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Abstract

The infusion of racial minorities into elected offices has had important ramifications for democracy and representation. Operating within a racist historical context, minority candidates have to overcome prejudicial notions that are deeply rooted in the conscious or subconscious minds of voters. Whether voters are able or willing to overlook racial cues imbedded in certain advertising spots has not yet been determined. Nevertheless, the extent to which these issues arise and become a part of the campaign discourse has serious implications for the type of representation that results. Our broader project, The Project on Race in Political Advertising, seeks to explore and explain the various ways in which race is used (and has been used) in televised political advertisements. This paper examines local print coverage of congressional contests form 2002 in which at least one candidate is a racial minority. Grounded in the framing media effects literature, this study reveals the way the media address racial components in these campaigns. We offer a descriptive qualitative analysis of media coverage in these contests in order to flesh out our theory of African American authentic appeals.

Introduction

In the last fifty years, race has been a central theme in American electoral politics. In the 1960s and 1970s, when African Americans and other racial minorities began making inroads into the formal political process, issues of inclusion and equal representation pursued through a largely unified front were paramount. In today’s political climate, issues of equal representation are still a priority for most minority groups; however, the political methods by which minorities strive to attain such equality are more varied and based on a more diverse array of ideological beliefs and issue positions.

Active research on the relationship between race and the political campaign process began in earnest following the 1988 presidential race where Willie Horton, the proxy candidate created by the Bush campaign, shaped much of the rhetoric surrounding the campaign and its candidates. Since this time, more systematic research has delved into the precise ways in which racialized communication in political campaigns is constructed, how it used and by whom, and what effects it has on voting behavior, on candidates, and on the landscape of racial representation.

Framing research regarding such issues has been employed to understand how voters process campaign communications and how those communications shape voters’ perceptions of candidates. However, as Valentino et al. (2002a, 2002b) appropriately
note, most research relies on white candidates and white voters as the target group of study, leaving much to be known about African American voters in general, and black candidates in particular.

Given this, we seek to add to the racial framing literature by providing a qualitative understanding of how the news media frame elections involving African American candidates and how African American candidates themselves frame their own image and election contests when running against other African Americans. In this regard, we propose, justify and descriptively categorize our theory of African American authentic appeals, which we argue is the dominant manner in which black candidates frame themselves and the election contests in which they are involved. To that end, we analyze news coverage of seven congressional races from the 2002 midterm elections, each of which were competitive elections primarily featuring black candidates.

Previous Work: Race, Representation & Framing

A wide variety of scholars have concluded that mass mediated forms of communication have a direct influence on racial attitudes, particularly on perceptions of people of color (Cottle, 2000; Hall, 1997; Kamalipour and Carilli, 1998; Rodriguez, 1997). It has been generally concluded that most mediated communication about racial minorities presents such individuals and groups (especially African Americans) in stereotypical ways (Chilsen, 1969), from associations of minorities with criminal behavior that is violent and threatening (Drago, 1992; Gibbons, 1993; Gray, 1996) to simple-minded caricatures (Cose, 1997; Gandy, 1998).

While not drawing a direct linkage between media images and their effects on perceptions of minority candidates, a second body of literature has demonstrated that whites’ perceptions of black candidates mirror many of those stereotypes allegedly played out in various mediated forms. For example, in a national survey studying white and black perceptions of black politicians’ electability, Williams (1990) found that most whites attributed characteristics such as “intelligent,” “a strong leader,” “knowledgeable,” “hard-working,” “gets things done,” “experienced,” and “trustworthy” more often to white candidates than to black candidates. Terkildsen (1993) also found that whites, particularly those who harbor some racial prejudice, tend to evaluate black candidates more negatively than white candidates. Terkildsen further concluded that black candidates’ skin color had a significant effect on the evaluation of his or her competence, such that the darker-skinned candidates are evaluated more harshly.

Framing

Scholars who seek to link conclusions from these two bodies of literature have employed notions of framing (see Gitlin, 1980; Kinder & Sanders 1996; Manoff, 1986; Popkin, 1993) as a way to make the connection between media representations of minorities in the political arena and public attitudes about minority candidates and “minority issues.” William Jacoby (2000) writes that “framing effects occur when different presentations of an issue generate different reactions among those who are exposed to that issue” (p. 751). Cognitive psychologists have conducted research on the
effects of differing contextualizations on attitudes and decision-making (Kahneman and Tversky, 1979, 1982, 1984; Tversky and Kahneman, 1981), concluding, in part, that individuals process information differently depending on the employed frame, and that this difference in information processing leads to observable and expected differences in actions taken or choices preferred.

Research on racial framing in political contexts has emphasized the way that the news media contextualize a particular campaign as “racial” (generally when a minority candidate is involved) (Clay, 1996; Reeves, 1997), or frame a particular minority candidate in a given election contest. Such case studies have provided a variety of insights into how such frames are imposed. For example, Gibbons (1993) demonstrates how the spatial association of news stories worked to frame the image of Jesse Jackson as devious and criminal during his 1988 presidential campaign by routinely placing his photograph and accompanying news story adjacent to one or more stories about criminal violence. The framing of issues and candidate image in these ways is accomplished through a variety of sources including candidates, members of the news media, and other third-party mediators such as political pundits, scholarly analysts and the like. This body of research adds to the previous by injecting the possibility that mass media, in addition to individual prejudices and ideological positions, may influence voting behavior.

Racial Frames and the Role of Mass Media

Mendelberg (2001) demonstrates that racial frames can be imposed on a given race by either the candidates themselves, the parties, or the news media. Additionally, she maintains that race can be used to frame campaigns in which none of the candidates is a member of racial minority groups. In focusing on how race gets injected into and framed by these various entities in campaigns involving only white candidates, her conclusions about news framing are necessarily limited to how they respond to an implicitly or explicitly racial message emanating from a candidate or the party with whom she or he is affiliated. Mendelberg’s primary case study is the Bush-Dukakis presidential race in 1988. She explains that the news media’s framing of the campaign took a racial turn only after the airing of the Willie Horton ad, and then only after a third party – Jesse Jackson – began to explicitly discuss the racial nature of the ad. After engaging publicly and on an explicit level about race in this case, the news media, she describes, imposed a frame on the race that centered on criminal justice, negative campaigning and race. She argues that the news media was not the source of the racial message, nor the primary antagonist of the Bush campaign on the racial matter. The media coverage, then, opens the possibility that the media themselves could redouble the implicitly racial message of the Horton ad in coverage of this aspect of the race.

Discussing the same campaign, Jamieson (1992) emphasizes the crime frame in which much of the media focused their coverage, arguing that the Horton ad was framed as “news,” and thus became “newsworthy.” In this context the media’s interest, at least the beginning, was in the dramatic elements of the narrative of the Horton story, which included protagonists, antagonists, conflicts, heroes and resolutions. This narrative, she says, was necessarily repeated to provide a context for the flurry of sound bytes that mentioned Horton or the presidential campaign.
Neither Jamieson nor Mendelberg discuss with any depth the way in which news framing occurs within campaigns where one of the candidates is a racial minority, however. Jamieson’s analysis of the Helms-Gantt 1990 senate race focuses solely on the visual racial cues from the various ads circulated by the campaigns. Mendelberg does mention the Gantt contest and several other campaigns that included minorities (such as J.C. Watts in 1994, for example) and whose campaigns featured some implicit or explicit use of racial messages, but these were not a focus of her study.

Terkildsen and Damore (1999), however, fill this gap in the literature by conducting a systematic analysis of these phenomena. They argue that news media generally frame biracial elections in a dual manner. They either arbitrate the degree of racial emphasis in a campaign (Jones & Clemons, 1993), or emphasize race through repetitious mentions of the minority candidate’s racial group status. (This can be accomplished by direct statements such as, “Candidate A is the first black…,” or by using a photograph of the minority candidate, for example). Media may, however, do both. That is, Terkildsen and Damore argue that news media may work to suppress the use of race by the candidates themselves, while at the same time emphasizing the race of the minority candidate and issues related to minority group constituencies (by emphasizing the racial composition of the district, for example). As Reeves (1997) and Traugott, Price and Czilli (1993) suggest, the media set a racially-competitive tone for elections as a way to further the way in which news gets done in today’s climate; that is, they enact a sense of drama, as noted by Jamieson (1992).

Why is it important to understand how news framing of campaigns including racial minorities mirror or differ from those in which race emanates from campaigns involving only white candidates? We contend that the very presence of a racial minority in an election places race as a central issue of the campaign. This is especially true when minority candidates run against white candidates in a majority-white district. The existence of a black candidate in such a situation is a break from the norm in American politics; the candidate’s minority group affiliation makes it an inherently “newsworthy” event. This is to say that news media are compelled to some degree to invoke race as a primary actor in the campaign, and therefore have the potential to be on equal footing as the candidates in determining what the public will know about the candidates involved.

There is a different set of circumstances to consider in majority-minority districts, however. In these contests, it is not out of the ordinary to have one or more African American candidates running for a given office. For this study, we intended to compare racial frames (as captured in news reports) in majority-white districts against those used in majority-minority districts. After determining which races involving African Americans were competitive, however, we found that they overwhelmingly included candidates and opponents who were both African American. Accordingly, this study examines election contexts where both candidates were black, as we elaborate our theory of African American authentic appeals.

**African American Authentic Appeals**

The primary purpose of this paper is to flesh out our theory of African American authentic appeals. This theory seeks to explain the manner in which racial messages are
used by African American candidates when more than one candidate in an election is black, whether these be contests in majority-white or majority-minority districts. We assert that this form of appeal exerts itself as a frame for election contests that are competitive and ideologically diverse (with respect to the candidates and members of the voting district). Further, this frame may be used by candidates themselves, the media, or other third-party entities. In this paper, we look at competitive contests (defined below) where a black member of Congress held the seat during the 107th Congress (2001-2003).

Investigating this particular framing strategy is justified given recent shifting trends among the voting populations and candidate entries among African Americans and other minorities. One recent shift is the general dramatic increase of the minority population in the U.S. (especially Latino; see Hero and Tolbert, 1995). Another is the increase in minorities elected to local and state offices (Bositis, 2002).

A third relatively recent shift involves the growing ideological diversity within African American communities that increases the propensity for black versus black general elections within majority-minority districts to be competitive. Such diversity is expressed in a number of factors, including: the non-racial types of policy issues that blacks say concern them; the increasing numbers of blacks self-identifying as either Independents or Republicans (whose numbers increased 150% between 2000 and 2002); and the changing view of what black leadership means (Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies National Opinion Survey 2002, cited in Myers, Pritchett and Kennedy, 2003). Though as a whole the vast majority of black voters are still registered Democrats and/or vote for Democratic Party candidates, this growing diversity is likely to change the degree of competitiveness among candidates vying for seats in majority-black districts, which, up to this point, has generally not been the case (Gerber, 1996). In this scenario, then, blacks will be targeted with a wider range of candidate messages aimed at a greater diversity of attitudes and policy issues. Black voters would increasingly have to make difficult choices about the candidate they vote for and, we believe, such messages will take the form of appeals to racial (in this case, African American) authenticity.

These trends, taken together, lead one to expect that federal election contests in non-majority black districts will increasingly involve minority candidates. However, nearly all black members of Congress have come from districts that are composed of a majority of black (or a combination of black and other minority groups) constituents (so-called “majority-minority districts”) (Lublin, 1995, p. 125, note 5). While the value of these districts to secure adequate representation for the black community is debatable (see Benoit & Shepsle, 1995; Guinier, 1995; Handley, Groffman & Arden, 1994; King, Bruce & Gelman, 1995; Lublin, 1995), their existence typifies the reality of black representation in Congress to date. Understanding the dynamics of voting behavior within such districts, then, is an important, but neglected, aspect of political psychology and political communication.

Very little is known about how and why African Americans make voting decisions generally, or how they respond to political messages and frames more specifically, because blacks have generally been seen as a monolithic voting bloc. But this is an increasingly incorrect assumption (Morris, Roberts & Baker, 1999). Accordingly, at least two significant psychological factors may have a bearing on blacks’ voting decisions: racial group identification and political ideology (which also relates to views about appropriate methods of political strategy). Black candidates running in
majority-black districts, we expect, will increasingly frame the elections through appeals to racial authenticity, which draw on these two factors for their persuasive success. We also expect that this framing strategy will also influence the type of racial frames that the media and other parties ultimately provide as a lens through which to interpret the communication in the race.

Black Identity Politics

The social psychology and political psychology literature on group identification is too voluminous to replicate here. (For an excellent review, see Huddy, 2001.) We limit our discussion to those works that have directly addressed the concept of black identity (generally) and black political identity formation. In a fairly recent assessment, Smith (1990) observes that black politics are degenerating because of the decreasing fidelity to which black politicians (and blacks in general) have, in the absence of a highly racially-charged atmosphere (as compared to the 1960s and 1970s), devoted themselves to race-based politics. Characterizing the results of such a trend, Smith states that “[l]ike the transformations of black music, it will be a hollow victory if in order to achieve equitable descriptive-symbolic representation blacks are required to sacrifice their substantive policy agendas” (p. 161).

Such attitudes about black identity, ideology and social action have arisen from the history of American culture that has necessitated the following: (a) the development of psychological beliefs about the self to combat double-consciousness; (b) black political solidarity to gain power and legitimacy in fighting anti-black sentiment and power; and consequently (c) the entanglement of race with specific political issues (or ideologies). The literature firmly supports the breadth and depth with which ideas about individual identity generally, and black identity in particular, contribute to African Americans’ cognitive processing of political information and decision-making (Allen, Dawson & Brown, 1989; Gandy, 2001).

Black psychology emerged in the 1960s as a response to what was seen as a bias towards white models of psychology. The standard form of psychology, already preoccupied with notions of individual personality, was amended by black psychologists who posited the need for the development of “authentic” black identities to counteract blacks’ internalized hatred of themselves given white perceptions of them (Akbar, 1984; Hall, Cross & Freedle, 1972; White, 1972). This concept of what would constitute a “healthy” sense of self for the black individual has persisted to this day as a necessary condition for proper psychological functioning (Cross, 1991; Grossman, Wirt & Davids, 1985; Phinney, 1990; Shelby, 2002; Thompson, 1999; 2001).

Where black identity development was the individual psychological response to the problem of racism, the notion of black solidarity (group identity) became, around the same time, the group political response. It was suggested that in order to gain the political agency necessary to redress problems associated with America’s racist past, blacks would need to band together under a common banner of identity and political strategy to attain gains in the political and socioeconomic contexts of the day (Clay, 1996; Smith, 1990).

The necessary final step in this process of African American socialization was the entanglement and association by blacks with a particular political ideology, which
includes both their stances on particular “racial” and “non-racial” policy issues, as well as with political party alliances (Glaser, 1995). Although African American political alliances still strongly favor the Democratic Party, blacks’ and whites’ issue concerns have largely converged. A recent poll reveals that the economy, world affairs and terrorism were the top three concerns for both blacks and whites, and that the number of blacks self-identifying with the Democratic Party decreased almost 24% between 2000 and 2002 (Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies, National Opinion Survey 2002, cited in Myers, Pritchett and Kennedy, 2003). Further, there is growing support for what have been seen as “conservative” or Republican issue positions: favoring school vouchers, Social Security Investment Accounts, and President Bush’s faith-based initiatives (Myers, Pritchett and Kennedy, 2003). Diversity on these issues carries with it the potential for black candidates to face off in general elections, as well as in Democratic primary elections, thus increasing the potential ideological differences between candidates.

In summary, it is reasonable to expect that African Americans’ voting decisions will be heavily influenced by the following factors: the degree to which African Americans strongly identify themselves individually to a racial group, and the degree to which they identify with members of the larger racial group; their political ideology; and strategies to realize political goals (all of which also vary with other demographic factors such as age, income and residential setting [see Cohen & Dawson (1993); Bledsoe et al. (1995)]). As Morris, Roberts and Baker (1999) point out, however, these factors are largely out of one’s control at the moment when one is making a voting decision. What can be controlled and varied significantly are the kinds of messages candidates use to persuade voters. Given the cultural foundations that produce African Americans’ individual attitudes and beliefs about normative political practice, the form of racial appeals and frames used by candidates will seek to prime black voters’ sense of authenticity in relation to the attitudes outlined above (see Bledsoe et al., 1995; Cross, 1991; Davis & Davenport, 1997; Kinder & Winter, 2001; “Social Science and the Citizen,” 2001).

As a necessary first step to substantiating this theory, this paper seeks to find evidence for and categorize the general forms of racial frames particularly used by the media and other non-candidate related spokespersons in elections between African American candidates. More important, we examine the different categories or varying ways in which frames of racial authenticity are articulated by candidates, as well as the ways they are either substantiated or criticized in other frames used by the media and others to communicate to the public about the election contest.

**African Americans and the 2002 Congressional Election Cycle**

**Data Collection**

We examine news reports of these election contests for several reasons. Pragmatically, the local papers are the only available source of information for the study of candidate messages since other material such as advertisements, press releases and other such communications may no longer exist or would be very difficult to obtain. (We
recognize this as a potential limitation; ideally, such communications would offer us more in terms of understanding how candidates make use of racial frames in general, and the authenticity frame in particular.) Additionally, however, news reports provide more plentiful data since television ads are fewer in number in U.S. House races than they are in U.S. Senate or presidential races. Finally newspapers are the primary link between campaigns and voters. The media report in order to inform the public about the candidates and issues of a campaign, and candidates rely largely on the news media to communicate their own messages. In this vein, newspapers are more likely to be an outlet for such communications than television news. Thus, we relied on newspaper accounts of the races in question as the principal source of ascertaining candidate-sponsored messages, as well as the way that reporters and other parties weigh in on these election contests.

Election campaigns from 2002 provide a unique opportunity to explore the dimensions of the theory discussed above. First, since the theory focuses on African American candidates in both primary and general elections, it is necessary to have both types of contests to examine. There were several black Republicans who ran (and lost) against black Democrats in 2002. Most past research on African American voting behavior and campaign messages has tended to focus on general election contests, which ignore the key point of competitiveness with majority-black election contests—the Democratic Party primary. Accordingly, we capture the most competitive races between black candidates, whether that competitiveness occurred in a general or primary election.

Second, the 2002 elections were perhaps indicative of what we see as the growing trend in minority-involved elections, and serve as a valid template for assessing future behavior in these contexts. That is, the 2002 elections give the following different campaign scenarios: blacks against whites in general elections; blacks against blacks in general elections; blacks against blacks in primary contests; blacks against blacks in majority-minority districts; and blacks against blacks in non-majority black districts. This plethora of dynamics have heretofore not occurred within the context of a given election cycle in a scenario in which the races were competitive.

The anomalies of the 2002 elections should be noted, as well. First, since we only examine one year, and it is a midterm election, we cannot ascertain the effect (or lack thereof) of having no presidential contest at the top of the ballot. Second, this was the first national election cycle after the widely disseminated allegations of racial discrimination in Florida, Missouri and elsewhere during the November elections in 2000. We do not suspect that these unique characteristics offset the benefits of examining the 2002 elections, nor do we anticipate that any other single-year study would have fewer anomalous characteristics.

Expectations

Our expectations of the data in our analysis follow from conclusions drawn from Terkildsen and Damore (1999) and other case studies of news framing and race cited in our review of literature, as well as from our elaboration of our theory of authentic appeals. We expect that candidates, members of the news media, and members of third-party groups will all employ a racial frame for the contest generally. We also expect to see several distinct ways in which candidates will employ the racial authenticity frame,
and how members of the media and third-party groups either contribute to the sustenance of this frame or call attention to and criticize a candidate’s use of race in this manner. The purpose of the following analysis, then, is to descriptively categorize and elaborate the various general racial frames used by the media and other third parties to discuss these election contests, to categorize the various layers of the authentic appeal frame as used by candidates, and to describe the manner in which the media and third parties add to or contradict such frames.

**Selected Contests**

While there were no competitive black candidates for the U.S. Senate in 2002, there were at least thirty-eight U.S. House district elections that featured at least one African American candidate in 2002. We chose to focus on the most competitive races, defined as those in which the eventual winner garnered 60 percent of the vote or less in either the primary or the general election. This yielded seven House Districts: Alabama 7, Florida 3, Georgia 4 and 13, Indiana 7, Mississippi 2 and North Carolina 1. A profile of these contests appears in Appendix A.

We searched the Lexis-Nexis (Academic Universe) news database for local newspaper coverage of the races in question. We supplied the name of the incumbent candidate in each race, or, in the case of an open seat, the candidate who won that election, to drive the search. This method insured inclusion of all primary and general election candidates involved in the contest, as well as all stories focusing specifically on the campaign from January 1 to November 5, 2002 (which was Election Day). As a secondary way to check the comprehensiveness of stories, we also used the search terms “election,” “congressional or senate race,” or the congressional district. A listing of newspapers searched appears in Appendix B. After weeding out stories that mentioned the candidates only in passing, we read and coded each story for racial content. As a basis upon which to begin our process of categorizing and analyzing the variety of types of racial frames used throughout the course of the elections, we noted whether the racial content was implicit or explicit, and whether the content appeared to be generated by one of the candidates, a third-party (pundit) or the writer of the story (journalist).

**General Racial News Frames**

The first set of frames employed throughout the contests in question are the general frames used typically by members of the news media to shape such contests as being essentially racial in nature. Several forms of this frame were apparent and, at times, statements by pundits and scholarly analysts are joined with the news reports to buttress the particular frame used. This is to say, when such quotes are mentioned, they generally are expressed along the same dimensions as that of the reporter.

**Racial Identification Frame**

The use of this frame is consistent with Terkildsen & Damore’s (1999) findings that demonstrate how reporters frame a campaign involving an African American
candidate as racial by pointing out the racial aspects of the candidate(s), the makeup of
the district, or by highlighting racial issues not related to the campaign – that is, as
contextual evidence in the absence of any such mention by the candidates or other third
parties involved in the present race.

Introducing race into the voter’s mind can be as simple as showing a picture of
the candidate or candidates, or noting his or her race directly in the text of the story. A
prime example of the latter is a September 10 story about the North Carolina 1st District
race by the Associated Press, which directly noted that candidates “[Frank] Ballance,
[Janice McKenzie] Cole and [Christine] Fitch are black; [Sam] Davis is white.”

Similarly, in a September 1 article, Gary D. Robertson of the Associated Press noted in
the second paragraph that retiring Congresswoman Eva Clayton was “the first black
woman the state has ever sent to Congress,” and that she represented a “black majority
district.” He went on to reveal that three of the challengers in the primary “come from
locally known black families,” and that “Sam Davis, who is white, could be the
beneficiary should the other candidates fracture the black vote…”

Some coverage reflected purposeful infusions of race by journalists, as
exemplified by a July 27 story about Georgia’s 4th District primary contest by AP writer
Jeffrey McMurray. He recalled a comment by Congresswoman McKinney from 2000:
“she accused Al Gore of having a low ‘Negro tolerance level,’ and a rule that he be
accompanied by no more than one black Secret Service Agent. She later retracted the
statement, saying that it was from a draft not intended for public distribution.” Since
McKinney made this statement two years previous and in a different context, there is no
objective reason to include it in the story. The frame that is generated as a result helps to
define McKinney in terms of her attitudes about race.

Identifying the race of the candidates is the most direct way to discuss racial
implications of an election contest, but since the overwhelming of African American
members of Congress have come from majority-minority districts, a discussion of the
district’s racial composition can serve as a proxy.

The contest for North Carolina’s 1st District had few racial stories, and nearly all
of them focused on the demographics of the district and the related fact of retiring
Congresswoman Eva Clayton’s race. For instance, a November 5 article by the
Associated Press noted that “Democratic Sen. Frank Ballance of Warrenton was the
favorite in the majority-black district against Republican Greg Dority of Washington. . .”
The story went on to note that “the winner will replace Clayton, who in 1992 became the
first black woman ever elected to the House of Representatives from North Carolina.
Clayton has endorsed Ballance, who is black and is a law partner of her husband’s.”

Associated Press writer Kristen Wyatt, in a July 6 article, called attention to the
fact that Georgia’s 13th district “snakes through heavily black south Fulton and Clayton
counties.” She noted that “more than 50 percent of the district’s residents are black or
Hispanic.” An August 10 article about the primary contest in Georgia’s 4th District by
AP writer Dick Pettys states it directly: “Both are black women in a district just east of
Atlanta that is primarily black.”

Since the 2002 elections were the first congressional elections after
reapportionment and redistricting associated with the 2000 census, much coverage
(especially early in the year) centered on the profile of newly-created districts. The
headline of a February 5 article on Mississippi’s 2nd District contest by AP writer Emlly
Wagster reads: “Thompson Aide Says Federal Plan Hurts Black Voters.” The story begins:

Federal judges’ congressional district proposal would limit black voters’ influence in a new central district, says an aide to U.S. Rep. Bennie Thompson, D-Miss. Thompson, Mississippi’s only black congressman, is asking the U.S. Justice Department to approve a competing state court redistricting plan that has a higher black voting age population in the central district.

The story contains specific percentages of black voters in some of Mississippi’s congressional districts.

It is no surprise that there was ample discussion of redistricting in Georgia, especially with regard to the 4th District. A January 23 article by Ben Smith of The Atlanta Journal-Constitution on Denise Majette’s pending announcement that she would challenge incumbent Cynthia McKinney in the primary contest for Georgia’s 4th District outlined the racial demographics of the district:

The last time McKinney faced a primary challenger was in 1996 when McKinney, then the 11th District representative, took on three white men for the 4th District, after the courts forced Georgia to redraw its congressional map. . . . Majette would be the first black women to challenge McKinney from within her own party. Often controversial, McKinney has strong support in much of African-American south DeKalb. Much of her opposition comes from the county’s predominately white Northside, where critics says she has been unresponsive to their needs.

Cynthia Tucker wrote an editorial in the August 25 issue of The Atlanta Journal-Constitution that, while outwardly critical of McKinney, focused the critique squarely on the basis of the district’s racial composition. She claimed that Cynthia McKinney “is a poor representative of a district that is home to a large enclave of economically successful, mainstream African-American voters.” She pointed to “a new generation of black political leaders – moderate, pragmatic, consensus-builders. . .”

A final way that the racial identification frame may be used is when members of the press call attention to people outside of the campaign with whom a candidate associates. In the contest for Georgia’s 13th Congressional District there were few racial messages, but reporters were able to suggest Congressman David Scott’s race by proxy. In an October 10 article in The Atlanta Journal-Constitution, for example, writer Henry Farber noted that Scott “is known for his interstate billboards, TV spots featuring brother-in-law Hank Aaron and his weekend door-to-door introductions.” AP writer Russ Bynum similarly noted Scott’s famous endorsements in an August 21 story, noting that Scott touted “celebrity support from the likes of home-run king Hank Aaron and former heavyweight champ Evander Holyfield.”

While the racial identification frame is perhaps most prevalent in these races, and most common in election in general among biracial contests, several other variations of racial frames are employed a number of times throughout the 2002 contests and are
stimulated more particularly by the novelty of the competitive nature of these races where the candidates are both black.

**Competitive Value Frame**

This frame, most often used by pundits, news editorialists and academics, seeks to use race as a basis for commenting on the value of competition in black vs. black campaigns. Rather than focusing on specific issues among either of the candidates, this frame expresses the historical lack of competition and the positive value of such in uniracial contests. In rare instances with this these data, this frame was used by candidates themselves. In such cases, it seems that the import in its use may be linked to strategy to shift the authentic identity frame (discussed below) to one of expanded choice for African Americans.

Like other contests mentioned above, some of the more explicit uses of this frame in the Alabama race came from political pundits and analysts. In a June 27 article in the *Birmingham News*, for example, Vicki McClure and Tom Gordon write that Artur Davis’s win over incumbent Earl Hilliard “signaled an end to the dominance that black political machines have exerted over who represents the black community.” Alabama A&M professor Ron Slaughter: “the perception of the black community as a monolithic voting block is changing. . . . As the community becomes more comfortable with the process, people are becoming more independent. . . . People are challenging others and are voting for people not just because of their race, but because of the issues.” Perry County Commissioner Albert Turner, Jr. said, “The day of who’s the blackest is over. It’s about production now.” A *Birmingham News* editorial of June 27 argues, “Earl Hilliard and [local political boss Joe] Reed symbolize the past in black politics, when endorsements by political machines meant everything. Tuesday showed that the days of those machines controlling the electorate are long gone.” Local activist Donald Watkins referred to the election as a signal of a “maturing of the black electorate.”

**Layers of African American Authenticity Frame**

As noted above, the African American authentic appeals frame is found when two black candidates run against one another in a majority-minority district, and at least one of them claims that he or she is a “better” representative for the black community than his or her opponent. Our analysis reveals five distinct variations of the authentic appeal frame. The following paragraphs describe each frame and provide several examples as used by candidates, reporters (and news editorialists), and third-party representatives such as pundits, academics, and party officials. It is the case with every frame other than the final one that when it is exerted by candidates, it is generally repeated in much the same way by the media or by pundits and other analysts.

**Physical Authenticity**

One way of expressing the authentic appeal frame is to make implicit or explicit references to the physical, racial features of a candidate, opponent or third party to which
one or the other is associated. This differs from a reporters’ objective mention of the race of a candidate or constituents of a particular district in the motivation behind its use. Such a frame is generally employed by a candidate or third-party and is offered as a valutative basis for comparison. The frame may be used to highlight one’s own racial features or to associate one’s opponent with a member of a racial group considered to be in opposition to one’s own racial group.

Indiana’s 7th District was quiet on the issue of race overall, but in a July 29 article by Peter Schnitzler of the Indianapolis Business Journal, Congresswoman Julia Carson was quoted as saying, “The people that I rely on to return me to Congress time after time don’t have their photos on dollar bills.” This quote was in the context of a discussion of fundraising, but the imagery of white American leaders on currency can be considered code for race and seen as signaling Carson’s assertion that she was more authentic because she did not resemble, nor does she say she associates with or represents, people who look like those on the dollar bill – white people.

The primary race for Georgia’s 4th District contained mostly explicit uses of the authentic appeal frame in this matter. For example, AP writer Patricia M. LaHay, in a story about a McKinney radio advertisement, relays the text of the ad in question: “Abuse of power is sometimes an angry, out-of-control cop beating up a teenager in California. Sometimes it’s an angry, out-of-control judge like Denise Majette.” LaHay reported that McKinney defended the ad as accurate, as it “targets the judicial record that her opponent has touted in her own ads.” While there is no direct mention of the race of either the police officer or the teenager, there had been considerable media attention of the event, including videotape of the incident that clearly identified the race of both. Advertising professor Ruthann Lariscy of the University of Georgia is quoted as saying that “the ads will likely evoke an especially strong response. . . because they implicitly compare Majette to the Inglewood, Calif., police officer who was videotaped slamming a handcuffed teenager onto the hood of a car and then punching him.” Lariscy went on to say that “this campaign is particularly interesting because we’ve got two black women, so there’s no race card, there’s no gender card.” But Lariscy is clearly mistaken. The “race card,” as we have shown elsewhere (McIlwain & Caliendo, 2002), can be (and is) used by candidates of any and all racial backgrounds. Mendelberg (2001) has argued, and we have demonstrated with experimental research (Caliendo, McIlwain & Kajala, 2003), that racial code words or imagery are more effective than direct racial language in triggering racial predispositions among potential voters.

More pointed uses of this frame were used in the Alabama race. When the Hilliard campaign launched a controversial television advertisement in mid-June, it started a week-long daily exchange between the candidates in the Birmingham News. A June 19 “ad watch” article first reported the specifics of the ad:

“Are you for sale? Artur Davis thinks so. The price? $270,000 – from 290 people and businesses in New York; 63 checks form New Jersey and California; money from Connecticut, New Hampshire and Maryland; money from Republicans who support George Bush. A huge fortune. Are you for sale? Artur Davis says this is laughable. A vote for Artur Davis isn’t funny. It’s an auction. Sold!” The ad shows the face of a white businessman, who is smoking a cigar and lighting a $100 bill afire, transforming into that of Artur Davis.
Two days following this, Mary Orndorff of the News wrote about Hilliard supporter Rev. Walter Fauntroy’s comments regarding Davis’s fundraising from pro-Israeli groups: “They send money to this boy. Excuse me, I know, but I had to say it because that’s what he is. New York already has 31 members of Congress. Why do they need to buy another one in the Black Belt?”

Then on June 24, a Birmingham News story by Vicki McClure and Mary Orndorff relayed joking comments by Davis supporter Bishop Earnest L. Palmer about Davis’s Ivy League education: “That is why his accent is so messed up. But he’s from Montgomery, Alabama.” McClure and Orndorff report that Davis was critical of Hilliard for “running television ads and mounting attacks against him that have attempted to divide ‘black against black.’ ‘I don’t have to use bigotry to win an election,’ [Davis] told [a] congregation [at Lily Baptist Church].”

Party Authenticity

This frame highlights one’s authenticity by referring to his or her own party affiliation as a basis of comparison or by attacking the party affiliation of one’s opponent. Most often these take the form of Democratic Party candidates attacking black Republicans in order to signify the opponent’s existence as a historical aberration, or as a basis of attacking his or her affiliation with “Republican” issues – that is, their “Republican-ness.”

A June 12 story in the Birmingham News by Vicki McClure and Mary Orndorff highlights the use of partisanship attacks to stand in for race: “The question of who is the authentic Democrat, and by implication, who is the true black candidate, carries significant connotations in Alabama’s only black-majority congressional district, political observers said. ‘Republican definitely equals white’ in the district,” said William H. Stewart, professor emeritus of political science at the University of Alabama. “And if you say a candidate is a Republican, then you are saying he is not a genuine representative of the black community.” In the same article, challenger Artur Davis is quoted as saying, “This has been an underground smear campaign. I think it is meant to have some racial implications and to mislead voters in the district. At the end of the day, voters will reject a campaign of code words and innuendo.”

As noted above, the inclusion of black Republican candidates is an emerging phenomenon in black electoral politics. The headline in a June 8 Associated Press story on the contest in Mississippi’s 2nd District reads: “For Thompson, Being Opposed by Black Republican is a Déjà vu Already Seen.” The first sentence of the story reads as follows: “U.S. Rep. Bennie Thompson heads into the general election campaign facing the rarest of rare in Mississippi – a black Republican.” The story notes that Thompson also faced black Republican challengers in 1994 and 1996. Mary Coleman of Jackson State University is reported as expecting the 2002 Republican challenger, Clinton LeSueur, to “play up his native roots... while fighting a perception that he is not his own man but a proxy for white Republicans.” In a May 31 article about this contest, AP writer Emily Wagster reports that Republican primary candidate Charlotte Reeves was upset that former national GOP chair Haley Barbour, in a letter to voters, claimed that the state legislature “drew [the 2nd District] to elect an African-American candidate,” and
therefore endorsed Clinton LeSuer, who is black. Reeves is reported to have said that it is unfair to discount her just because she’s white: “We have tried white men to beat Bennie Thompson, we have tried black men to beat Bennie Thompson and neither can do it . . . But we have never tried a white woman to beat him.”

An October 12 story by Rich Tucker in the (Jacksonville) Florida Times-Union notes that Republican challenger Jennifer Carroll has been warned by Republican leaders about running against Corrine Brown for the state’s 3rd congressional district. Tucker reports, however, that Carroll, who ran against Brown in 2000, as well, would receive the maximum financial support from the Black America’s Political Action Committee. Similarly, in a July 9 front-page article about this race in the (Jacksonville) Florida Times-Union by Matthew I. Pinzur, Republican leader Tom Slade said, “With [Oklahoma Congressman] J.C. Watts getting out, the Republicans are desperate to have an African-American in Congress flying their banner, and [Carroll] would instantaneously become a national political heroine that would bring enormous prestige to the people she would be representing.”

Issue Authenticity

In this aspect of the frame, one candidate emphasizes his or her stance as being in line with traditional norms of black political ideology. Closely linked to the former aspect of the authentic appeal frame, this one purports a clear division between descriptively “black” and “non-black” issues and a normatively directional or “correct” (as per tradition) position on such issues. As seen in the descriptions of use of the previous frame, the party frame is used often by members of the press and others because of its relative novelty, and thus its assumed newsworthiness. The issue authenticity frame, as expressed by candidates especially, is often used as a proxy for the party frame. This is to say that one candidate’s statement is less authentic because of his or her stand on a particular issue. In many cases, this signals identification with the Republican (the “less authentic”) party. One reason for using this frame rather than the party frame is that it allows one to talk directly about an issue without insinuating that there is something necessarily bad about blacks having a broader choice of candidates, or that blacks should give blind loyalty to the Democratic party. Such sentiments are becoming increasingly unpopular in African American circles, and the employment of this frame could have negative consequences for the candidate who uses it.

In contests such as Georgia’s 13th, where racial tensions were decidedly lower than in Georgia’s 4th or Alabama’s 7th, the explicit use of race by candidates or journalists was not only quantitatively fewer, but qualitatively less forceful. An August 22 article by Tom Baxter in The Atlanta Journal-Constitution reveals that “the item that seemed to work best for [Congressman David Scott] in this race, he said, was his fight to allow a devotional moment of silence in schools – an issue that connected with conservative whites as well as blacks. He predicted voters will increasingly be crossing party and racial lines to express their preferences, as so many in Georgia did Tuesday.”

On August 21, Associated Press writer Kristen Wyatt noted that the race for Georgia’s 4th District was “heated from the start. [Incumbent Cynthia] McKinney has accused [challenger Denise] Majette of opposing affirmative action and ‘selling out’ to the Republicans. Both are black women and liberals, but Majette is considered more
moderate than McKinney.”

**Historical Authenticity**

This aspect of the authentic frame is used by making general references to one’s historical place as a candidate or officeholder. Such appeals seek to implicitly connect a present candidate with other “racial record-breakers.” Many such historical figures accomplished their feats further back in history, during a time when one might claim more easily that African Americans were more monolithic than they are now. This is done to make a connection with a figure from a past in which black people had to emphasize their racial solidarity around political ideologies and issues.

In a number of cases, a candidate addressed race directly and with a celebratory and historically aware tone. Congresswoman Corrine Brown, in a November 3 profile of candidates in the (Jacksonville) *Florida Times-Union*, is quoted as saying, for example, “For me, it’s an honor to be able to serve Florida’s Third District, particularly since I am one of the first African-Americans to serve Florida in 129 years.”

In another example expressed in a May 23 story in the *Birmingham News* about the Alabama race, Mary Orndorff writes: “[Hilliard’s] blackness, relative to that of his closest challenger [Davis], is a part of his campaign discourse. Hilliard, old enough to have marched with civil rights leaders in the heart of the movement, faults Artur Davis not for his youth, but for what he says is a resume shy on work with groups such as the NAACP and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. ‘Which one of us has served the interests of the black community?’ Hilliard asks.”

This historical authenticity is sometimes invoked by associating oneself with living figures from that era, and by having such people speak on one’s behalf. For example, one of the most strongly-stated comments in the Alabama campaign came not from Hilliard or Davis directly, but from Reverend Al Sharpton. Mary Orndorff of the *Birmingham News* reported on June 21 that Sharpton, at a campaign stop for Earl Hilliard, said of Davis, “The new challenge is to try and buy leadership and to have money come in and use people that look like us but that are not for us. Everybody that is our color is not our kind. . . . It seems that there are those who want to impose their will and call it new black leadership when really it is old leadership with black faces on it. It is more a face-lift of manipulation than an example of democracy.”

**Race Card Accusation**

This frame mirrors the dynamics discussed by Mendelberg (2001). It emerges when a particular statement by a candidate in any form of communication is interpreted as using race as an appeal to gain some competitive advantage. With biracial contests, when a black candidate running against another black candidate invokes one aspect of the aforementioned variations of the racial authenticity frame, it either goes unnoticed or is recognized and responded to as primarily “negative” and “divisive.” The reason for a candidate to invoke an authentic appeal frame is clear. However, calling attention to that appeal is *itself* an appeal to racial authenticity. To do so is to claim that “playing the race card” is a “white” strategy historically used to denigrate blacks, and that to employ such a strategy is to betray one’s race by employing a white person’s tool to do harm to one’s
own (black) people. This scenario is played out by candidates in several of the contests under examination.

Quite different from what has been the norm, however, in regards to how the media and others frame such controversies, reporters, pundits and analysts here generally show little hesitation in broadcasting the original appeal, the racial accusation by an opponent and a repudiation of the original tactic. That is, while some claim that the race card cannot be played, or that racism is not the source of such appeals involving two African Americans, those outside of the campaign are quick to draw attention to and express their opinion about the controversy, either explicitly or simply by a strategic contextualization (frame).

On August 15, for instance, *The Atlanta Journal-Constitution* ran a story by Bill Torpy and Rhonda Cook entitled “McKinney Says Majette Guilty of Racial Profiling.” The story starts with an allegation against McKinney: “U.S. Rep. Cynthia McKinney’s camp has waged a racially charged campaign against primary opponent Denise Majette. But now McKinney is charging that Majette is the one engaged in racial profiling.” Majette spokesperson Elizabeth Wilson had written an email to staffers stating, “We can’t allow McK [sic] to paint Denise as the white candidate.” The email went on to advise that the campaign must “work the streets in a posse, in t-shirts, probably no white folks if it is a black neighborhood.” McKinney and members of her staff are critical of the email, saying that using blacks to work black neighborhoods is “wrong” and an example of “racial profiling.” McKinney’s campaign manager Bill Banks is quoted as saying, “I can’t believe that Majette’s campaign looks at the color of your skin the minute you walk in her door. . . . That’s disgraceful, and that’s not what Georgia is about.” Torpy and Cook report that “some McKinney supporters have called Majette ‘Tomette,’ a play on the pejorative term ‘Uncle Tom.’ A McKinney ad states Majette ‘sold us out.’” In response, Majette addressed a crowd by saying “I know what’s going on. . . . I know what it’s like to be a black woman in America, having a black husband in America, having teenager sons in America.”

In the Alabama contest, Davis and his supporters attacked what they claimed to be deplorable and divisive tactics by Hilliard throughout the weeks leading up to the primary, and after that to the runoff. In a June 19 Associated Press story by Stan Bailey, Davis is quoted as follows: “[The Hilliard campaign’s] efforts to divide this district along racial and religious lines are unacceptable.” Former state legislator Chris McNair, in a June 21 AP story by Jay Reeves, says, “I’m not calling (Hilliard) a racist, but some of the things coming out of his campaign are racist. I think it’s utterly important that those of us who have struggled for years and criticized white people for such things speak out when blacks do it.”

In a follow-up story on June 21, Vicki McClure and Tom Gordon note that “race has been an often-played card in Alabama politics.” David Bositis is quoted as saying, “The allusions to Davis being white are not really about Davis as a person. They are really about Davis as an outsider.” Davis said, “To suggest that one black candidate does not stand in the same tradition as other black candidates is offensive.” State Rep. John Rogers “said a Hilliard ad portraying Davis as a Republican is ‘a code for saying he’s white.’”

Pundits from elected officials and community leaders such as Rogers, as well as academics, repeatedly called attention to the authentic appeals frame. Mary Orndorff, in
a June 25 Birmingham News story quoted former University of Alabama professor William Steward as follows: “There are a lot of unanswered questions. Do Hilliard’s allegations that Davis is not a true representative of the black community have any validity? Those vast experiences by Davis, will they have an impact?”

Other expressions of this frame appeared in the form of newspaper editorials. A June 26 editorial in the News claimed, “In a race in which both candidates were black, Hilliard played the race card. . . . Yet voters saw through Hilliard’s deceit and responded to Davis’ relentless message that the 7th District had nothing to show for Hilliard’s 10 years in Congress.”

On November 4, AP writer Mike Smith reported on Indiana’s contest in the 7th Congressional District as follows: “[Congresswoman Julia] Carson, who is black, accused [Republican challenger Brose] McVey, who is white, of ‘racial polarization’ in some of his ads, and claimed that there was a ‘whispering campaign’ that she is anti-Semitic.” While this is a rather pointed criticism, it is one of the very few mentions of race (and the only explicit one, though it did appear in two stories) in the local newspapers about the contest.

**Discussion**

The purpose of this paper is, in many respects, straightforward and descriptive. Yet is nonetheless reveals and begins to fill some important theoretical gaps in the extant literature. First, it highlights and lends credence to the growing trend of competitive African American election contests and provides justification and encouragement for future inquiry. Second, it provides empirical evidence supporting and extending our understanding of how the media generally frame election contests that include African Americans. That is, it provides additional substantive examples of previous forms of the framing (through racial identification), but finds additional distinct framing categories that, at least in this instance, are particularly linked to the fact of having candidates of color, as opposed to all-white or biracial contests. Third, it provides empirical support for a theory of understanding political communication and persuasion strategies in African American contexts – a theory that heretofore has not (to our knowledge) been proposed, much less substantively described.

This leads to the fourth and final significance of this project: it provides a firm basis upon which to conduct future empirical, quantitative studies to test not only the prevalence and cogency of the various layers of the authentic frame, and the ways in which they are supported, contradicted and framed by the media and others, but how the use of such tactics directly impacts African American voters’ psychological processing and ultimate voting decisions – not to mention that of whites.

Demographic, ideological and political alignment trends are likely to necessitate replication and extension of the number of contests that warrant attention. There are many questions yet untouched. What frames are apparent with Hispanic candidates, for instance? How do these findings hold in, say, Hawaii? It is essential that we begin to think of more systematic ways in which we can understand a distinctly new set of dynamic, political campaign and communication processes if we are to continue to
understand and make public policy decisions that seek to affect representational equality in the American political system.
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Appendix A. Profile of U.S. House Districts Under Consideration with 2002 Results

**Alabama 7**

District racial composition: 62% African American, 1% Hispanic or Latino, 36% white

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Political Affiliation</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Artur Davis</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Earl Hilliard</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sam Wiggins</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Artur Davis</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Earl Hilliard</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Artur Davis</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lauren Orth McCay</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Florida 3**

District racial composition 50% African American, 8% Hispanic or Latino, 42% white

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Political Affiliation</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrine Brown</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jennifer Sandra Carroll</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Georgia 4**

District racial composition 54% African American, 9% Hispanic or Latino, 36% white

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Political Affiliation</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Denise Majette</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cynthia McKinney</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Denise Majette</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cynthia Van Auken</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Georgia 13**

District racial composition 40% African American, 10% Hispanic or Latino, 47% white

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Political Affiliation</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Scott</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greg Hecht</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Worley</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Donzella James</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Embry Malone</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Scott</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clay Cox</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indian 7
District racial composition 30% African American, 4% Hispanic or Latino, 65% white

Democratic Primary: Julia Carson incumbent black 90%
Bob Hidalgo challenger 10%

General: Julia Carson incumbent black Democrat 53%
Brose McVey challenger white Republican 44%
Andrew Horning challenger white Libertarian 3%

Mississippi 2
District racial composition 64% African American, 1% Hispanic or Latino, 35% white

Democratic Primary: Bennie Thompson incumbent black 73%
George Irvin challenger black 27%

General: Bennie Thompson incumbent black Democrat 54%
Clinton LeSeuer challenger black Republican 43%
Lee Dilworth challenger black Reform 2%

North Carolina 1
District racial composition 51% African American, 3% Hispanic or Latino, 45% white

Democratic Primary: Frank Ballance, Jr. challenger black 47%
Sam Davis challenger white 26%
Janice McKenzie Cole challenger black 18%
Christine Fitch challenger black 9%

General: Frank Ballance, Jr. challenger black Democrat 63%
Greg Dority challenger white Republican 35%
Michael Ruff challenger white Libertarian 2%

Sources: District demographics are from the U.S. Census Bureau’s Fast Facts for Congress website (http://fastfacts.census.gov/). Vote totals are as reported by local or national news organizations. Candidate race was determined by local or national news organizations or Internet searches of the candidates.
Appendix B. Newspapers Searched for Stories on Select 2002 U.S. House Races

**Florida**
- 50 Plus Lifestyles
- Associated Press State & Local Wire, The
- Broward Daily Business Review
- Florida Underwriters
- Fort Pierce News (Fort Pierce, FL)
- Fort Pierce Tribune
- Jupiter Courier (Jupiter, FL), The
- Ledger (Lakeland), The
- Miami Daily Business Review
- Miami Herald
- Miami New Times (Florida)
- New Times Broward-Palm Beach (Florida)
- Palm Beach Daily Business Review
- Palm Beach Post, The
- Press Journal, The
- Sebastian Sun
- St. Petersburg Times
- Stuart News / The Port St. Lucie News (Stuart, FL), The
- Tampa Tribune, The
- Treasure Coast Business Journal

**Alaska**
- Associated Press State & Local Wire, The

**Birmingham News**

**Georgia**
- Associated Press State & Local Wire, The
- Atlanta Journal and Constitution, The
- Augusta Chronicle, The
- Fulton County Daily Report

**Indiana**
- Associated Press State & Local Wire, The
- Indiana Lawyer, The
- News-Sentinel, The
- South Bend Tribune

**Mississippi**
- Associated Press State & Local Wire, The

**North Carolina**
- Associated Press State & Local Wire, The
- Chapel Hill Herald
- Herald-Sun, The
- News & Record (Greensboro, NC)
- Star-News (Wilmington, NC)
- Winston-Salem Journal