander	1,247 (DEM)	2,395	1,148
Bond	1,510 (DEM)	4,227	2,717
Boone	3,889 (DEM)	11,206	7,317
Brown	235 (DEM)	1,308	1,073
Bureau	4,364 (DEM)	10,648	6,284
Calhoun	692 (DEM)	1,604	912
Carroll	2,231 (DEM)	4,961	2,730
Cass	1,445 (DEM)	3,341	1,896
Champaign	26,265 (DEM)	51,813	25,548
Christian	4,222 (DEM)	9,323	5,101
Clark	267 (REP)	3,566	3,833
Clay	1,109 (REP)	2,505	3,614
Clinton	2,872 (DEM)	9,437	6,565
Coles	4,133 (DEM)	12,758	8,625
Cook	1,299,625 (DEM)	1,629,296	329,671
Crawford	41 (DEM)	4,302	4,261
Cumberland	106 (DEM)	2,598	2,492
DeKalb	14,123 (DEM)	26,077	11,954
Dewitt	1,367 (DEM)	4,340	2,973
Douglas	522 (DEM)	4,239	3,717
DuPage	126,803 (DEM)	251,445	124,642
Edgar	156 (DEM)	4,014	3,858
Edwards	721 (REP)	1,155	1,876
Effingham	2,666 (REP)	6,264	8,930
Fayette	699 (DEM)	4,826	4,127
Ford	37 (DEM)	3,021	2,984
Franklin	5,728 (DEM)	11,949	6,221
Fulton	7,173 (DEM)	11,729	4,556
Gallatin	1,323 (DEM)	2,109	786
Greene	1,062 (DEM)	3,343	2,281
Grundy	5,977 (DEM)	12,285	6,308
Hamilton	778 (DEM)	2,458	1,680
Hancock	1,018 (DEM)	5,143	4,125
Hardin	262 (DEM)	1,253	991
Henderson	1,509 (DEM)	2,704	1,195
Henry	7,746 (DEM)	15,965	8,219
Iroquois	559 (REP)	6,177	6,736
Jackson	10371 (DEM)	17,295	6,924
Jasper	627 (REP)	2,141	2,768
Jefferson	2,333 (DEM)	9,111	6,778
Jersey	1,845 (DEM)	5,670	3,825

JoDaviess	2,746 (DEM)	6,714	3,968
Johnson	164 (DEM)	2,781	2,617
Kane	48,786 (DEM)	101,105	52,319
Kankakee	13,550 (DEM)	28,164	14,614
Kendall	6,928 (DEM)	18,450	11,522
Knox	10,395 (DEM)	17,098	6,703
Lake	108,518 (DEM)	183,717	75,199
LaSalle	16,517 (DEM)	32,193	15,676
Lawrence	299 (DEM)	3,255	2,956
Lee	2,687 (DEM)	8,873	6,186
Livingston	1,961 (DEM)	8,474	6,513
Logan	1,428 (DEM)	6,945	5,517
Macon	12,218 (DEM)	30,729	18,511
Macoupin	7,477 (DEM)	14,423	6,946
Madison	37,777 (DEM)	77,208	39,431
Marion	3,989 (DEM)	10,088	6,099
Marshall	1,555 (DEM)	3,909	2,354
Mason	2,268 (DEM)	4,498	2,230
Massac	380 (REP)	3,309	3,689
McDonough	4,729 (DEM)	9,422	4,693
McHenry	33,716 (DEM)	76,652	42,936
McLean	17,987 (DEM)	43,027	25,040
Menard	1,076 (DEM)	3,529	2,453
Mercer	3,044 (DEM)	5,729	2,685
Monroe	3,061 (DEM)	9,150	6,089
Montgomery	3,825 (DEM)	7,903	4,078
Morgan	3,100 (DEM)	8,578	5,478
Moultrie	827 (DEM)	3,449	2,622
Ogle	2,991 (DEM)	12,903	9,912
Peoria	30,173 (DEM)	55,061	24,888
Perry	3,179 (DEM)	6,464	3,285
Piatt	1,152 (DEM)	4,548	3,396
Pike	314 (DEM)	3,887	3,573
Pope	191 (DEM)	1,211	1,020
Pulaski	612 (DEM)	1,749	1,137
Putnam	1,221 (DEM)	2,192	971
Randolph	4,048 (DEM)	9,009	4,961
Richland	1,137 (REP)	3,048	4,185
Rock Island	30,476 (DEM)	49,096	18,620
Saline	2,718 (DEM)	6,851	4,133
Sangamon	27,953 (DEM)	57,385	29,432
Schuyler	699 (DEM)	2,241	1,542
Scott	214 (DEM)	1,315	1,101
Shelby	738 (DEM)	5,364	4,626
St. Clair	41,159 (DEM)	74,447	33,288
Stark	603 (DEM)	1,722	1,119
Stephenson	4,362 (DEM)	12,244	7,882
Tazwell	13,103 (DEM)	36,058	22,955
Union	1,423 (DEM)	4,761	3,338
Vermilion	7,087 (DEM)	19,500	12,413
Wabash	706 (REP)	2,404	3,110

Warren	2,717 (DEM)	5,402	2,685
Washington	795 (DEM)	4,110	3,315
Wayne	1,296 (REP)	3,233	4,502
White	546 (DEM)	4,038	3,492
Whiteside	9,706 (DEM)	17,585	7,879
Will	90,105 (DEM)	162,891	72,786
Williamson	6,211 (DEM)	17,113	10,902
Winnebago	34,441 (DEM)	74,911	40,470
Woodford	754 (DEM)	9,304	8,550

TOTAL VOTE 3,597,456 1,390,690

Source: The Illinois State Board of Elections, Official Vote, November 2, 2004.

APPENDIX D

**PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT
OF THE UNITED STATES**

November 2, 2004

COUNTY	PLURALITY	DEM	REP
		KERRY EDWARDS	BUSH CHENEY
Adams	10,323 (REP)	10,511	20,834
Alexander	185 (DEM)	2,016	1,831
Bond	840 (REP)	3,228	4,068
Boone	2,846 (REP)	8,286	11,132
Brown	784 (REP)	895	1,679
Bureau	1861 (REP)	7,961	9,822
Calhoun	50 (DEM)	1,367	1,317
Carroll	997 (REP)	3,537	4,534
Cass	671 (REP)	2,492	3,163
Champaign	1,628 (DEM)	41,524	39,896
Christian	2,932 (REP)	6,112	9,044
Clark	2,205 (REP)	2,877	5,082
Clay	2,315 (REP)	2,101	4,416
Clinton	3,422 (REP)	6,797	10,219
Coles	3,449 (REP)	9,566	13,015
Cook	842,319 (DEM)	1,439,724	597,405
Crawford	2,889 (REP)	3,194	6,083
Cumberland	1,635 (REP)	1,862	3,497
DeKalb	1,832 (REP)	19,263	21,095
Dewitt	2,084 (REP)	2,836	4,920
Douglas	2,935 (REP)	2,767	5,702
DuPage	38,805 (REP)	180,097	218,902
Edgar	2,165 (REP)	3,093	5,258
Edwards	1,482 (REP)	930	2,412
Effingham	7,386 (REP)	4,388	11,774
Fayette	2,309 (REP)	3,571	5,880
Ford	2,599 (REP)	1,912	4,511
Franklin	1,572 (REP)	8,816	10,388
Fulton	1,262 (DEM)	9,080	7,818
Gallatin	46 (REP)	1,573	1,619
Greene	1,102 (REP)	2,457	3,559
Grundy	2,735 (REP)	8,463	11,198
Hamilton	839 (REP)	1,814	2,653
Hancock	1,862 (REP)	3,975	5,837
Hardin	578 (REP)	923	1,501
Henderson	412 (DEM)	2,269	1,857
Henry	1,335 (REP)	11,877	13,212
Iroquois	6,082 (REP)	3,832	9,914
Jackson	3,110 (DEM)	14,300	11,190
Jasper	1,748 (REP)	1,781	3,529
Jefferson	3,447 (REP)	6,713	10,160

Jersey	838 (REP)	4,597	5,435
JoDaviess	863 (REP)	5,311	6,174
Johnson	2,184 (REP)	1,813	3,997
Kane	18,252 (REP)	73,813	92,065
Kankakee	4,736 (REP)	20,003	24,739
Kendall	7,279 (REP)	12,497	19,776
Knox	2,292 (DEM)	13,403	11,111
Lake	4,729 (REP)	134,352	139,081
LaSalle	1,838 (REP)	24,263	26,101
Lawrence	1,644 (REP)	2,518	4,162
Lee	2,891 (REP)	6,416	9,307
Livingston	4,684 (REP)	5,632	10,316
Logan	4,839 (REP)	4,273	9,112
Macon	4,777 (REP)	23,341	28,118
Macoupin	220 (REP)	11,193	11,413
Madison	4,015 (DEM)	63,399	59,384
Marion	1,719 (REP)	7,694	9,413
Marshall	928 (REP)	2,806	3,734
Mason	692 (REP)	3,215	3,907
Massac	1,773 (REP)	2,805	4,578
McDonough	537 (REP)	7,119	7,656
McHenry	26,082 (REP)	50,330	76,412
McLean	11,399 (REP)	29,877	41,276
Menard	2,271 (REP)	2,137	4,408
Mercer	107 (DEM)	4,512	4,405
Monroe	2,680 (REP)	6,788	9,468
Montgomery	872 (REP)	5,979	6,851
Morgan	3,742 (REP)	5,650	9,392
Moultrie	1,640 (REP)	2,388	4,028
Ogle	5,900 (REP)	9,018	14,918
Peoria	70 (DEM)	41,121	41,051
Perry	819 (REP)	4,770	5,589
Piatt	2,268 (REP)	3,124	5,392
Pike	2,183 (REP)	2,849	5,032
Pope	582 (REP)	918	1,500
Pulaski	348 (REP)	1,372	1,720
Putnam	81 (DEM)	1,704	1,623
Randolph	1,305 (REP)	6,771	8,076
Richland	2,624 (REP)	2,529	5,153
Rock Island	10,217 (DEM)	39,880	29,663
Saline	2,360 (REP)	4,697	7,057
Sangamon	17,274 (REP)	38,630	55,904
Schuyler	809 (REP)	1,594	2,403
Scott	769 (REP)	927	1,696
Shelby	3,009 (REP)	3,744	6,753
St. Clair	12,207 (DEM)	62,410	50,203
Stark	652 (REP)	1,189	1,841
Stephenson	3,299 (REP)	8,913	12,212
Tazwell	10,244 (REP)	25,814	36,058
Union	1,598 (REP)	3,735	5,333
Vermilion	4,005 (REP)	14,726	18,731

Wabash	2,460 (REP)	1,752	4,212
Warren	536 (REP)	3,938	4,474
Washington	2,086 (REP)	2,986	5,072
Wayne	3,963 (REP)	2,139	6,102
White	2,109 (REP)	3,071	5,180
Whiteside	764 (DEM)	13,723	12,959
Will	13,556 (REP)	117,172	130,728
Williamson	6,401 (REP)	11,685	18,086
Winnebago	1,042 (REP)	59,740	60,782
Woodford	6,693 (REP)	6,005	12,698

TOTAL VOTE: 2,891,550 2,345,946

Source: Illinois State Board of Education, Official Vote, March 16, 2004.