

**The Future of the Tea Party:
A Comparison of the Progressive (Bull Moose) Party and the Tea Party Movement**

Kendall Lyons Bailey

Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of:

Master of Arts

In

Political Science

Craig L. Brians, Chair
Karen M. Hult
Timothy W. Luke

August 2, 2012
Blacksburg, Virginia

Keywords: Tea Party, Bull Moose Party, Campaign Rhetoric, 2010 U.S. House Elections,
Campaign Websites

Copyright 2012, Kendall Lyons Bailey

The Future of the Tea Party: A Comparison of the Progressive (Bull Moose) Party and the Tea Party Movement

Kendall Lyons Bailey

ABSTRACT

The Tea Party Movement (TPM) has emerged as an important player in United States politics by promoting fiscal conservatism, limited government, free market economics, and Constitutionalism. Candidates championing these TPM values have had some successful campaigns, particularly in the 2010 congressional primary and general elections. In doing so, TPM candidates focused their attacks on President Obama and his supporters in Congress, drawing attention to the increase in government spending and the growing budget deficit. The niche focus of the TPM combined with the strength of the U.S. two-party system and voters' partisan loyalties may limit the long-term effectiveness of the group. An analysis of campaign rhetoric from a sample of successful TPM House candidates highlights similarities in language used by the sampled TPM candidates in conveying TPM values. The discussion of similar economic and political climates of the Progressive (Bull Moose) Party and the Tea Party Movement eras provides for a historical comparison from which to predict the future of the TPM. In sum, this thesis suggests that the Tea Party Movement will likely expire with an improved economy and the conclusion of Barack Obama's presidency.

For my parents

Dad, thank you for sparking my interest in politics.

Mom, thank you for all of the encouragement.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would first like to thank the Political Science department and the Graduate School at Virginia Tech as the graduate assistantship I received made pursuing my Master's degree financially possible. Thank you to the faculty of the Political Science department for providing the opportunity to challenge and improve my critical thinking and analytical skills.

I owe my deepest gratitude to Dr. Craig Brians for agreeing to take on the position as the chair of my committee as well as for his unwavering support and assistance throughout this entire process. Through our many conversions, Dr. Brians helped me take what I thought to be at first simply an interesting idea about a recent event and transform it into a researchable theory with a set of hypotheses. Your insight and constant feedback on my numerous outline and drafts were invaluable.

Many thanks are owed to Dr. Karen Hult for her constructive comments on my many proposal drafts and for helping me build a solid foundation in research methods. Thank you for always being available to answer my plethora of questions.

I owe Dr. Timothy Luke a great deal of thanks for not only his helpful feedback and insight, but also for his assistance in helping me become fully admitted into the M.A. program. Initially taking classes in the non-degree-seeking status, Dr. Luke provided me with not only a recommendation for admittance, but more importantly the confidence to be successful as a graduate student.

I would also like to thank my friends for the good times, laughter, and maintenance of my sanity while in graduate school.

Finally, I would like to thank my family for their constant love and support.

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT.....	ii
DEDICATION.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
Chapter 2: Literature Review and Research Design.....	6
Chapter 3: Tea Party Campaign Rhetoric during the 2010 U.S. House Elections.....	25
Chapter 4: A Comparison of the Progressive (Bull Moose) Party and the Tea Party Movement.....	39
Chapter 5: The Future of the Tea Party Movement?.....	57
Bibliography.....	65
Appendix.....	68

List of Tables

Table 1: Sample of Language used by TPM Candidates in Issue Discussion.....26

Table 2: Sample of Language used by TPM Candidates in Proposal Discussion.....35

Appendices

Table 1: Sample of Language used by TPM Candidates in Issue Discussion.....68

Table 2: Sample of Language used by TPM Candidates in Proposal Discussion.....69

Table 3: List of Winning TPM House Candidates in 2010.....70

Table 4: Template for Rhetoric Analysis.....71

Table 5a: Scott DesJarlais- Status and Election Results.....71

Table 5b: Scott DesJarlais – Campaign Rhetoric.....72

Table 6a: Paul Gosar- Status and Election Results.....72

Table 6b: Paul Gosar- Campaign Rhetoric.....73

Table 7a: Joe Heck- Status and Election Results.....76

Table 7b: Joe Heck- Campaign Rhetoric.....76

Table 8a: Mick Mulvaney- Status and Election Results.....78

Table 8b: Mick Mulvaney- Campaign Rhetoric.....78

Table 9a: Marlin Stutzman- Status and Election Results.....83

Table 9b: Marlin Stutzman- Campaign Rhetoric.....84

Chapter 1: Introduction

In recent years, the Tea Party Movement (TPM) emerged as an important player in the American political environment. Although still a fairly new political group, this has not prevented its success of getting candidates elected who hold the same views as the TPM. As was seen in the 2010 congressional elections, several members of Congress lost their seats to candidates endorsed by the Tea Party movement; overall five seats in the Senate and 44 seats in the House of Representatives went to candidates who either were endorsed by or self-identified with the TPM (Moe 2010). This success signaled the emergence of a new threat to the established Republican Party and one worthy of attention considering these results from a group that emerged only about a year prior to the 2010 elections. This places a large amount of the pressure on Republican candidates, who now have to account for and contend with viable candidates in primary elections before focusing on the general elections.

The beginnings of the Tea Party Movement stem from a February 19, 2009 rant by Rick Santelli, a CNBC commentator and former financial trader. His tirade emphasized his strong disapproval of the proposed government funded bailouts and called for a change in the current Washington establishment. Santelli took a populist stance, pushing for a public referendum on the bailouts that, in his view, would show the elected officials in Washington the overall opposition by the “silent majority” of the American electorate.¹

The emergence of the TPM itself was the result of numerous groups organized on these Tea Party values. While there is no single Tea Party group, the two largest national organizations in terms of membership and national media exposure are the Tea Party Express and the Tea Party

¹ “CNBC’s Rick Santelli’s Chicago Tea Party.” < <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zp-Jw-5Kx8k>>.

Patriots. Although these major Tea Party organizations have subtle differences, both are driven by the core principles of fiscal responsibility, limited government, and free market economics.

The Tea Party Movement has been relatively successful in its short existence. The TPM continues to evolve and grow; the evidence for which can be seen in the 2012 presidential nomination race with multiple candidates running as self-identified Tea Party supporters, such as Michelle Bachmann² and Herman Cain.³

However, the intriguing notion driving this research is that no candidate, in either the 2010 congressional races or the 2012 Republican presidential nomination campaign was endorsed by a singular, unified Tea Party. The candidates who are endorsed by a TPM-associated group are still running under the Republican banner as opposed to a separate Tea Party designation. This signals that while the Tea Party Movement is a facet of Republican conservatism, it has yet to nominate a candidate for a federal office under a singular “Tea Party” label.

Importance of this Research

The potential importance of this research stems from the success of a niche-focused political group in having the candidates it endorsed or supported win seats over more established officials. Its status of having a niche-driven ideology may ultimately be the Tea Party Movement’s downfall as previous studies have demonstrated that such niche-focused, third party-type political groups have limited longevity (Friedman 2002; Hirano and Snyder 2007). The TPM structure follows various aspects associated with political factions, parties, and movements. It differs from the prior notions of what is considered strictly a political party, or a

² <http://bachmann.house.gov/biography/>

³ “04-12-11-Herman Cain on being a Tea Party candidate.wmv” <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5UP-9TRHpVk>

movement, or a faction. It appears to be a distinctive entity. Political parties are institutions that “have one primary goal: the construction of a coalition that enables them to win elections and exercise government power” (Maisel and Berry 2010, 7) and with this goal they “serve broader purposes such as accountability, representation, and integration” (Stone 2010, 286). The TPM exhibits portions of this definition as the TPM-groups like the Tea Party Express are focused on endorsing and supporting candidates for office. However, the differences occur to other TPM groups like the Tea Party Patriots whose policy is to support policy and not individual candidates.

Political factions result when “[a]ctivists whose primary interest is in issue and policy outcomes...support candidates who agree with them on the issues, rather than candidates who are well positioned to win the general election” which therefore “threaten party unity, undermine long-term coalitions, and fragment the party in government (Stone 2010, 287). Overall, factions bring about a “weakening [of] the parties’ capacity to mount a coherent campaign and present a united front in governance” (Stone 2010, 287). Some similar faction characteristics are present in the TPM due to the issue focus of fiscal conservatism combined with supporting those who will advocate them once elected. The difference is that the TPM has been successful in winning general elections, as seen in 2010, but the overall disunity of the various TPM groups and the niche issue focus will influence the eventual weakening of the TPM as the definition mentions.

In contrast to factions, political movements are “partially induced by conditions in the political system” where a “collective action” is taken by people to mobilize resources in an attempt to advance a particular issue of concern (McFarland 2010, 44). Again, the TPM exhibits some characteristics of political movements. Being formed from discontent with the economy and the desire to bring fiscal conservatism to government demonstrates the political movement

aspects of the TPM. However, there is no mention of candidate-endorsement of support for movements as they are more focused on the issue itself and the policies associated with it than the actual election of officials. This can be seen in the Tea Party Patriots organization, but not in the Tea Party Express as the Express do endorse and financially support like-minded candidates.

The TPM's combination of having similar characteristics of particular political entities while also not completely conforming to an exact definition and the practice of its many subgroups self-labeling as part of the TPM and advocating TPM values forms this unique status. Combined with the TPM's initial electoral success experienced in the 2010 congressional elections, these factors inspire research into the future persistence of the Tea Party Movement.

Theory

The Tea Party Movement emerged with the goal of promoting fiscal conservatism, limited government, free market economics, and Constitutionalism. In doing so, TPM candidates focused their political attacks on President Obama and his supporters in Congress⁴. The niche focus of the TPM combined with the strength of the U.S. two-party system limits the longevity of this political group. This thesis posits that the Tea Party Movement is likely to expire upon: 1) an improvement in the U.S economy, signaled by lower nationwide unemployment, popular approval of the economy, and lessened press coverage, and 2) the ending of Barack Obama's presidency, due to the TPM's niche focus on fiscal conservatism and anti-Obama rhetoric.

Chapter Summary

Chapter Two consists of the literature review and the research design. A discussion of the nature of political parties, factions, and movements leads into a description of the history of the United States two-party system. Research on political loyalty will be presented to further

⁴ Appendix Table 1 and Table 2

substantiate the strength of the two-party system. In addition, the political longevity of third party-type political groups is explored in order to provide a foundation for later implications for the Tea Party Movement and the Republican Party.⁵ The research design section outlines the methods used in each of the following chapters.

Chapter Three contains the analysis of the rhetoric used by winning TPM House candidates during the 2010 Congressional Elections. The focus is on the specific rhetoric the Tea Party Movement candidates used in discussing issues and proposed solutions. The analysis helps to gain insight into the TPM platform and highlights similarities in rhetoric among the candidates. This ultimately leads into a historical comparison in the following chapter.

Given their evident similarities, the Bull Moose Party era is compared with the Tea Party Movement era in Chapter Four. In this chapter both the political climate and the economic climate for both eras are discussed to illustrate the similarities, past and present.

The future implications of the Tea Party Movement for itself and the Republican Party are studied in Chapter Five. The events present in the current era indicate a similar pattern to the earlier Bull Moose Party era leading to the conclusion for the likely weakening of TPM support associated with the likely eventual improvement of the economy and Obama's inevitable term limit. Using the rhetoric analysis in conjunction with the BMP era comparisons, different scenarios for the future of the Tea Party and the Republican Party will be discussed. In addition, the limitations of this research as well as the possibilities for future research on the Tea Party Movement will be addressed.

⁵ Although the Tea Party Movement is not a true political party, I am using the discussion of third-party political groups to demonstrate the lack of longevity of such groups, as these groups are often niche-focused like the Tea Party Movement.

Chapter 2: Literature Review and Research Design

Literature Review

The literature review provides the background for explaining the strength of the United States two-party system, the effects of partisan loyalty, and the limited longevity of third party-type political groups. The first section examines the United States two-party system including political parties, factions, and movements. It demonstrates that the strong foundation of the two-party system in the United States makes long-term success for third party-type, niche-focused political groups extremely difficult. Additionally, the second section notes that while party loyalty can shift, briefly causing some new political groups to enjoy temporary success, the overall nature of voters' partisan loyalties further reinforces the two-party system. The final section explores the longevity of third party-type groups in order to provide a foundation for the future of the Tea Party Movement and implications for the Republican Party.

The Two-Party System in U.S. Politics

There are several kinds of political entities that exert influence in the American political system. Political parties, factions, and movements may operate in the same arena, but they differ in their organization and goals. Political parties are institutions with central, common ideological platforms that “have one primary goal: the construction of a coalition that enables them to win elections and exercise government power” (Maisel and Berry 2010, 7); with this goal they “serve broader purposes such as accountability, representation, and integration” (Stone 2010, 286). Parties use their constructed coalition of supporters to “translate or convert...social and economic interests into political power directly” (Eldersveld 1964, 6). The overall party structure is based on the goal to “stabilize” smaller subgroups of voters with similar ideologies under a larger, broader ideology of a political party and ultimately expand and maintain their support in

striving for political power (Eldersveld 1964, 7). The members' collective similar interest maintains this relationship to the political party as well as the knowledge that they have a stronger voice as a united group (Eldersveld 1964, 7).

Disunity in the overall direction of a political party leads to a split from the party in terms of factions. For example, the Citizens' Party was founded in 1979 "by dissident liberals" who were dissatisfied with President Jimmy Carter's administration (Kruschke 1991, 45). Political factions result when "[a]ctivists whose primary interest is in issue and policy outcomes...support candidates who agree with them on the issues, rather than candidates who are well positioned to win the general election" which therefore "threaten party unity, undermine long-term coalitions, and fragment the party in government (Stone 2010, 287). The Citizens' Party focused on environmentalist and populist-oriented programs, which it hoped would lead toward an "economic democracy" (Kruschke 1991, 45).

Recent conditions in the political environment have given factions the opportunity to emerge. Former Democratic congressman Timothy Roemer, who served in Congress from 1991-2003, observed that "we are in a time of poison, of gridlock, of grassroots change, of frustration" (Roemer 2010, 36). This is the present state of affairs within American politics. The lack of cooperation between Democrats and Republicans in Congress and the gridlock that followed in the 2011 budget debate has given rise to considerable frustration in the electorate. This has only brought more attention to factions, especially in reference to the Tea Party Movement. A 2011 New York Times/CBS News poll indicated that only 21 percent of those questioned "had not heard enough" about the Tea Party Movement to form an opinion, clearly lower than the results of a similar poll it conducted a year earlier, in which 46 percent could not form an opinion of the TPM because "they had not heard enough" (Zernike 2011).

The TPM has commonalities with political factions as it is concerned with supporting candidates who are focused on its specific values relating to fiscal conservatism, as the Tea Party Express is committed to doing, rather than the mainstream Republican Party platform that also encompasses social conservatism.⁶ Overall, factions bring about a “weakening [of] the parties’ capacity to mount a coherent campaign and present a united front in governance” (Stone 2010, 287). Since a political party is composed of subgroups of voters with similar interests, sometimes there are varying degrees of support for certain policies. Through factions, a political party can lose some of its supporters to these break-away groups if the groups advocate a key interest of a subsection of the political party, much like the Tea Party Movement is doing through its fiscal conservatism rhetoric. Those who are fiscal-minded Republicans inherently share common ideologically beliefs with the TPM message, providing the potential for such fiscally principled Republicans to split and support the TPM.

In contrast to political factions, political movements are “partially induced by conditions in the political system” where people pursue “collective action” to mobilize resources in an attempt to advance a particular issue of concern (McFarland 2010, 44). Here the focus is on advancement of the issue without directly attempting to do so through the use of candidates and the voting power that comes with the political office. Through this lens, the Tea Party Movement can be seen as a movement as well, specifically when discussing groups like the Tea Party Patriots. This group focuses on advancing the issues of “fiscal responsibility, constitutionally limited government, and free market economic policies.”⁷ In contrast with the Tea Party Express, the Tea Party Patriots do not endorse or support specific candidates in attempting to advance

⁶ “Tea Party Express.” <www.teapartyexpress.org>.

⁷ “Tea Party Patriots.” <www.teaparty patriots.org/about>.

their ideals; rather they provide “logistical, educational, networking and other support” to local grassroots organizations that are promoting the same values.⁸

Even with factions and movements playing a role in the political process, the two-party system remains the dominant political influence. In presidential elections, the Electoral College strongly reinforces the two-party system, ultimately limiting the ability of the TPM to advance towards full “political party” status. As initially established in Article II, Section I of the U.S. Constitution, the Electoral College was the name given to the process for selecting a president based on the number of electoral votes from each state (the number of each state’s representatives and senators) (Mayer 2010, 186). Although the original Electoral College has changed, it is still the case that the candidate receiving the most popular votes in a state is awarded all of the state’s electoral college, with the exception of two states that allocate by winners of House districts; in order to win, the candidate needs to acquire a majority of the electoral votes (Mayer 2010, 186-194).

In addition to the Electoral College’s impact on the two-party system, the principle of Duverger’s Law also reinforces the two-party system. According to Duverger’s Law, “when its constitution requires that elections be conducted by plurality or majority rule..., a polity tends toward having exactly two major parties (Aldrich 2010, 24). There are two main reasons for this, the “mechanical effect” and the “psychological effect.” The “mechanical effect” reflects that the “translation of votes into seats under virtually all electoral laws ordinarily advantages the plurality-winning party”, and the “psychological effect” suggests that voters “who support third parties...will realize their vote for that third party will be wasted on a certain loser (Aldrich 2010, 24).

⁸ “Tea Party Patriots.” <www.teapartypatriots.org/about>.

Duverger's Law and the Electoral College help to account for the persistence of the two-party system in the United States. While the Tea Party Movement can be seen as both a faction and a movement, the nature of the two-party system presents a monumental hurdle for the TPM to overcome in becoming a political party and gaining sufficient votes to elect its own candidates. While it has had some success in endorsing successful candidates, the prospects for the Tea Party Movement becoming a political party and having the broad influential electoral power associated with political parties is quite unlikely.

Party Loyalty

Due to the two-party system in American politics, there is a divide between those who identify with one major party and those who identify with the other major party. With political debates not limited to elected officials, voters themselves often discuss opposing viewpoints. The strength of the connection a voter feels to their self-identified political party through these discussions begins to form that voter's sense of party loyalty. The concept of one's own belonging to or association with a group advocating for policies based on similarly held beliefs lasts through many voters' lives.

Once a sense of partisanship is established by the voter, it typically continues to grow and strengthen as the voter ages. An earlier study involving voting behavior during the 1952 and 1956 elections sought to see if voters split their ballot and/or changed over the course of the four year span depending on their exposure and contact with the political party (Eldersveld 1964, 471). The results indicated convincingly that for both the Republican and the Democratic parties "contact with the organization is functional for the maintenance of party loyalty and its implementation in voting regularity" (Eldersveld 1964, 471). Specifically, "those most exposed

to the party in 1956 and before were the constant regulars” and “that party contact also produced greater loyalty” than those not as exposed to the party (Eldersveld 1964, 471-472).

More recent studies indicate that the number of “pure” independents is declining and that most Americans lean to or side with a party and vote for the candidate from that party (Stonecash 2010, 4). It has been argued that partisanship is a loyalty that remains constant over the course of one’s life. An introduction in Donald Green et al.’s Partisan Hearts and Minds emphasizes the concept of a voter’s political loyalty:

Recessions, wars, and dramatic swings in the political fortunes of parties tend to leave a shallow imprint on the partisan affiliation of adults, just as doctrinal and organizational disputes within Christian sects typically have little effect on the religious affiliation of churchgoers (Green et al. 2002, 2).

Such a statement is confirmed in Table 1.2, “Distribution of Partisanship among Voters, 1952-1998,” where there is a relatively consistent composition of support year after year among Democrats, Independents, and Republicans, with the results only varying several percentage points (Green et al. 2002, 16). Partisan stability plays a role in the continuance of loyalty as Green et al.’s results indicate that “party identification and most other social identities are highly stable over time” and that even though the discourse of politics involves negative aspects of politicians and their respective parties, it does not “influence the voter’s sense of self” (Green et al. 2002, 83). Upon further analysis, the pattern of consistent party loyalty remains the same in terms of presidential approval ratings (Green et al. 2002, 108). However, the study also indicates that an action by a president that “alters the social imagery associated with the parties” can have some effect on this loyalty, but for the majority of the time the trend remains constant (Green et al. 2002, 108).

This leads into an analysis of what may prompt a possible change, such as party loyalty “may change as people acquire new information” (Green et al. 2002, 109). A common resource

for voters acquiring this new information is the media. Whether through news programs or political advertising, new information is presented to the potential voter. Campaign advertising is an important method of presenting this information; in the 2008 election, combining House, Senate and state campaigns, “the total advertising budget for political campaigns in 2008 was in the billions” (Hayes 2010, 48). “More than 23 million people each night still watch one of the three network newscasts”; with this in mind, if politicians and party organizers can get their activities covered by the media in some way, then this can increase the exposure for their message (Hayes 2010, 53).

The nationally televised presidential debate in 2011 organized by the Tea Party Express enabled the questions and direction of the debate to be tailored in a manner best illuminating TPM goals.⁹ This way of introducing information to the electorate and potential new voters continues to aid in forming and maintaining party loyalty as “partisans are far more likely to interact with the parties online than independents” (Hayes 2010, 51). The use of online media also reinforces party loyalty. Once partisanship has formed in the mind of a voter, they are more likely to continue exposing themselves to the message of their self-identified party, such as through online media like Facebook or campaign websites. This can be seen in one study that indicated that “40 percent of Democrats (and leaners)” visited the Obama/Biden website (Hayes 2010, 51). Another important finding from the same study indicated that “about 85 percent of independents avoided the candidates’ Web pages, and three quarters said they never received e-mail from a campaign or party,” which further illustrates the influence of party loyalty (Hayes 2010, 51). This distance from party rhetoric may inhibit party loyalty as those claiming to be independents, and therefore nonpartisan, are not actively seeking exposure to campaign

⁹ “Tea Party Presidential Debate Presented by CNN” <<http://www.teapartyexpress.org/debate/>>.

messages directly from a candidate's website; nor are the political parties able to attempt to connect to these voters as they would a more partisan voter.

Longevity of Third Party Political Groups

Outside of the standard two parties in U.S. politics, third-party political groups have trouble with maintaining longevity. There may be a strong popular discontent that creates such third-party groups, but no more than a "tiny fraction" of voters are drawn to them (Hirano and Snyder 2007, 1). Support may exist temporarily, allowing for some minor, brief successes such as the Progressive (Bull Moose) Party. While the Bull Moose Party was not victorious in winning the presidency, it did succeed as a third party over one of the established two-parties as Theodore Roosevelt gained more votes than incumbent President William Taft (Bibby and Maisel 2003, 33).

While the support levels for third-party groups received initial surges at their formation, their existence was limited due to a decline in voter support over time (Hirano and Snyder 2007, 1). The decline in votes effectively limits a third-party group's influence. One study concluded that the decline in third-party support is due to one of the established two parties absorbing a main policy issue that the third-party group has been advocating (Hirano and Snyder 2007, 14). As a group's rallying point is eliminated, thus third parties lose a significant portion of their electoral influence. Shrinking support and shrinking influence eventually leads to the expiration of such political groups.

This ultimate decline in third-party longevity can be primarily attributed to the nature of the two-party system. The simple-majority single-ballot system typically convinces "rational voters to vote for the lesser-of-two-evils" (Friedman 2002, 164). This causes parties to abandon the political extremes for the center in order to collect more votes (Friedman 2002, 166). In

presidential elections, third-party candidates received “over five percent of the vote in a third of presidential election between 1840-2000,” resulting in “seventeen of the last forty-one presidents [being] elected with less than fifty percent of the popular vote” (Friedman 2002, 164). While this can be viewed as a minor victory for third-party candidates, it also indicates a serious threat to future success of third parties. These findings highlight two important factors: the continual dominance of the two-party system and a discontent with the status quo (Friedman 2002, 165).

The naturally “radical” platforms of many third-parties is undermined as the established parties move toward the middle during general elections to collect a wider range of voters; by doing so, established parties reduce the political extremes and ultimately the “major sources of leverage” of third party groups (Friedman 2002, 166; 185). The strength of the two-party system and its ability to stifle third-party growth beyond gathering a few percentage points in elections demonstrate how the longevity of third party political groups can be reduced due to the lack of voter support in a two-party system. A primary concern for third party longevity rests with the voters. If voters continue to think that they are “wasting their vote” on third party candidates, the existence of third party political groups will decline (Freidman 2002, 166).

It is evident that there are significant obstacles for third party-type, niche-focused political groups to overcome in order to achieve long-term success. The U.S. two-party system, aided by Duverger’s Law and the Electoral College, presents a formidable hurdle for niche-focused groups. The strength of party loyalty in voters is another barrier that stands in the way of such groups and long-term success. These niche-focused groups also have history against them as previous third parties have not had significant electoral success. The Tea Party Movement, having had a successful election during the 2010 congressional elections, presents another point from which to conduct a study and ultimately analysis future implications for the TPM and the

Republican Party. The analysis of winning TPM candidates' campaign rhetoric from 2010 and the historical comparison with the Progressive (Bull Moose) Party, allows for an exploration of such future implications based on the influence of the U.S. two-party, party loyalty in voters, and the historical lack of longevity in third parties.

Research Design

This research investigates the rise of the Tea Party Movement during the 2010 congressional elections. These midterm elections brought the TPM to the forefront of national politics. Initially, the analysis of campaign rhetoric illustrates the specific language used by TPM candidates when discussing policy issues.¹⁰ In addition, this research discusses how the Bull Moose Party and the political and economic climates of that era compare to the Tea Party Movement. The purpose of the research is to establish foundations for drawing conclusions about the implications of the TPM for itself and the Republican Party and why it is likely that the TPM will expire soon and be engulfed back into the Republican Party. First, the process for the analysis of the 2010 TPM candidate rhetoric is explained, including discussion of limitations. The following section outlines the method for the Bull Moose Party and the Tea Party Movement comparison. Finally, the manner for discussing future implications for the Tea Party Movement and the Republican Party is addressed.

Tea Party Campaign Rhetoric during the 2010 U.S. House Elections

The analysis will establish a foundation for a discussion of similarities present in the language used by TPM candidates in the 2010 congressional elections ultimately leading into a

¹⁰ The analyses of the policy issues are based on the policy *claims* as presented by the candidates in their respective campaign statements. These claims are how each candidate expressed their understanding of the policy issues, but are not verified as candidate beliefs as it would be beyond the scope of this study.

historical comparison. Illustrating the specific language used presents a window into understanding how the rhetoric resonated voters. The issues of focus and rhetoric used by the TPM candidates are analyzed to convey the common themes and overall shared message among the elected TPM candidates.

The first stage of the process was compiling the list of winning TPM candidates in the 2010 Congressional elections. The names of the candidates were gathered from an MSNBC news article published immediately following the 2010 Congressional elections (Moe 2010). Although the article listed the outcomes of both Senate and House elections in which a candidate was endorsed by or self-identified with the Tea Party Movement, I focused on TPM candidates who were successful in winning a seat in the House. I examined winning candidates as the goal of the analysis is to explore how the campaign rhetoric successfully resonated with voters, resulting in the Republicans gaining a majority in the House and gaining enough seats in the Senate to break the Democratic supermajority. The House candidates were chosen over the Senate as there was a large n from which to draw a sample: 44 successful TPM candidates in the House elections and 5 successful TPM candidates in the Senate elections. In addition, the House was chosen over a House/Senate combination in order to account for the fact that Senate candidates represent an entire state and therefore are likely to generalize their message to account for the greater variety of voters and conditions. This has the potential to water down the TPM message to appeal to Republicans who might be anti-TPM and to attempt to gain independent voters. The goal of the analysis was to focus on the TPM-specific rhetoric to show how this was influential. While the House candidates may also exhibit some expressions of mainstream Republican values, it is more likely that at the district-level, candidates running as associated with the TPM would be

more likely to stick to the TPM message, as they do not have to account for a variety of voters like their Senate counterparts due in part to the gerrymandering of congressional districts.

From the list of successful 2010 TPM candidates for the House, the list was alphabetized by last name to reduce bias from other factors such as by state or region.¹¹ After the alphabetized list was created, every eighth name was selected, resulting in five candidates on whom to focus the analysis. Of the 44 TPM candidates who won election to the House of Representatives, five were randomly selected for the rhetorical analysis. The random sample resulted in Scott DesJarlais, Joe Heck, Paul Gosar, Mick Mulvaney, and Marlin Stutzman. The sample included candidates from different regions of the United States drawing from southern, Midwestern, and western Congressional districts. DesJarlais and Mulvaney were from southern districts, representing Tennessee and South Carolina respectively. The Midwest was represented in Marlin Stutzman from Indiana. Joe Heck and Paul Gosar, Nevada and Arizona respectively, were from western House districts.

None of the sampled TPM candidates were incumbents.¹² Typically, incumbents have an inherent advantage in elections as they already hold the office and have name recognition with voters (Maisel and Brewer 2010, 216). Since the sampled TPM candidates were not incumbents, this eliminates an additional influential and places more focus on other factors, such as the campaign rhetoric of TPM values. If one of the sampled candidates was an incumbent, then it could be that that candidate's campaign rhetoric did not play as large of a role due to the nature of the incumbent advantage; rather than the candidate's message being the influential factor, the candidate's status as the incumbent could have been the reason for the candidate's success.

¹¹ Appendix Table 3

¹² Appendix Tables 5a,6a,7a,8a,9a

While there were instances in the 2010 elections where incumbent Republicans were defeated in the primaries, none of the sampled candidates defeated a Republican incumbent¹³. Even though the sample did not represent this aspect of the 2010 elections, four of the five sampled candidates did defeat incumbents in the general elections. While those in the sample did not face incumbents during the primary elections, all but one candidate faced an incumbent in the general election. While the candidates' victories over incumbents in the general election indicate support for the TPM, it could have been the result of Republicans voting with the TPM as the only viable option against a Democratic incumbent. If the sample had included some candidates who defeated Republican incumbents in the primaries, this would add more evidence to the effects of the TPM message compared to the Republican Party message. However, with the candidates being randomly sampled, it is likely that the campaign language from such candidates who defeated Republican incumbents is similar to rhetoric from the sampled candidates in this research.

After selecting the candidates, the data collection began. Before collecting the rhetorical data, I designed the template for recording the data.¹⁴ Each candidate had a separate sheet. Recorded on the each candidate's sheet was the candidate's name. House district, profession and education (if given), website, issues listed on the website, quotes from issue rhetoric, and keywords from issue rhetoric.

The candidate's campaign websites served as the sources from which to collect the each candidate's rhetoric on policy issues. I chose the campaign website as the primary source for data collection as it made collecting the rhetoric from each candidate on a range of issues more

¹³ Appendix Tables 5a,6a,7a,8a,9a

¹⁴ Appendix Table 4

efficient. Data collected covered a variety of issues such as the economy and jobs, education, taxes, immigration, and national security. Attempting to collect this data through other means such as new articles or direct contact with the Congressmen or their campaign staff would have likely been more difficult and not as encompassing. Using the official campaign website also enhances the authenticity of the rhetoric collected due to its publication directly from the official campaign and not a third-party source.

Accessing each candidate's campaign website, the following process was performed for each candidate. The main issues listed by each candidate were recorded on spreadsheet. The issues often were clearly present under an "Issues" tab on the website¹⁵. For each issue topic, the statements made about each issue were reviewed and quotes from the issue discussion that highlighted the candidate's overall arguments were selected for the spreadsheet. Finally, to enable an easier construction for the analysis, multiple keywords were selected from each topic's quotes and placed on the spreadsheet.

The analysis portion consisted on discussing the common issues present among the sampled candidates. The discussion as organized by issues and the similar rhetoric used by the various candidates was explored. This organization was the same for the proposed solutions discussion. The discussion as organized by similar proposals and the candidates' common rhetoric was explored.

A Comparison of the Progressive (Bull Moose) Party to the Tea Party Movement

The analysis compares economic and political similarities from the Bull Moose Party and Tea Party Movement eras. The Bull Moose Party was chosen as the case study for comparison with the Tea Party Movement for several reasons. First, the Bull Moose Party has greater name

¹⁵ Scott DesJarlais listed his issues in prose on his website and did not have an "Issues" tab.

recognition than some other minor historical third parties. Another reason stems from the popularity of the historical political figures involved. William Taft is commonly known for his weight as being a large U.S. president (Flehinger 2003, 155). Theodore “Teddy” Roosevelt is often known for serving in the “Rough Riders” regiment that fought during the Spanish-American War and for holding the office of President before Taft before breaking away from the Republican Party for the Progressive Party (Gould 2008, 23; Flehinger 2003, 3). The high profile factor of both the Bull Moose Party and the political figures involved makes a good case study because: 1) more detailed scholarly work has been published on the Bull Moose Party and the era than on some lesser-known third-parties, providing for a greater pool of resources and 2) it makes the comparison more relatable to those whose specialty may not be U.S. political parties.

Popularity is not the sole factor for selecting the Bull Moose Party. The similarities between the Bull Moose Party and the Tea Party Movement are prevalent. Both the Bull Moose Party and the Tea Party Movement resulted in a split from mainstream, political parties. While they both split from the Republican Party, the Republican Party of the early 1900’s is not ideologically equivalent to the Republican Party in the 2000’s. Regardless of this, the similarities between the Bull Moose Party and the Tea Party Movement are still present in that both groups separated from mainstream political parties.

The commonalities extend to the economic environments and political climates during both eras. Both the Bull Moose Party and the Tea Party Movement formed during economic declines. There was also dissent among party members as to the best way to combat the failing economy and the sitting president. These similar political climates resulted in the splits from mainstream parties leading to the groups’ formations.

In exploring the comparison between the Bull Moose Party and the Tea Party Movement, the economic environment of the Bull Moose Party era was first discussed. Particular attention was paid to the Panic of 1907 and the subsequent government intervention. The focus then shifted to a discussion of the political environment and the formation of the Progressive Party, eventually referred to as the Bull Moose Party.

The Tea Party Movement era was then discussed. Similar to the Bull Moose Party discussion, the economic environment was presented in order to lay the foundation for the ensuing political implications. The Great Recession of 2008 was the focus for exploring the economic conditions. Government intervention will play a role as an attempted solution to the economic problems leading to the discussion of the political climate and emergence of the Tea Party Movement.

Following the discussion of each era's economic and political environments, I analyze the similarities. Similarities in the economy and government intervention also lead to similarities in the populist nature of each political group's formation. Eventually the Tea Party Movement will disappear much like the Bull Moose Party.

Future Implications for the Tea Party Movement

The final chapter summarizes the research presented in this thesis. First, the importance of the research is reiterated. The process for how the research was conducted is then explained, including a brief overview of the research design. Findings for both the rhetorical analysis and the historical comparison are presented as well.

Next, I explore the future implications for the Tea Party Movement and the Republican Party. Explanations for the TPM's decline are specifically addressed as well as the likelihood

that the TPM will be absorbed into the Republican Party. Potential solutions for how the TPM could remain influential in United States politics are also explored, highlighting the TPM's staunch support of a particular understanding of the Constitution and the group's significant evangelical Christians membership.

The chapter concludes with calls for future research. These calls are based in part on several limitations of this study. Particular instances, such as the 2012 elections, are outlined in order to address issues that this thesis has not covered as well as provide suggestions for the evolving field of TPM research.

Limitations

Due to the recent emergence of the Tea Party Movement, only a fairly limited number of scholarly articles address the Tea Party Movement. The TPM story is constantly evolving. By the time this thesis was completed, few journals have published scholarly work primarily focused on the Tea Party Movement. Papers presented at conferences across the country have begun such research, but it is still evolving. Future research will be able to draw upon more data as time continues, especially with the coming 2012 congressional elections. The 2012 presidential election will be another point for further research on the Tea Party Movement and its supporters. Voting preference and opinions will add to the available data on the subject.

Another limitation of this research is the rhetorical analysis focused solely on the TPM candidates who won seats in the House of Representatives. Voters for Senate seats typically are different from those in gerrymandered House districts that for the most part are safe for one party or lean considerably to one ideological side. Although some states are safe for Republican candidates, others are crucial swing states, such as Ohio, for control in the Senate. Adding an analysis of just Senate candidates could provide an interesting comparison to see if the

similarities in rhetoric expressed by the House candidates are similar to that of the Senate candidates or if the nature of being a state-wide office has influence on the strength of rhetoric used.

From the rhetorical analysis sample itself, there was no sampled candidate who was representative of TPM candidates in the northeastern part of the United States. The list of the successful House candidates in the Appendix shows that there were successful TPM candidates for House seats in northeast states such as New York and New Hampshire¹⁶. Perhaps further research into the northeastern TPM candidates as compared to southern, Midwestern, or both, could be beneficial in revealing any potential differences in rhetoric used by northeastern candidates which is typically a Democratic strong-hold as opposed to southern candidates from states like South Carolina or Texas. The table of the successful TPM House candidates is representative of the U.S. and has the potential to be used as a source for conducting such comparisons or specific foci on certain regional candidates.

An additional limitation of this research was that the rhetoric used for the analysis was collected from campaign websites. While there were from the candidates' websites and not an outside group, there were additional sources that could have included. An analysis of rhetoric used in candidates' speeches or television and radio advertisements could have been included to provide additional reference points. Resources and time constraints for the completion of this research limited the ability to utilize such additional resources. Future studies with the appropriate financial and timely resources could conduct further analysis of TPM candidates' rhetoric in speeches or television and radio ads. This would provide the potential for comparisons of the rhetoric used in statements made via different media sources.

¹⁶ Appendix Table 3

Other limitations arising from the use of campaign websites as sources concerns the timely collection of data. As this research took place in 2012, two years after the elections studied, the content may have been altered since 2010. As noted in Appendix Table 6b, Mick Mulvaney's website was updated in 2012. Such changes may not accurately reflect the candidate's precise words at that particular time during the 2010 election. It is possible that some may have changed their rhetoric to sound more "Tea Party-friendly" after the election. However, the only noted case of change when collecting the data was with Mulvaney; four of the five websites showed no indication of updated information¹⁷. Therefore, it is more likely that the data collected reflects the same statements made by the candidates during the 2010 election. In Mulvaney's case, it was reported in a news article that he "positioned himself as a Tea Party movement conservative supporting limited government and greater accountability." (Hananel 2010). This provides evidence that Mulvaney was voicing TPM values prior to the 2010 election.

¹⁷ Appendix Table 5b shows that Scott DesJarlais' website was updated; however, this occurred shortly after collecting the data.

Chapter 3: Tea Party Campaign Rhetoric during the 2010 U.S. House Elections

Introduction

The Tea Party Movement's success in federal elections was clearly demonstrated by the 2010 congressional elections. In these elections, 49 Tea Party-supported candidates won, of those: 44 in the House and five in the Senate (Moe 2010). A previous study of these elections found that Tea Party endorsements had an effect during the primaries (Karpowitz et al. 2011, 306); "In the 2010 Republican primaries, either bearing a Tea Party stamp of approval or showing a willingness to affiliate with Tea Party principles clearly improved a candidate's electoral prospects" (Karpowitz et al. 2011, 306).

The positive effect of the TPM label carried over into the general elections as well. In the general election, Karpowitz et al. examined whether the Republican candidate received an endorsement from a Tea Party group or from Sarah Palin (Karpowitz et al. 2011, 306). Although the "evidence suggests that Tea Party endorsements are typically not associated with increased vote share for Republican candidates in the general election," the greatest improvements in vote share came when candidates adopted the Tea Party label (Karpowitz et al. 2011, 306). Specifically, with only a Tea Party endorsement the candidate gained between eight and nine percentage points but by adopting the Tea Party label, the candidate's "vote shares increase[ed] by more than 20 points" (Karpowitz et al. 2011, 306). The TPM label seemed to have only a minor effect in the general election, but the effect was maximized when the candidates themselves adopted the label. This suggests that the success of the TPM and the candidates associating with it was based on candidates campaigning as self-declared Tea Party supporters.

Yet focusing solely on the label suggests that the label itself did not win the seats. This indicates the need for an analysis of the rhetoric TPM candidates used in order to explore the message that evidently resonated with voters.

Analysis of Campaign Rhetoric

The analysis of the campaign rhetoric used by winning TPM House candidates provides insight into the perceptions of issues and proposed solutions associated with TPM values. The data used is the analysis was gathered from the sampled candidates’ campaign websites. Using the rhetoric issued directly from each candidate’s campaign rather than an outside source reduces some bias. However, there is a potential limitation that comes with using a campaign website after the elections have taken place. The potential exists for changes to occur to the website based on the constantly evolving nature of events. While this concern is a possibility, four of the five websites sampled had not appeared to have been recently updated and therefore are likely to be consistent with each candidate’s 2010 website. As previously mentioned, while Mulvaney’s website had been updated for the 2012 election, Mulvaney had been reported as advocating TPM values prior to the 2010 election.

Issue Rhetoric

Table 1: Sample of Language used by TPM Candidates in Issue Discussion.

Issue	TPM Language
Economy & Jobs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The most crucial issue facing Indiana today is creating jobs for Hoosier families.” • “streamline federal workforce development programs to cut red tape and get Americans back to work.” • “[Obamacare] is a job killer”
Spending, Taxes & Bailouts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "End corporate bailouts" • “reduce extravagant government spending” • “Failure is just as much a part of our free market system as success. In fact, business failures are often the genesis of tremendous

	<p>innovation and improvement.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Increased taxes, which are now under consideration, discourage self reliance and personal accountability.” • “Deficit spending, unsustainable government programs, and a crippling national debt are the sources of the relentless government intervention we see in the form of higher taxes, excessive regulation, and hostility toward investment.”
Government Regulations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “MORE LAWS ARE NOT THE ANSWER” • “excessive government regulations hurt the economy and cost jobs.” • “We are learning first hand the cruel lesson that the larger the government is, the less responsive it is to the people”
Healthcare	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “ Repeal Obamacare.” • “The President’s health care law known as Obamacare is, in large part, what motivated Dr. Gosar to run for Congress. That is how devastating he believes this law will be to the future of this country.” • “The Obama health care take over hurts patients and cuts \$500 billion from Medicare.”
Immigration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Stop Illegal Immigration” • “I strongly believe we need to immediately secure our border and oppose amnesty for anyone who blatantly violates our law.” • “illegal immigration not only jeopardizes those opportunities for everyone, but presents a serious threat to national security”
Anti-Washington Sentiment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The real problem is the incompetence and ineptitude of the federal bureaucracy” • “in just a generation Washington has gone from “Ask not what your country can do for you....” to “We will guarantee your GM warranty.”” • “Washington Millionaires have been taking your family’s hard-earned tax dollars to bailout AIG, Wall Street, the auto industry, and others who take money from your family’s success and gives it as a reward to those that have been irresponsible.” • “I adamantly oppose this Liberal Congress’ tax and spend ways.”

Source: Data collected by the author from the sampled candidates’ official campaign websites.
<http://www.scottdesjarlais.com/www>, <http://www.gosarforcongress.com/>, <http://heck4nevada.com/>,
<http://www.mulvaneyforcongress.com/>, <http://gomarlin.com/>

The most common theme in the campaign websites of the sampled TPM candidates was the poor economy. The public’s discontent with slow growth, high unemployment, and no incentives to invest what money they had saved was the spark for the formation of the Tea Party Movement. These candidates were clear in making the economy and jobs the primary points of their campaigns. Marlin Stutzmen described the current situation as one of a “struggling economy” that continued to produce “devastating effects.” “Obamacare” and the stimulus bill were two policies of the administration that the candidates pointed to as being the sources for

such effects. These policies made the Obama administration and congressional Democrats the target for attacks from the TPM candidates citing the government's perceived ineffectiveness in promoting job growth. As Mick Mulvaney argued, "Simply demanding jobs, or conjuring them up with deficit spending, does not solve the problem." It was obvious that there was higher unemployment nationwide than there had been in previous years. With households struggling and ineffective job creation, the common thread among the TPM candidates was to convey to the electorate that these candidates would be the ones "re-igniting American Business" and "[getting] Americans back to work," as stated by Paul Gosar and Joe Heck, respectively.

The catalyst for job growth that these candidates championed was to let the "free market" solve the problem. Many, like Paul Gosar, cited similar principles of "free enterprise" and "small business" as the cornerstones of the United States economy. The free market notion was clear in Mulvaney's campaign through his "Let business create jobs" rhetoric. Straightforward and concise, this was the essence of the TPM candidates' views on how best to turn the economy around.

Excessive government spending was another prevalent theme used in the campaign statements by all of the sampled the TPM candidates. Commonly used words like "extravagant," "runaway," "wasteful," and "out of line" described recent federal spending. In particular, Stutzmen described the situation as having come from the idea that "Washington has bought in to the myth that it can spend its way out of trouble." This also pointed the finger at the Obama administration as well as the Democratic-controlled Congress in an attempt to fuel discontent in the electorate with the current situation. Candidates also mentioned excessive spending as the cause for the current Washington politicians being "on the verge of bankrupting the country, debasing the currency, and throwing the economy into a death-spin," as Mulvaney argued.

Again, connecting the spending to the congressional Democrats, Gosar directly mentions his incumbent opponent Ann Kirkpatrick and Speaker Nancy Pelosi as those “whose first instinct is to spend more of our money.”

Aside from the calls to “stop spending” as DesJarlais emphasized during his campaign, several candidates also proposed a balanced budget amendment was presented. This amendment was under the larger framework of candidates’ references to “common sense solutions” references by the candidates. Heck and Stutzmen both directly addressed the idea for this amendment.

Along with the candidates’ cries of excessive spending and increases in taxes, corporate bailouts were presented as another failure of President Obama and the Washington establishment as whole. The common theme was that the corporate bailouts should have never happened and were ultimately bad for the economy. Being champions of the free market, several of the candidates sampled made it a point to discuss the opportunities associated with having a free market society. In such an economy, Stutzman argued “businesses have the opportunity to succeed, and sometimes, even the opportunity to fail.” The prospects for positive opportunities drive the entrepreneurial spirit and promote growth. Mulvaney’s statement echoes Stutzman’s about such opportunities, saying that failure and success go hand-in-hand and these failures are “the genesis of tremendous innovation and improvement.”

In addition to the attacks on Obama and the congressional Democrats for their excessive spending, candidates contended that the increase in taxes added to the economic hardships going as far as to place the blame on the actions of the “far Left.” The frequently referenced “burden” from current taxes was another focal point of the TPM candidates’ attacks on federal spending. Gosar referred to the recent spike in taxes as the government’s attempt to “discourage self

reliance and personal accountability.” The continued connection of current problems as being caused by those in power appeared in Stutzman’s arguments that the taxes were a “symptom” of the status quo.

The TPM candidates commonly proposed solution was to stop raising taxes and eliminate the estate tax (the “death” tax”). The harmful effects of more taxes were argued as presently damaging the economy. By eliminating this particular tax and through simplifying the tax code, the candidates contended households would be encouraged to “save and invest in their future” and enable “small business and farms [to] grow.”

The TPM candidates again displayed common rhetoric when they discussed the issue of government regulations. The similar thread among the candidates was the perception that there was more government control over people and the private sector than was needed. As Joe Heck stated, “excessive government regulations hurt the economy and cost jobs.” This also demonstrates the overall connection candidates made between the regulations imposed and enforced by the Obama administration and the struggling economy. The idea of “simply passing ‘more’ laws” to solve problems is not effective according to Gosar’s campaign statements; “better government, not bigger government” is the solution. While the main point of the harmful effects of increased government regulations is argued through words such as “excessive,” “passing ‘more’ laws,” and “bigger government,” the alleged effects of the perceived increase in government regulations assist in further driving a wedge between voters and the current Democratic administration and Democratic-controlled Congress. The poor economy permeates the various issues and rhetoric the TPM candidates used. The candidates attempted to strengthen the perceived connection of the struggling economy to these increases in regulations. The common rhetoric of “limited federal government” emphasized by Mulvaney, and other similar

language, was utilized to illustrate the potential benefits of fewer regulations under a TPM member of Congress.

Another focus was the candidates' shared belief in repealing "Obamacare." The perceived harms of the legislation not only to businesses but also to the American taxpayers led to the "Repeal Obamacare" battle cry from the TPM candidates. The candidates frequently exploited the potential costs associated with the Affordable Care Act, such as increases in taxes and job loss as harmful effects of the program. Besides similarities in the candidates' calls for repealing the statute, there also were similarities in their proposed solutions for the health care system. They called for implementation of "free market solutions." As Mulvaney argued, "the solutions can be found...in more personal control and free market competition, less government intervention, and some common-sense reforms." Gosar, a dentist, whose solution was "to reform the health care system and put forth free market solutions to increase access and decrease costs to the consumer" echoed this thought. Stutzman proposed "Expanding free market solutions such as Health Savings Accounts to include all citizens."

Immigration was another common issue with similar rhetoric. Strong opposition to illegal immigration and the common rhetoric of the U.S. as an immigrant-built nation is prevalent throughout the campaign statements of the TPM candidates, as is the proposed solution for enforcing the current immigration laws. DesJarlais simplifies the shared belief as being to "stop illegal immigration." The candidates characterized allowing the continual flow of illegal immigrants into the country as leading to a "serious threat to national security" and an increase in crime. While the TPM candidates mentioned their clear opposition to illegal immigration, they also referenced the United States as a "beacon for immigrants" as the U.S. is a "nation of immigrants" itself. Gosar also noted that, "legal immigration helped define the character of our

country,” further illustrating a common populist thread. It is this acceptance of legal immigration that brings about the common solution among the sampled TPM candidates. The candidates argued that enforcing existing laws would reduce the amount of illegal immigration, something Mulvaney states “the federal government [is] currently ignoring.”

All of the issues the sampled candidates mentioned eventually funnel to a key target for the Tea Party Movement, the intense opposition to Obama and congressional Democrats. The President and his allies in Congress are presented as promoting the poor economy through increased government spending, greater government control through regulations, not securing the borders, and policies such as “Obamacare.” Frequently mentioned are the failures of the Obama administration and the Democratic-controlled Congress. Candidates presented the “status quo” in Washington as being the source of the recent recession. In specific reference to the Democratic-controlled legislature, Paul Gosar stated during his campaign that he “adamantly oppose[d] this Liberal Congress’ tax and spend ways.” The frequent mention of rampant government spending was a key focus for these candidates, and here Gosar links the spending specifically to the Democrats in Congress. Mick Mulvaney also emphasized this point when he stated that the solution for those in Washington was to “spend more money that we don’t have” and the “current Administration is pushing” for this increase in spending, which Democrats are happy to oblige through “rubber stamping” their approval. Again, there is the connection directly linking the congressional Democrats to Obama and together they are presented as the problem.

The attacks on Obama and congressional Democrats continue in discussions of national security. Obama and Congress presented are portrayed as being harmful to national security. Stutzman refers to the “constant handwringing by the President and the liberals on Capitol Hill [as] a danger to Americans.” It illustrates that the TPM candidates did not focus solely on the

perceived connection of economic failures to Obama and the Democrats. Illegal immigration, for example, was connected to a concern to national security. Gosar voices his concern that “The Obama Administration, assisted by the far left, such as Speaker Pelosi and his opponent Ann Kirkpatrick, believe that ‘open borders; should apply to the United States,” arguing that open borders can lead to an increase to such criminals as “drug smugglers, human traffickers, criminals and murderers, sex trade operators.” Gosar suggests that that immigration is also a national security concern, one that the current federal government has failed to address. Mulvaney also makes this point, arguing that the “federal government is currently ignoring immigration laws.” This demonization of Obama and the Democrats in Congress adds to the perceived failure of the Democratic politicians. The TPM candidates evidently sought to get the idea implanted in the voters’ minds that not only were the Democrats causing the economic problems; they were also not helping to protect the American people.

The Washington bureaucracy was not immune to attacks from the TPM candidates. Several of the sampled TPM candidates, in addition to blaming Obama and Congress for the recent economic problems, also pointed to the ineffectiveness of executive branch agencies. The main idea present in the rhetoric used by the sampled TPM candidates is that the Washington “bureaucracy” is failing the American people. As Gosar mentions, the present economic problems are a result of the “incompetency and ineptitude of the federal government.” A specific reference to the perceived failing bureaucracy centers on education. The Department of Education is frequently referenced as a source of inefficiency. Mulvaney states, for example, that “the Department of Education is fast becoming part of the problem, not part of the solution” as it ineffectively spends its funding. There is the shared solution to “reduce the size of government”, as DesJarlais stated. In order for this proposed solution to be successful, elected officials need to

follow Stutzman's argument to "shrink government bureaucracy." In addition, Heck's promise to "streamline" current federal programs and "cut red tape" illustrates the common rhetoric for less government and a more effective bureaucracy through reduction and elimination.

Interestingly, the candidates rarely addressed foreign policy and national security. Although the established focus of the Tea Party Movement is fiscal conservatism, the grounding of such ideals in the Constitution provides the opportunity for candidates to elaborate on other such issues through similar Constitutional framings. The candidates do occasionally mention the value of a strong national defense, supporting veterans' rights, and ensuring the safety of the American people. However, there is little detail beyond these overall generalities. When there is detail, it often returns to discussion of security as it relates to immigration and domestic issues. Stutzman is the lone sampled candidate who elaborates his national defense stance. It is interesting that the candidates did not take the opportunity to elaborate on such an issue, given the opportunity to further allude to the Constitution.

Perhaps the lack of a detailed statement on national defense stems from none of the candidates having to face an incumbent Republican in the primary. By default, these candidates assumed the role of the Republican candidate and inherited the GOP stance of support for a strong national defense. The TPM's overall focus of fiscal conservatism was the rallying cry that evidently in part generated the initial support for these candidates. Therefore, it would make sense for these TPM candidates to continue to champion the message of fiscal conservatism over other policy issues. However, if candidates did have to face an incumbent Republican, there may have been a more detailed discussion of national defense issues in order to distinguish each candidate's platform from their incumbent counterparts. A different sample of the overall winning TPM House candidates from 2010 may provide for such a discussion.

Proposals Rhetoric

Table 2: Sample of Language used by TPM Candidates in Proposal Discussion.

Proposals	TPM Language
Free Market	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Let business create jobs.” • “The solutions can be found... in more personal control and free market competition, less government intervention, and some common-sense reforms.” • “I support creating a market-friendly environment for businesses to operate and grow.” • “The free market didn’t create the problems we face now in the economy, but it can create the solution.”
Limited Government	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Reduce the size of government" • “we must look to shrink government bureaucracy.” • “We need better government, not bigger government.” • “I believe in the concept of a limited federal government.” • “The best balance comes in recognizing and honoring the limitations on the federal government – and the primacy of the people and the states – set forth in the Constitution.”
Common Sense	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Washington can learn a lot from Hoosier families: common sense, setting priorities, and not spending more than you have.” • "We must work together to restore common sense, no-nonsense values back to Washington before we loose[sic] this Republic all together." • “I support common sense spending solutions such as a balanced budget amendment and putting an end to earmark spending.”
Constitution/Founding Fathers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “I believe in the United States Constitution.” • “Obamacare is unconstitutional to boot, both in statute and in practice: the individual mandate stomps on the principles our Founders intended while the Department of Health and Human Services has exercised its authority under this law to enact a decision that violates the First Amendment right to freedom of religion.” • “When our founders wrote the U.S. Constitution, they did not envision the Federal Government playing a heavy handed role in the education of America’s children.”

Source: Data collected by the author from the sampled candidates’ official campaign websites.
<http://www.scottdesjarlais.com/www>, <http://www.gosarforcongress.com/>, <http://heck4nevada.com/>,
<http://www.mulvaneyforcongress.com/>, <http://gomarlin.com/>

Similar rhetoric is prevalent in the solutions the candidates proposed. The common mantra of “free market solutions” is a key component in promoting a strong economy. The candidates called for changes in favor of letting businesses make decisions free of government

restrictions. The idea of having the government heavily involved through various regulations, like the policies of the Obama administration and congressional Democrats the candidates highlighted, has the inverse effect on growth. Through competition, the candidates argued these “free market” decisions would result in growth and job creation in order for businesses to survive and prosper.

Free market solutions are part of the large view of limited government that the candidates commonly mentioned in their campaign statements. Mulvaney voices this need highlighting the populist nature of the Tea Party Movement: “We are learning first hand the cruel lesson that the larger government is, the less responsive it is to the people.” This statement summarizes the common rhetoric that over-regulation by the federal government is directly having harmful effects. Calling for reduction in government and placing people themselves as those whom the policies are hurting demonstrate the populist nature of the TPM.

Building on the theme of populist rhetoric by the TPM candidates, there is the shared usage of “common sense” as a solution. The use of this rhetoric evidently conveys an idea to the voters that they too possess what is necessary to turn the economy around and make it successful again. Specifically, the popularly referenced phrase calling on the government to “live within its means” highlights the TPM populism. Stutzman in particular focuses on this as his solution to reduce spending. Referring to his rural district, “Washington can learn a lot from Hoosier families: common sense, setting priorities, and not spending more than you have” and that “thousands of families across Indiana set their family’s budget every day without the aid of a Harvard Economist.” This seeks to promote the voter’s feelings of being able to personally relate to the current economic hardships and one’s personal reduction in spending, as seen nationwide by less overall investing. The populist nature of such statements is clear. The candidates

positioned themselves along with the disgruntled public and portrayed the current administration and those in Congress as the “insiders” causing the economic problems. By doing so, the candidates projected the image of the people versus an ineffective government, one that was not, as Mulvaney indicates, “responsive...to the people.” Mulvaney effectively conveyed this populist message when stating, “The best balance comes in recognizing and honoring the limitation on the federal government—and the primacy of the people and the states—set forth in the Constitution.”

The candidates similarly cited the grounding for these overall solutions of free market, limited government, and common sense as the United States Constitution. They blamed current Washington politicians for ignoring what was written in the Constitution. The candidates’ issue statements frequently labeled many current government policies as being “unconstitutional.” Mulvaney and Gosar in particular heavily reference the Constitution on a variety of issues in their statements. When stating his view on national defense, Gosar quotes Article 1, Section 8 as supporting his stance that “the security of the American citizens is one of the sole constitutional duties of the federal government.” When discussing his views of the role of government, Mulvaney mentions first, “I believe in the United States Constitution.” Before addressing the broader issue, he made this statement, conveying the notion that his overall beliefs were grounded in that document.

References to the U.S. Constitution would not be complete without mentioning the Founding Fathers and their founding principles. The candidates used this historical image as additional framing for their asserted values. As the candidates referenced the failings of the current government due to its perceived ignorance or neglect of the Constitution, they specifically mentioned aspects of the vision that the Founding Fathers had for the country. When

discussing “Obamacare” as unconstitutional, Gosar cites the Founding Fathers in his argument: “the individual mandate stomps on the principles our Founders intended.” Gosar’s use of a harsh sounding verb like “stomp” attempts to create a mental image of Obama and members of Congress who supported the legislation exhibiting a significant disrespect for their country and the principles on which it was founded; perhaps implying that Obama and his supporters in Congress were anti-American.

The extensive use of similar rhetoric among the sampled TPM candidates appears throughout their statements on a variety of issues. All of these sampled candidates were successful in their attempts for election, indicating that their words might be related to how voters perceived these candidates and their opponents. Through demonizing President Obama, his administration, and the congressional Democrats, the TPM candidates directly blamed the Democrats for the recent economic hardships and promoted a sense of fear that if the TPM candidates were not elected, then the economy would continue to decline.

Preaching of founding Constitutional values such as free market solutions, limited government, common sense was the cornerstone for the emergence of the Tea Party Movement. This sentiment continued to echo in the campaign rhetoric of the sampled 2010 House candidates, demonstrating a common adherence to a shared set of principles. With the TPM being a niche-focused political group of small government, pro-capitalism, and anti-Obama rhetoric, the collective adherence to similar rhetoric exhibited by the candidates likely contributed to the success of the TPM in the 2010 elections. By not veering from the standard TPM message, as can be the case in the established parties as their members can be representative of a larger variety of viewpoints, the candidates were able to be consistent in their delivery of statements and benefit from growing support nationwide.

Chapter 4: A Comparison of the Progressive (Bull Moose) Party and the Tea Party Movement

The United States experienced significant economic turmoil at the turn of the 20th century. This was the case at the turn of the 21st century as well. One major event during the early 1900's that became influential in the 1912 presidential election was the Panic of 1907. Before the rise of the Tea Party Movement there was the Great Recession of 2008, which brought about government bank bailouts and the passage of an economic stimulus package. Both cases set the stage for the emergence of new political entities that directly addressed the results of these economic pains.

The U.S. Economy Prior to the Progressive (Bull Moose) Party

The economy had experienced vast growth due to the rapid industrialization and corporate mergers taking place in the years leading up to 1907 (Bruner and Carr 2007, 3-9). However, these mergers led to the control of a select, powerful few of Wall Street financial professionals with J.P. Morgan at the helm of many of the consolidations (Bruner and Carr 2007, 9-11). These consolidations paved the way for these elites to continue to grow wealthier as these “oligopolies...sacrificed the welfare of the consumers for the benefit of the investors” (Bruner and Carr 2007, 24). An increase in the success of the economy combined with the growing interdependency within society left those on the bottom rung of the corporate ladder in a powerless position (Fleehinger 2003, 23). The consolidated corporations had grown so large that the small business owners who ran their own enterprises were being pushed out of business with the large corporations soon becoming nothing more than a “machine for making money”

(Fleehinger 2003, 29-30). These actions would ultimately catch up with the Wall Street elites in 1907.

An initial blow to the economy was first felt by the 1906 San Francisco earthquake. The damages were estimated up to \$500 million, which were devastating to what was seen as the western United States' Wall Street and also the west coast home of the U.S. Mint (Bruner and Carr 2007, 13-14). The fallout from the earthquake resulted in an estimated \$1 billion loss in securities traded on the New York Stock Exchange (Bruner and Carr 2007, 14). Clearly, the effects of the earthquake were not limited to the west coast. As gold reserves were used to aid San Francisco, capital began to dry up eventually causing stock prices to rise, bond prices to fall, and ultimately result in an increase in interest rates (Bruner and Carr 2007, 15-16). These events illustrate that while this was a natural disaster, the decisions of corporations and the elites who ran them had an initial influence in the market arriving at the possibility for a panic to occur due to the use of gold reserves for aid.

The "silent crash" in March of 1907 stemmed from the earthquake and provided another warning for the impending panic. Stock prices fell and sales were at a record high due to rumors surrounding the failure of the financial institutions which led the U.S. to intervene by having the Treasury push \$12 million into the economy (Bruner and Carr 2007, 19-21). This quick fix by the government helped to temporarily stabilize the economy, but it would not last.

After the March 1907 silent crash, there was a downturn in the confidence of the banking industry as more and more patrons began making withdrawals (Bruner and Carr 2007, 89). Following such withdrawals, there was a shortage of money on the New York Stock Exchange with investors continuing to pull money out of the market (Bruner and Carr 2007, 98-99). This began the Panic of 1907 as there was a drop in stock prices, loans were being called in, and

rumors quickly spread concerning the fate of many brokerage firms (Bruner and Carr 2007, 100-101). However, the Panic subsided after J.P. Morgan was able to secure several loans and the buy-out of a major corporation (Bruner and Carr 2007, 112; 133).

The lack of confidence in the banking and financial industry was the catalyst for the brief economic decline. With government intervention used as a temporary solution, the issue became a political matter. This was amplified by the fact that the \$12 million put forth by the U.S. Treasury did not completely solve the issue as private business dealings eventually helped to stabilize the economy. The apparent ineffectiveness of the government brought this to the forefront of national politics.

The Emergence of the Progressive (Bull Moose) Party

The Progressive Party was born from Theodore Roosevelt's discontent with President William Taft's strong stance against certain fundamental processes Roosevelt saw for achieving Republican objectives (Kruschke 1991, 138). Such issues were stated throughout Roosevelt's 1912 presidential campaign, particularly evident in one speech in Boston, Massachusetts where he presented some of these fundamental issues that center on promoting "popular rule as a means of getting fairer play, getting a square deal for all the people" (Gould 2008, 18). As Roosevelt claims in his Boston speech, that popular rule is the only way "possible to get social and economic justice" in the United States (Gould 2008, 18).

One such policy that drew intense disapproval from Roosevelt and the Progressives due to the potential for greater economic injustice was the Aldrich-Vreeland Act. This legislation was passed in 1908 as a response to the Panic of 1907 and provided for an emergency procedure for "issuing currency based on the reserves in banks" as well as a commission to evaluate the U.S.

financial system (Bruner and Carr 2007, 143-145). In the eyes of Progressives, the legislation pitted the wealthy establishment on Wall Street against the average person creating a fear that the outcome of the evaluation would recommend a solution more favorable to wealthy Wall Street financiers (Bruner and Carr 2007, 145).

Another piece of legislation that widened the gap within the Republican Party was the Payne-Aldrich Tariff Act. Signed into law by President Taft on August 6, 1909, the tariff act lowered some rates, but increased others (Arnold 2003, 75). Overall, it decreased the high rates from the Dingley tariff; however, it did establish a tax on corporation incomes (Arnold 2003, 75). Initially seen as fairly successful, the tariff came under scrutiny by those calling it a “betrayal of Taft’s promise of reform” (Arnold 2003, 77). As a presidential candidate, Taft had advocated that the Republican ideals possess what is “essential” to reform corrupt practices (Arnold 2003, 79). However, reform under Taft proved to be “more constrained than Roosevelt’s” and while Taft was successful as a reformer, he had “lukewarm commitments to the reform *process*” as he often tried to avoid the inherent conflict (Arnold 2003, 79). This refusal to engage in the conflict is where Roosevelt drew his discontent with Taft. While Roosevelt was seen as a “forceful” reformer, Taft was seen as “passive” (Arnold 2003, 64). The nature of their views on the overall powers of the presidency gives insight into such motivation for their respective stances. Roosevelt being the more intense reformer believed that the powers of the presidency were “limited only by what the Constitution expressly prohibits because it is ‘his duty to do anything that the needs of the nation demanded’” (Arnold 2003, 65; Roosevelt 1913, 197). This broad interpretation of presidential powers by Roosevelt provides the necessary insight to understand his views on being a strong reformer. However, the Taft’s more passive stance is understood through his statement on presidential powers “that the President can exercise no

power which cannot be fairly and reasonably traced to some specific grant of power” (Taft 1916, 138). In contrast to Roosevelt’s view, Taft believed that his powers were only those specifically given to him in the Constitution and therefore this could be seen as a reason for his less aggressive position on the reform process. Nevertheless, Taft’s contrasting passiveness strongly influenced Roosevelt’s disapproval of his successor.

The struggling economy and perceived economic injustice played a significant role in the establishment of the Progressive Party. In the early 1900s, the Progressive Party emerged to combat party corruption and the “influence of big business in politics” (Dwyre 2010, 77). By targeting large corporations as the root of the economic problems, the Progressives were able to expand the party’s populist base. As Theodore Roosevelt said in one of his presidential campaign speeches in 1912 as the Progressive, and later popularly referred to as the Bull Moose Party,¹⁸ candidate, “The Progressive movement is aimed at the rotten machines, the rotten boss system of both parties” (Gould 2008, 10). The Progressives sought to fix the system from the corrupt political bosses and big business as they championed more “direct democracy” methods such as a merit system for government employment, later becoming the civil service, and the use of primaries (Dwyre 2010, 77; 79).

The Bull Moose Party clearly was focused on promoting a populist agenda over the status quo of party politics. Quoting another 1912 presidential campaign speech by Roosevelt, “We are making our fight for the plain people...The men for whom we are making the fight are not politicians, and are not men of great wealth” (Gould 2008, 12-13). The party was positioning itself to be an outsider to the current establishment in Washington, D.C. and not associated with

¹⁸ For the remainder of this thesis the Progressive Party of 1912 will be referred to as the Bull Moose Party due to the popularity of the name in response to Roosevelt’s statement after the assassination attempt that “it takes more than that to kill a Bull Moose.” (Gould 2008, 174-175).

the political elites of the perceived corrupt system (Bibby and Maisel 2003, 33). The championing of populist ideals aided in the early success of the party as Roosevelt received more votes than Taft, but the Republican split allowed for the Democrat Woodrow William to win the presidency (Bibby and Maisel 2003, 33). The brief success was cut short by this overall defeat and began the downfall of the Bull Moose Party.

The brief existence of the Bull Moose Party was evident in the next presidential election. Roosevelt rejoined the Republican Party and gave its nominee his endorsement (Bibby and Maisel 2003, 33). Such a statement clearly indicated the primary issues resulting in Roosevelt's 1912 bid were the economy and President Taft. The Bull Moose Party was effectively dead after the 1912 presidential election as Roosevelt was the driving force behind its electoral influence. The Progressives' constant attempts to nominate Roosevelt for another presidential run in the following election cycle were a testament to his success in elevating, though temporary, the national prominence of the Progressive Party. However his declining of the nomination signaled the end of the Bull Moose Party progressives.

A subsequent Progressive Party presidential candidate did not emerge until the 1924 election (Kruschke 1991, 141). While still advocating populist ideals, the rebirth of the Progressive Party was different from the progressives of Roosevelt's Bull Moose Party. The new Progressive Party, led by Senator Robert La Follete, drew its base from farmers and labor support, previously those associated with the Socialist Party which was transforming into a more intellectually-driven party (Bibby and Maisel 2003, 33-34). While there were similar populist undertones, this new Progressive Party was in contrast to the Bull Moose Party of Roosevelt as Roosevelt's base was composed of "middle- and upper-class" voters (Bibby and Maisel 2003, 34). Roosevelt's return to the Republican Party brought along a significant amount of Bull

Moose Party supporters to the Republican effectively thinning the support for the Progressive Party in future elections. Even with the party's rebirth under La Follete, the newly targeted blue-collar base changed the direction of the party making it a shell of the party which nominated Roosevelt.

The U.S. Economy Prior to the Tea Party Movement

Between December 2007 and June 2009, the United States experienced a severe economic downturn, "the most severe economic contraction in the United States since the Great Depression of 1929-1933" (Thomas 2011, 93). A primary reason for this economic disaster centers on the wage aspiration effect. Employees become accustomed to constant real wage increases similar to those in previous years and employers are inclined to approve such increases, which ultimately results in a rise in production costs, a rise in inflation, and a higher national rate of unemployment to maintain economic equilibrium in order to accommodate the pay raises (Thomas 2011, 97-98). In addition to the perceived wage increased, there was the expectation of continued job growth. In the fifteen years prior to the start of the Great Recession, there was an average of 150,000 jobs created each month (Thomas 2011, 100). The combined expectations of continual increases in pay and continual job growth produced a favorable outlook in consumers.

However, this was an unrealistic expectation which manifested into the Great Recession. The trigger for the decline was the decrease of aggregate spending in terms of consumption, investments, government purchases, and transferring of goods and services (Thomas 2011, 103-104). This decline in economic activity produced greater unemployment. The high unemployment spike began to reduce the amount of disposable income available for households which brought investment spending on stocks and housing to a halt (Thomas 2011 105-106).

From December 2007 to February 2010, job loss averaged 300,000 per month leading to this decline in wealth and spending as from 2006 to 2009, \$14 trillion was lost in the housing and stock markets (Thomas 2011, 100; 106).

The failure of the housing market was a spark for the continued decline of the economy. With less consumer and investment spending, not only did housing prices fall from 20% to 30% of their 2005 peak values, but those who owned houses began defaulting on their mortgages leading to increased foreclosures (Thomas 2011, 103; 106). There was an approximate decline of \$450 billion per year in home improvement investments during the Great Recession causing additional suffering for the housing industry, particularly the those involved in building construction, which aided in the increasing unemployment nationwide (Thomas 2011, 104; 108). It was not simply a lack of spending and investment that caused the burst, but rather the lack of spending combined with those already owning their homes not being able to make payments on the houses they purchased under the assumption of continued prosperity associated with the wage aspiration effect and previous job growth.

With the decline in the housing market, other industries were affected as well, specifically the banking industry. There was a rapid increase in housing foreclosures and repossessions (Thomas 2011, 108). The increased foreclosures and repossessions illuminated a serious flaw in the previous lending practices of banks. Banks were lending money people could not afford to pay back. About “half of new homes built after 2003” had their market values fall below their mortgage balances (Thomas 2011, 108). This called for a change in these lending practices. Banks soon began to tighten their overall lending and instituted stricter policies regarding loans (Thomas 2011, 107; 109). Consumer spending and confidence further declined as a result of these policies (Thomas 2011, 107). Less money in people’s pockets meant less

money to spend. While the banks were safeguarding their investments and trying to recover from the burst, they were effectively killing any potential for future growth. The stagnant nature of the economy can only perpetuate when there is no spending.

The banking industry was not alone in experiencing financial damage from the housing burst. Business overall was suffering as a result of failures in the housing market and the new stricter lending policies of banks. During the Great Recession, business profits declined about 40% leading to a great decrease in perceived confidence of businesses in the U.S. furthering the abysmal decline of the economy (Thomas 2011, 110). The lack of business performance was felt globally as well. The foreclosures associated with the housing market had a harmful financial effect on foreign banks as many had invested in bonds that were backed by the mortgages and related investments from U.S. banks (Thomas 2011, 108-109). When the housing mortgages failed, the resulting chain-reaction caused foreign investment to decline. In addition, the decrease of incoming foreign investments was combined with a large decline in the exporting of goods from the United States (Thomas 2011, 111). The collapsing nature of the U.S. economy had an effect on both domestic affairs and transnational business relations.

These situations in the private sector echoed into the workings of the government, particularly at the state and local levels. The potential for revenue was declining due to the troubles in the private sector. Budget deficits were present in all but two states because of the decreased spending, decreased investing, and the plummeting of housing values (Thomas 2011, 110). These influential declines reduced the amount of revenue as there was less to be taxed and the value of the capital being taxed was at a significantly lower value than in previous years. As a whole, the nationwide aggregate deficit was over \$125 billion, including the approximate \$200 million aid from the 2009 federal stimulus package (Thomas 2011, 110). These effects were

most visible at the local level as expenditures for these governments are typically funded through sales taxes and property taxes (Thomas 2011, 110). Due to the reduction in individual spending and lower housing values, the revenues for local governments were shrinking, as were their expenditures (Thomas 2011, 110). This economic collapse effectively brought about a freeze on both private and public spending, threatening the future of both individuals and the government. With government revenues declining and the economy overall in jeopardy, there was a strong calling for government intervention. During the collapse of the banking industry under President George W. Bush's administration, the Troubled Asset Relief Program was implemented to help stabilize the country's financial sector at a cost of \$245 billion¹⁹. However, the "maximum possible loss" for the program could have been in the \$700 billion range (Elliot 2009, 6). It is likely that this threat of great potential loss of investment for the government was a strong concern ultimately leading to President Barack Obama's stimulus act. While the \$700 billion potential loss was billed as the ultimate bottom, there was discussion that a loss of that size was not possible, even in such a poor economy (Elliot 2009, 6). This may have soothed some doubt in the American public, but there was still a strong voice of disapproval. As was TARP implemented, opposition to it grew. From October 2008 to December 2008, those calling TARP a "good thing" decreased from 50 percent to 46 percent and those calling it a "bad thing" increased from 41 percent to 47 percent, illustrating a progressively negative opinion as the policy was being implemented.²⁰

TARP alone did not solve the economic crisis facing the country and the grim outlook from the bank bailouts extended into President Obama's term. The economy was in great disarray as it was in "the worst recession since the Great Depression" (Jacobson 2013, 224).

¹⁹ <http://www.treasury.gov/initiatives/financial-stability/programs/Pages/default.aspx>

²⁰ <http://www.gallup.com/poll/113047/americans-falling-favor-initial-bailout.aspx>

When then President-elect Obama requested that the remaining \$350 million of the TARP bailout to be released, 62 percent of Americans wanted Congress to block the release until there were more specification for the allocation of funds.²¹ The 62 percent majority disapproval in the face of great economic adversity shows a considerable lack of confidence in the government and the private sector.

Even following the increase in TARP funds, the economy still did not make a significant turnaround. Further economic decline again signaled the need for another solution to the persistent problem. President Obama put forth his stimulus package bill, which became the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. Before the February 2009 Santelli rant, the economy appeared to be in such grave concern that 75 percent of Americans were in favor of some version of President Obama's stimulus plan including a total of 56 percent of adults self-identifying as Republicans surveyed were in favor of it passing as proposed or passing with major changes²² While 43 percent of the 56 percent were in the "pass with major changes" category, this survey still provides some information as to the view of the economy right before the emergence of the Tea Party Movement. The economy was viewed in such a terrible light that a majority of surveyed adults self-identifying as Republicans were in favor of an economic stimulus plan, eventually becoming the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, originally proposed to cost about \$787 billion.²³ The move towards support of President Obama's stimulus package indicated an increasing belief that the economy was not in a good place.

²¹ <http://www.gallup.com/poll/113788/americans-want-details-before-release-more-tarp-funds.aspx>

²² <http://www.gallup.com/poll/114097/Americans-Support-Stimulus-Major-Changes.aspx>

²³ http://www.recovery.gov/About/Pages/The_Act.aspx

Having this grim view of the economy at the time eventually resulted in the spark that ignited the Tea Party Movement. The government's ineffectiveness to provide a swift, successful solution to the economic collapse became a primary issue in national politics (Jacobson 2013, 224). The discontent with the government throughout the economic decline was the rallying point for those who would eventually become the Tea Party Movement.

The Emergence of the Tea Party Movement

The Tea Party Movement traces its founding to the February 2009 rant by CNBC commentator Rick Santelli.²⁴ His impassionate rant emphasized his stark opposition to the planned government funded bank bailouts that rose of out the plethora of failed mortgages sparking significant applause and support from those around him on the Chicago trade floor from where he was reporting. Santelli argued that the “government is promoting bad behavior” by going through with the proposed bailouts.²⁵ He proposed a populist-style solution by calling for a public referendum on the bailouts, further stating that the government needed to “reward people that could carry the water instead of drink the water.”²⁶ Nearing the end of his approximately five-minute long rant, Santelli mentioned his desire to organize a “Chicago Tea Party” to take place at Lake Michigan in a similar fashion to the Boston Tea Party that occurred in 1773. As the rant was concluding, another CNBC anchor jokingly asked Santelli about a possible run for U.S. Senate due to the thunderous support from the traders around him. Santelli took this opportunity to voice his opinion that he wanted nothing to do with Washington politics and stated that the last place he is “ever going to live or work is D.C.”²⁷ From his rant, the present Tea Party Movement and the anti-Washington sentiment has emerged onto the foreground of current

²⁴ “Tea Party Express.” <www.teapartyexpress.org>.

²⁵ “CNBC’s Rick Santelli’s Chicago Tea Party.” <<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zp-Jw-5Kx8k>>.

²⁶ “CNBC’s Rick Santelli’s Chicago Tea Party.” <<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zp-Jw-5Kx8k>>.

²⁷ “CNBC’s Rick Santelli’s Chicago Tea Party.” <<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zp-Jw-5Kx8k>>.

American politics as a promoter of fiscal conservatism and change to the current Washington political establishment.

The basis for the Tea Party Movement's platform is fiscal conservatism. Focusing on the two largest TPM groups, the Tea Party Express and the Tea Party Patriots, the core values of these groups are fiscal responsibility, limited government, and free market economics. However, there are a few subtle differences between the two largest TPM organizations that illustrate a sense of disunity. First, looking at each organization's specifically stated values and principles, there is a clear division in how the values are presented. The Tea Party Express lists the six principles of 1) "No more bailouts," 2) "Reduce the size and intrusiveness of government," 3) "Stop raising our taxes," 4) "Repeal Obamacare," 5) "Cease out-of-control spending," and 6) "Bring back American prosperity."²⁸ However, the Tea Party Patriots cite three less editorialized primary principles of "fiscal responsibility, constitutionally limited government, and free market economic policies."²⁹

In federal elections to date, there have been no candidates running for office solely under the Tea Party label. Instead there is the stated support given by these two primary Tea Party Movement organizations. The Tea Party Express clearly states on its official website that it is "committed to identifying and supporting conservative candidates and causes that will champion tea party values..."³⁰ However, this support is through endorsements of candidates. This demonstrates the recent political environment as the current age of candidate-centered politics revolves around "short-term results" where "presidents are now being responsible for solving, or failing to solve, the nation's current political problems" (Wattenberg 1991, 130).

²⁸ "Tea Party Express." <www.teapartyexpress.org>.

²⁹ "Tea Party Patriots." <www.teaparty Patriots.org/about>.

¹⁷"Tea Party Express." <www.teapartyexpress.org>.

It appears as though the Tea Party Express, as outlined in its goals specifically with that of repealing the recent healthcare bill, sees President Obama as failing to solve the current national problems and therefore the Tea Party Express is taking a candidate-centered approach rather than trying to do so through mainstream Republican Party channels. However, this is not the primary approach for all TPM groups and while one organization clearly states that it does lend some forms of support to actual candidates, the Tea Party Patriots organization states that it “does not support any political party nor do [they] endorse candidates.”³¹ The Tea Party Patriots’ statement further emphasizes its focus on supporting local grassroots organizations that are promoting the same values and providing these local groups with “logistical, educational, networking and other support” as opposed to the methods of the Tea Party Express organization who clearly state the primary focus of supporting actual candidates.³² The endorsements and financial support given to candidates by the Tea Party Express when compared to the Tea Party Patriots stance against supporting candidates, further illustrates the non-conformity among Tea Party Movement groups.

Despite these subtle differences among the various TPM groups, the electoral success of the Tea Party Movement is evident. The 2010 Congressional elections were a clear indicator of this success. Research of the 2010 Republican primaries concluded that the Tea Party label and endorsement did help boost a candidate’s prospects (Karpowitz et al. 2011, 306). The effect was not limited to the primaries as forty-nine Tea Party-supported candidates won, of those: forty-four were seats in the House and five in the Senate in the 2010 Congressional elections (Moe 2010). These changes in seats resulted in Democrats losing control of the House of Representatives and control of the filibuster-proof, super-majority in the Senate (Jacobson 2013,

³¹ “Tea Party Patriots.” <www.teapartypatriots.org/about>.

³² “Tea Party Patriots.” <www.teapartypatriots.org/about>.

223; 244). The Tea Party Movement's association with these drastic changes in the Congressional landscape is evident, despite its recent formation and many subgroups.

Comparison

Both eras, the early 1900's and the late 2000's, experienced similar cases of economic dysfunction. The wealth was being concentrated by the elites, the financial industry was waning due to a lack of public confidence, and the view of the economy was dim. In both cases, the economy was decline due in large part to the lack of confidence in the banking industry. During the Panic of 1907, the people were removing their investments from the banks leading to a halt on any potential growth in the financial sector. This lack of spending and investing was echoed during the Great Recession as the people's inability to invest, due to less disposable income, caused a freeze on economic growth. In both of these cases, the removal of investments in banks and the refusal to purchase new homes, invest, or spend in general resulted in the economic collapses. The economic environment both prior to the emergences of the Bull Moose Party and the Tea Party Movement respectively, was in a state of disarray. The failures of the private sector were brought to the national stage as an increased number of people were being affected by these transactions, or lack thereof. These economic failures bred discontent in the public leading to the lack of confidence displayed in both eras.

Eventually, the growing discontent led to the intervention by the federal government in attempts to stabilize the economy and ultimately restore consumer confidence. The initial failures of the private sector combined with public anger signaled the need for federal assistance. In both cases, the federal government's solution was to pump money back into the economy. The Great Recession saw multiple attempts by the federal government to stop the decline, first

through the use of President Bush's TARP program and then through President Obama's Recovery and Reinvestment Act. The attempt during both eras was to provide business with a financial safety net. Attempts to spark the economy through the people themselves were not the primary focus. Rather, the businesses that were collapsing were seen as those in greatest need to aid. This lack of attention to the people was a catalyst for both the Bull Moose Party and the Tea Party Movement.

In both eras, government intervention was the primary attempt to fix the economy, ultimately promoting an increase in the public's lack of confidence leading to the formation of populist political groups. The Bull Moose Party and the Tea Party Movement were both driven by discontent in the actions of the present government in their respective eras. The sitting President was the primary focus for the anger of these populist groups. In both cases, the perceived ineffectiveness of the government rested on the shoulders of the President. Roosevelt's disapproval of Taft was a primary reason for his candidacy as the Progressive Party's nominee. The attack on Taft's direction for achieving the Republican Party objectives was prevalent in the 1912 presidential election as Roosevelt mentioned certain fundamental principles throughout his campaign speeches (Kruschke 1991; Gould 2008). This was further confirmed during the following presidential election as Roosevelt endorsed the Republican Party's 1916 presidential nominee (Bibby and Maisel 2003, 33). Returning to the Republican Party following the end of Taft's presidency and immediately endorsing the Republican nominee clearly illustrates the disapproval of Taft as a primary factor in Roosevelt's split from the Republican Party and the rise in national prominence of the Bull Moose Party.

During the emergence of the TPM, President Obama and his policies were the focal point of the TPM's rhetoric for change. Anti-Obama sentiment on the stimulus package and the

healthcare bill were key arguments against the current president. Similarly to how the Bull Moose Party used Taft's involvement with the Aldrich-Vreeland Act and the Payne-Aldrich tariff as a rallying cry, the TPM focused on Obama's policies and legislation as being harmful to the economy. Popular discontent with policies in both eras was utilized as a means for drawing support and grounding each group's ideological platform.

In addition, the perceived status quo of the federal government and the established two parties ignited the desire for change. Anti-Washington sentiment was evident during both eras. Roosevelt made frequent statements about how the Bull Moose Party was fighting for the common man and not the ultra wealthy, long-established politicians in Washington (Gould 2008). From the beginning with Santelli's rant, the TPM has challenged the Washington establishment and portrayed those politicians in a similar light to how Roosevelt did during the 1912 presidential election.

In both eras, a poor economy combined with the public's growing discontent with the actions of the government fueled the populist platforms of the Bull Moose Party and the Tea Party Movement. Both groups attempted to demonize the present government and claim to fight on behalf of the average person. The Bull Moose Party and Roosevelt criticized Taft and the Washington elite; while the Tea Party Movement demonized Obama and called for a rebirth of fiscal conservatism through their frequent citing of the Constitution and in this way championed populist notions (Appendix: Figures 3-7).

There are a plethora of similarities between the Bull Moose Party and the Tea Party Movement. From the common theme of struggling economies to anti-Washington, populist rhetoric, the two groups share many similarities. As such similarities have been the catalyst for

the formation of these groups; these common factors will also be influential to the expiration of the groups. As Roosevelt's Bull Moose Party was short-lived, the common factors it shares with the Tea Party Movement will likely yield a similar ending.

Chapter 5: The Future of the Tea Party Movement?

Summary

Established politicians in the U.S. House of Representatives are rarely unseated. Even more unusual is for incumbents to lose primary elections. In the 2010 elections, candidates associated with the Tea Party Movement did both.

This thesis sought to analyze the nature of the Tea Party Movement and its ultimate longevity. The TPM structure follows various aspects associated with political factions, parties, and movements. While not truly one specific entity, the Tea Party Movement shares different aspects from all three contributing to the group's distinctive identity. Their status of having a niche-driven ideology added to the initial intrigue establishing this research for not only what were some factors, like campaign rhetoric, for their initial success, but also for addressing the future of such a specialized political group of fiscal conservatism and anti-Obama principles.

This thesis addressed both an internal comparison of analysis of the similar rhetoric used by the successful TPM candidates in the 2010 House election, and an external comparison, the analysis of the similar economic and political environments in which the Bull Moose Party and the Tea Party Movement emerged. The discussion of each candidate's language pertaining to issues and proposals highlights the commonalities shared among the TPM candidates. Analysis of rhetoric yielded results indicating a common message with an intense focus on the economy, jobs, and opposition to the President. Similar rhetoric across the sampled TPM candidates helps to understand how the candidates were consistent in their delivery of their statements on issues and ultimately benefit from growing support of the TPM nationwide. The specific rhetoric the TPM used demonstrates a reason outside of simply having the Tea Party label; the common

themes present in candidates statements give examples of the similar rhetoric of TPM values which clearly resonated with the electorate as seen by the number of successful TPM candidates.

The comparison of the economic and political environments of the Bull Moose Party and the Tea Party Movement also demonstrated similarities. The Tea Party Movement's similarities with the Bull Moose Party provide evidence to help explain the TPM's emergence and early success. Both groups were born from popular discontent with the economy, the current presidential administration, and the perceived stagnant, ill-focused politics of those in Congress.

In addition, these similarities provide the foundation for understanding the TPM's likely decline. The commonalities may foretell of a shortened longevity for the Tea Party Movement as historically, third parties have not experienced lengthy existences. While the TPM is not a true political party, it does operate similar to one. Therefore, it is likely that the TPM will experience a similar lack of longevity as seen by the BMP in its relative lack of electoral success following the 1912 presidential election.

Future Implications

This thesis offers evidence that the Tea Party Movement's focus limited to highlighting problems with the economy, jobs, taxes, and the Obama administration likely makes its long-term future problematic. The TPM formed during the Great Recession, focused on a poor economy and poor government policies. This rhetoric was then used throughout the 2010 congressional campaigns where TPM candidates maintained consistency in their attacks on Obama and the associated suffering economy. Frequently demonizing Obama, calling many of his policies unconstitutional, and advocating a small government with less spending were the common messages candidates invoked during their campaigns. The TPM candidates sampled

were those who had been successful in their election attempts. Therefore, this message of TPM principles appears to have resonated with the voters as is indicated nationwide from the numbers of TPM candidates who were elected. Combine this factor with that of the Republican Party regaining a majority in the House and gaining seats in the Senate demonstrates a powerful statement from the electorate.

These two primary foci of the TPM's message are dependent on the economy doing poorly and Obama remaining in office. When the economy begins to improve, this part of the TPM's message will start to diminish. If the economy is growing and returning to prosperity, then many voters may well not argue with the methods used to enact the improvement. Due to the pain caused by the Great Recession, the arrival of a more prosperous economy is unlikely to be met with many criticisms. Some will advocate differing policies, but a growing economy will be the predominate factor in the minds of the electorate who have experienced the financial losses associated with the recession.

Regardless of which party controls the presidency or Congress, the success of the economy will render moot a key point strongly advocated by the studied TPM candidates. If the economic turnaround is a result of a Republican president and/or takes place under a Republican Congressional majority, the party itself, being the long established conservative voice, will be viewed as the victors of such policies. While the candidates associated with the TPM may have succeeded at bringing the issue to light and turning control of Congress towards Republican conservatives, the TPM candidates are still running as Republicans; therefore, it will be the GOP that gets the credit for any economic improvement. If economic growth emerges from policy enacted by a Democratic president and/or Congressional majority, then the policy advocated by TPM politicians will likely be viewed as flawed. As seen during the 2010 Congressional

elections, the rhetoric used by the TPM candidates was highly critical of the policies enacted by President Obama and the Democratically-controlled Congress. Therefore, if it was a Democratic president or Democratically-controlled Congress that was associated with significant economic growth, then any potential future TPM candidates still advocating the TPM rhetoric would be viewed as possibly harmful to the present economic success. Portraying the TPM in such a way would be devastating to any future political success, with the exception of a future repeat of a severe economic downturn.

The other prominent theme of the TPM is intense disapproval of President Obama. Constant attacks on his policies, like the stimulus package and “Obamacare”, permeated the 2010 congressional elections. Even referring to the health care law as “Obamacare,” places a pejorative spin on the legislation. The frequent attacks on Obama and his politics were evident in the rhetoric. However, it is inevitable that Obama will not be in office forever. If Republicans take control of the White House in the 2012 presidential election, then the anti-Obama stance would be silenced. However, if the economy has not improved, then there would still be the opportunity for future TPM candidates to continue focusing on economic concerns. If Obama is successful in his 2012 re-election bid, eventually the 2016 presidential election will begin the transition to another presidency. For the most part, this will effectively place a halt on the anti-Obama focus. However, there is the potential for marginal anti-Obama sentiments to continue. If there is a Democratic president, especially one endorsed by Obama, this situation could lend itself to continued shared comparisons equating the new president to Obama. This could be further reignited if the economy is not prospering, virtually making it a repeat performance for the TPM. It is more likely that by the 2016 the economy will be growing, at least more than

initially during the emergence of the TPM and with this growth a lessening extent of blaming Obama.

Ultimately, an improved economy combined with an Obama-free presidency will likely render the Tea Party Movement's voice virtually silent. With the arrival of these factors, it is likely that the TPM will be engulfed by the Republican Party and its ideals encompassed in the mainstream GOP rhetoric as was seen at end of the Bull Moose Party when Roosevelt returned to the Republican Party and endorsed its next presidential nominee. With the TPM's voice lessened by the departure of Obama and a better economy, there will be little for future TPM candidates to debate. Grounding their attacks in the need for an economic turn-around and the departure of Obama from office, this severely limits the TPM from even remotely breaking into the mainstream arena. The TPM was able to increase its influence due to popular discontent with the struggling economy. Many people nationwide felt the effects of the Great Recession, which put a personal aspect to their anger and desire for change. With the economy failing to grow, even under a new president with contrasting views from his predecessor, the discontent mounted leading to more potential supporters of the TPM. However, with the future creation of jobs and money returning to people's pockets, the discontent is likely to fade away, along with the influence of the Tea Party Movement.

There is the possibility for the Tea Party Movement to remain influential, even with an improved economy and the end of the Obama presidency. However, in order to do so, the TPM would need to alter its focus to social values issues or other broader issues linked to the Constitution, social welfare, national security, etc. As indicated in the 2010 congressional elections, the TPM candidates appeared as staunch champions of the Constitution. The shared rhetoric of calling policies unconstitutional, quoting the Constitution, and referencing the

Founding Fathers were prevalent throughout their campaign statements. The social values issue leaves the door open for the TPM to exert their influence into this arena.

The sampled TPM candidates did not address the social aspects of policy issues to the extent that is typical of their mainstream Republican Party counterparts. However, the Tea Party Movement has a large evangelical Christian membership. A 2010 poll showed “almost 40% of Tea Party supporters described themselves as evangelical Christians” (Skocpol and Williamson 2012, 35). Another exit poll from the 2010 elections drew similar results; overall, the religious nature of voters was more than during the 2008 election: almost 60% of voters surveyed said they attended religious services at least once a week (Williams 2012, 11). The second question directly addressed Tea Party support, with 50.5% of voters acknowledging they had strong or weak support for the Tea Party Movement and only 21.1% with strong or weak opposition (Williams 2012, 11). The more religious turnout combined with a majority of surveyed voters supporting the Tea Party Movement gives additional evidence of the potential influence of conservative strains of Christianity present in the TPM. The presence of this inherent religious association could make such a transition to a social values focus easier than if this was not the case. These conservative evangelical Christian relationships combined with the calls for strict adherence to the Constitution could allow for a switch towards the TPM advocating social conservatism.

However, according to the poll, evangelical Christians do not compose a majority of TPM supporters. Many likely became supporters based on the strong fiscal conservatism exhibited by the TPM. Therefore, such a transition to a social conservatism focus could be met with significant resistance. The majority of members may wish for the TPM to remain an advocate for continued fiscal conservatism following an economic improvement and the ending

of Obama's presidency. The more likely scenario would be for those who wanted economic improvement and an Obama-free presidency to move away from the TPM, leaving it less influential than it was during the 2010 congressional elections.

The Tea Party Movement may still remain relevant following Obama's presidency and an improvement in the economy. However, such a possibility seems unlikely given that the success the TPM exhibited during the 2010 congressional elections was fueled by popular discontent with the economy and the federal government's attempted solutions. The foundation of fiscal conservatism evidently was the driving force behind the success in 2010, without an economy in peril or an Obama-led government, it is likely that the Tea Party Movement will expire and be absorbed into the mainstream Republican Party.

Future Research

Since the Tea Party Movement is a relatively new political group, there is little published scholarly work studying it. While this can be a limitation in some cases, it also provides a significant opportunity for growth in the field. Unfortunately for researchers, the limited time frame of the TPM's existence provides few data points.

Of course, the 2012 congressional and presidential elections will provide additional data points for future research projects. A variety of potential research topics exist surrounding these elections. A future study analyzing the reelection results of those TPM candidates who won in 2010 could provide valuable findings in the TPM support levels from voters. If a significant number of those TPM politicians lose reelection, this could signal a decline in support and potential future troubles as predicted in this thesis.

A future project which analyzes the rhetoric used in the 2012 elections and compares it with the language used by the candidates in 2010 could also be an important part of

understanding the overall TPM effect. Perhaps the TPM begins to alter its message as it relates to the evolving economy. These elections combined with those in 2014 and 2016 will continue to provide additional opportunities to study the effects of the Tea Party Movement and ultimately provide additional evidence to build on the findings and predictions presented in this thesis.

Bibliography

- Aldrich John H. and Jeffery D. Grynviski. 2010. "Theories of Parties." The Oxford Handbook of American Political Parties and Interests Groups. Eds. L. Sandy Maisel and Jeffery M. Berry. Oxford University Press. 21-36.
- "Arizona 1st District Race Profile." *The New York Times*. 2010.
<http://elections.nytimes.com/2010/house/arizona/1>
- Arnold, Peri E. 2003. "Effecting a Progressive Presidency: Roosevelt, Taft, and the Pursuit of Strategic Resources." *Studies in American Political Development*, 17: 61-81
- Bibby, John F. and L. Sandy Maisel. 2003. Two Parties- or More?: The American Party System. 2nd ed. Westview Press: Boulder, CO.
- "Biography" < <http://bachmann.house.gov/biography/>>
- Bruner, Robert F. and Sean D. Carr. 2007. The Panic of 1907: Lessons Learned from the Market's Perfect Storm. John Wiley & Sons, Inc: Hoboken, NJ.
- "CNBC's Rick Santelli's Chicago Tea Party." < <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zp-Jw-5Kx8k>>.
- Dwyre, Diana. 2010. "Party Organization and Mobilization of Resources: Evolution, Reinvention, and Survival." *New Directions in American Political Parties*. Ed. Jeffrey M. Stonecash. Routledge: New York, NY. 63-90.
- Eldersveld, Samuel J. 1964. Political Parties: A Behavioral Analysis. Rand McNally and Company.
- Elliot, Douglas J. 2009. "Measuring the Cost of the TARP." *Initiative on Business and Public Policy*. Brookings Institution: Washington, DC. January 23, 2009.
- Flehinger, Brett. 2003. The 1912 Election and the Power of Progressivism. Bedford/St. Martin's: Boston, MA.
- Friedman, Gerald. 2002. "Success and Failure in Third-Party Politics: The Knights of Labor and the Union Labor Coalition in Massachusetts, 1884–1888." *International Labor and Working-Class History*. 62: 164-188
- Gould, Lewis L. 2008. Bull Moose on the Stump: The 1912 Campaign Speeches of Theodore Roosevelt. University Press of Kansas: Lawrence, KS.
- Green, Donald, Bradley Palmquist and Eric Schickler. 2002. Partisan Hearts and Minds: Political Parties and the Social Identities of Voters. Yale University Press: New Haven, CT.

- Hananel, Sam. 2010. "Three top committee chairmen are ousted." *The Boston Globe*. 4 Nov. 2010. <http://www.boston.com/news/nation/washington/articles/2010/11/04/three_top_committee_chairmen_are_ousted/?rss_id=Boston.com+--+Top+political+stories>
- Hayes, Danny. 2010. "Parties and the Media: Getting Messages to Voters." *New Directions in American Political Parties*. Ed. Jeffery M. Stonecash. Routledge: New York, NY. 44-62.
- Hirano, Shigeo and James M. Snyder, Jr. 2007. "The Decline of Third-Party Voting in the United States." *The Journal of Politics*. 69: 1-16.
- "Indiana 3rd District Race Profile." *The New York Times*. 2010. <http://elections.nytimes.com/2010/house/indiana/3>
- Jacobson, Gary C. 2013. *The Politics of Congressional Elections*. 8th ed. Pearson Education, Inc.
- Karpowitz, Christopher F., J Quin Monson, Kelly D. Patterson, and Jeremy C. Pope. 2011. "Tea Time in America? The Impact of the Tea Party Movement on the 2010 Midterm Elections." *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 44: 303-309.
- Kruschke, Earl R. 1991. *Encyclopedia of Third Parties in the United States*. ABC-CLIO, Inc: Santa Barbara, CA.
- Maisel, L. Sandy and Jeffery M. Berry. 2010. "The State of Research on Political Parties and Interest Groups." *The Oxford Handbook of American Political Parties and Interests Groups*. Eds. L. Sandy Maisel and Jeffery M. Berry. Oxford University Press. 3-18.
- Mayer, William G. 2010. "How Parties Nominate Presidents." *The Oxford Handbook of American Political Parties and Interests Groups*. Eds. L. Sandy Maisel and Jeffery M. Berry. Oxford University Press. 185-203.
- McFarland, Andrew. 2010. "Interest Group Theory." *The Oxford Handbook of American Political Parties and Interests Groups*. Eds. L. Sandy Maisel and Jeffery M. Berry. Oxford University Press. 37-56.
- Moe, Alexandra. 2010. "Just 32% of Tea Party Candidates Win." MSNBC. 3 Nov. 2010. <http://firstread.msnbc.msn.com/_news/2010/11/03/5403120-just-32-of-tea-party-candidates-win>
- "Nevada 3rd District Race Profile." *The New York Times*. 2010. <http://elections.nytimes.com/2010/house/nevada/3>
- Roemer, Timothy. "A New Direction for the Parties?" *The Future of America's Political Parties*. Ed. Andrew E. Busch. Lexington Books.
- Roosevelt, Theodore. 1913. *Autobiography*. Scribner's: New York, NY.
- Skocpol, Theda and Vanessa Williamson. 2012. *The Tea Party and the Remaking of Republican Conservatism*. Oxford University Press.

- “South Carolina 5th District Race Profile.” *The New York Times*. 2010.
<http://elections.nytimes.com/2010/house/south-carolina/5>
- Stone, Walter J. 2010. “Activists, Influence, and Representation in American Elections.” The Oxford Handbook of American Political Parties and Interests Groups. Eds. L. Sandy Maisel and Jeffery M. Berry. Oxford University Press. 285-302.
- Stonecash, Jeffery M., 2010. “Changing American Political Parties.” New Directions in American Political Parties. Ed. Jeffery M. Stonecash. Routledge: New York, NY. 4-10.
- Taft, William Howard. 1916. Our Chief Magistrate and His Power. Columbia University Press: New York, NY.
- “Tea Party Express.” <www.teapartyexpress.org>.
- “Tea Party Patriots.” <www.teapartypatriots.org/about>.
- “Tea Party Presidential Debate Presented by CNN” <<http://www.teapartyexpress.org/debate/>>.
- “Tennessee 4th District Race Profile.” *The New York Times*. 2010.
 <<http://elections.nytimes.com/2010/house/tennessee/4>>.
- Thomas, Lloyd B. 2011. The Financial Crisis and Federal Reserve Policy. Palgrave Macmillan: New York, NY.
- Wattenberg, Martin P. 1991. The Rise of Candidate-Centered Politics. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA.
- Williams, John W. 2012. “God is a Republican; the Media are Sinners.” Presentation paper at the 2012 Midwest Political Science Association conference
 <<http://conference.mpsanet.org/OnlineDirectory/Sections.aspx?section=29&session=18>>.
- Zernike, Kate. 2011. “Poll Shows Negative View of Tea Party on the Rise.” New York Times. 5 Aug <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/08/05/us/politics/05teaparty.html?_r=2>
- “04-12-11-Herman Cain on being a Tea Party candidate.wmv”
 <<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5UP-9TRHpVk>>
- <<http://www.treasury.gov/initiatives/financial-stability/programs/Pages/default.aspx>>
- <<http://www.gallup.com/poll/113047/americans-falling-favor-initial-bailout.aspx>>
- <<http://www.gallup.com/poll/113788/americans-want-details-before-release-more-tarp-funds.aspx>>
- <<http://www.gallup.com/poll/114097/Americans-Support-Stimulus-Major-Changes.aspx>>
- <http://www.recovery.gov/About/Pages/The_Act.aspx>

Appendix

Table 1: Sample of Language used by TPM Candidates in Issue Discussion

Issue	TPM Language
Economy & Jobs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The most crucial issue facing Indiana today is creating jobs for Hoosier families.” • “streamline federal workforce development programs to cut red tape and get Americans back to work.” • “[Obamacare] is a job killer”
Spending, Taxes & Bailouts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "End corporate bailouts" • “reduce extravagant government spending” • “Failure is just as much a part of our free market system as success. In fact, business failures are often the genesis of tremendous innovation and improvement.” • “Increased taxes, which are now under consideration, discourage self reliance and personal accountability.” • “Deficit spending, unsustainable government programs, and a crippling national debt are the sources of the relentless government intervention we see in the form of higher taxes, excessive regulation, and hostility toward investment.”
Government Regulations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “MORE LAWS ARE NOT THE ANSWER” • “excessive government regulations hurt the economy and cost jobs.” • “We are learning first hand the cruel lesson that the larger the government is, the less responsive it is to the people”
Healthcare	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “ Repeal Obamacare.” • “The President’s health care law known as Obamacare is, in large part, what motivated Dr. Gosar to run for Congress. That is how devastating he believes this law will be to the future of this country.” • “The Obama health care take over hurts patients and cuts \$500 billion from Medicare.”
Immigration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Stop Illegal Immigration" • “I strongly believe we need to immediately secure our border and oppose amnesty for anyone who blatantly violates our law.” • “illegal immigration not only jeopardizes those opportunities for everyone, but presents a serious threat to national security”
Anti-Washington Sentiment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The real problem is the incompetence and ineptitude of the federal bureaucracy” • “in just a generation Washington has gone from “Ask not what your country can do for you...” to “We will guarantee your GM warranty.”” • “Washington Millionaires have been taking your family’s hard-earned tax dollars to bailout AIG, Wall Street, the auto industry, and others who take money from your family’s success and gives it as a reward to those that have been irresponsible.” • “I adamantly oppose this Liberal Congress’ tax and spend ways.”

Source: Data collected by the author from the sampled candidates’ official campaign websites.
<http://www.scottdesjarlais.com/www>, <http://www.gosarforcongress.com/>, <http://heck4nevada.com/>,
<http://www.mulvaneyforcongress.com/>, <http://gomarlin.com/>

Table 2: Sample of Language used by TPM Candidates in Proposal Discussion

Proposals	TPM Language
Free Market	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Let business create jobs.” • “The solutions can be found... in more personal control and free market competition, less government intervention, and some common-sense reforms.” • “I support creating a market-friendly environment for businesses to operate and grow.” • “The free market didn’t create the problems we face now in the economy, but it can create the solution.”
Limited Government	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Reduce the size of government" • “we must look to shrink government bureaucracy.” • “We need better government, not bigger government.” • “I believe in the concept of a limited federal government.” • “The best balance comes in recognizing and honoring the limitations on the federal government – and the primacy of the people and the states – set forth in the Constitution.”
Common Sense	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Washington can learn a lot from Hoosier families: common sense, setting priorities, and not spending more than you have.” • "We must work together to restore common sense, no-nonsense values back to Washington before we loose[sic] this Republic all together." • “I support common sense spending solutions such as a balanced budget amendment and putting an end to earmark spending.”
Constitution/Founding Fathers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “I believe in the United States Constitution.” • “Obamacare is unconstitutional to boot, both in statute and in practice: the individual mandate stomps on the principles our Founders intended while the Department of Health and Human Services has exercised its authority under this law to enact a decision that violates the First Amendment right to freedom of religion.” • “When our founders wrote the U.S. Constitution, they did not envision the Federal Government playing a heavy handed role in the education of America’s children.”

Source: Data collected by the author from the sampled candidates’ official campaign websites.
<http://www.scottdesjarlais.com/www>, <http://www.gosarforcongress.com/>, <http://heck4nevada.com/>,
<http://www.mulvaneyforcongress.com/>, <http://gomarlin.com/>

Table 3: List of Winning TPM House Candidates in 2010

**Selected for Sample (every 8th candidate)

<u>Name</u>	<u>State/District</u>
Adams, Sandra	FL-24
Amash, Justin	MI-3
Bachmann, Michelle	MN-6
Benishek, Dan	MI-1
Buerkle, Ann Marie	NY-25
Chabot, Steve	OH-1
Crawford, Rick	AR-1
**DesJarlais, Scott	TN-4
Dold, Robert	IL-10
Duffy, Sean	WI-7
Duncan, Jeff	SC-3
Ellmers, Renee	NC-2
Farenthold, Blake	TX-27
Flores, Bill	TX-17
Gibson, Christopher	NY-20
**Gosar, Paul	AZ-1
Gowdy, Trey	SC-4
Graves, Tom	GA-9
Griffith, H. Morgan	VA-9
Griffin, Tim	AR-2
Grimm, Michael	NY-13
Guinta, Frank	NH-1
Hartzler, Vicky	MO-4
**Heck, Joe	NV-3
Hultgren, Randy	IL-14
Johnson, Bill	OH-6
Johnson, Ron	WI
Kinzinger, Adam	IL-11
Labrador, Raul	ID-1
Landry, Jeff	LA-3
McKinley, David	WV-1
**Mulvaney, Mick	SC-5
Renacci, Jim	OH-16
Ribble, Reid	WI-8
Schilling, Bobby	IL-17

Schweikert, David	AZ-5
Scott, Tim	SC-1
Southerland, Steve	FL-2
Stivers, Steven	OH-15
**Stutzman, Marlin	IN-3
Walberg, Tim	MI-7
Walsh, Joe	IL-8
West, Allen	FL-22
Young, Todd	IN-9

Source: Data collected by author from Moe, Alexandra. 2010. "Just 32% of Tea Party Candidates Win." MSNBC. 3 Nov. 2010.
 < http://firstread.msnbc.msn.com/_news/2010/11/03/5403120-just-32-of-tea-party-candidates-win>

Table 4: Template for Rhetoric Analysis

Candidate Name		
House Seat Won		
Source		
Issues (As featured on candidate's website)	Rhetoric (Words being used to describe the issues)	Keywords/ Key Phrases

Source: Created by author.

Table 5a: Scott DesJarlais- Status and Election Results

Candidate Status	NOT Incumbent
Defeated Incumbent in Primary Election	No
Defeated Incumbent in General Election	Yes

Source: "Tennessee 4th District Race Profile." *The New York Times*. 2010.
<http://elections.nytimes.com/2010/house/tennessee/4>

Table 5b: Scott DesJarlais- Campaign Rhetoric

Candidate Name	Scott DesJarlais	Family Physician, M.D.
House Seat Won	TN-4	
Source	http://www.scottdesjarlais.com/www	
Issues (As featured on candidate's website)	Rhetoric (Words being used to describe the issues)	Keywords/ Key Phrases
Size of gov't	"Reduce the size of government"	Reduce size
Government-private sector relations	"End corporate bailouts"	End bailouts
Jobs	"Stop spending to create jobs in Middle Tennessee."	Stop spending
Taxes	"Decrease the tax burden and eliminate the death tax so small businesses and farms can grow."	Decrease burden, Eliminate death tax
National Security/Defense/Veteran Affairs	"Increase our national security and protect benefits for our veterans."	Increase Security, Protect benefits
Values/Traditions	"Protect our traditional Tennessee values."	Protect traditional values
Term Limits	"Impose term limits in the House and Senate"	Impose term limits
Immigration	"Stop Illegal Immigration"	Stop illegal immigration
Note: Issues written out in prose, not directly listed by topic.		
Note: New website as of 5/24, the above descriptions are from the original website		
Note: Above content is from website for 2010 campaign		

Source: Data collected by the author from Scott DesJarlais' official campaign website, <http://www.scottdesjarlais.com/www>

Table 6a: Paul Gosar- Status and Election Results

Candidate Status	NOT Incumbent
Defeated Incumbent in Primary Election	No
Defeated Incumbent in General Election	Yes

Source: "Arizona 1st District Race Profile." *The New York Times*. 2010. <http://elections.nytimes.com/2010/house/arizona/1>

Table 6b: Paul Gosar- Campaign Rhetoric

Candidate Name	Paul Gosar	Dentist, D.D.S.
House Seat Won	AZ-1	
Source	http://www.gosarforcongress.com/	
Issues (As featured on candidate's website)	Rhetoric (Words being used to describe the issues)	Keywords/ Key Phrases
Energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Energy independence is a must" and "within our grasp" • "It's a matter of national security." • "We need to be drilling more at home" • "We also need to explore all alternative energy options, such as bi-products, geothermal, nuclear, wind and solar energies." • "We need to elect leaders who have the courage to utilize all resources in a common sense application." 	National Security, Explore alt. energy sources, more domestic drilling, common sense
Taxes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "We must work together to restore common sense, no-nonsense values back to Washington before we loose[sic] this Republic all together." • "I adamantly oppose this Liberal Congress' tax and spend ways." • "This country was built on sound principles of "free enterprise", "small business" and "community involvement". • "Hard work, opportunities and timely resources are cornerstones to re-igniting American Business." • "We must return to an environment which fosters citizens to provide for, invest in, be responsible for and enjoy the fruits of their labor." • "Increased taxes, which are now under consideration, discourage self reliance and personal accountability." • "I will do my best to minimize your tax burden and I will fight to make sure that your tax dollars are used wisely, without prejudice." 	Common sense, Oppose Liberal Congress, free enterprise, small business, community involvement, invest, minimize tax burden, use tax money wisely

<p>Immigration</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “I strongly believe we need to immediately secure our border and oppose amnesty for anyone who blatantly violates our law.” • “The Federal Government has completely failed its constitutional, legal and moral duty to secure our borders.” • “The Obama Administration, assisted by the far left, such as Nancy Pelosi and Ann Kirkpatrick, believe that “open borders” should apply to the United States, even though no other country in the world has an open border. Because of President Obama’s recalcitrance and Ann Kirkpatrick’s obstructionism, the State of Arizona had to take action, which included the passage of Senate Bill 1070.” • “I believe that we have to support our law enforcement officials who have a sworn duty to uphold our immigration laws.” • “Legal immigration helped define the character of our country.” • “I have called on Congress to get serious about true immigration reform and finally pass H.R. 1868 (Birthright Citizenship Act of 2009).” • “We need to welcome everyone who applies to immigrate here lawfully. But we can no longer turn our backs on Arizona and allow illegal drug smugglers, human traffickers, criminals and murderers, sex trade operators, and others to cross our borders illegally, burden our schools and our jails and our hospitals, and expect the people of Arizona to continue paying the price.” • “We are a nation of immigrants but more importantly we are a nation of laws.” • “At the same time measures of deploying soldiers to the border, building the double barrier fence and ending catch and release must be implemented immediately.” 	<p>Secure Border, oppose amnesty, unconstitutional, Obama Administration, Nancy Pelosi, enforce laws, reference to AZ law, "nation of immigrants", fence, soldiers</p>
<p>Health Care</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "As a health care provider for over twenty-five years and a member of the Doctors Caucus, Dr.Gosar has lead the charge in the House to reform the health care system and put forth free market solutions to increase access and decrease costs to the consumer." • “The President’s health care law known as Obamacare is, in large part, what motivated Dr. Gosar to run for Congress. That is how devastating he believes this law will be to the future of this country. It is a job killer” • “It punishes American people and businesses by levying hundreds of billions of dollars in new taxes.” • “Obamacare is unconstitutional to boot, both in statute and in practice: the individual mandate stomps on the principles our Founders intended while the Department of Health and Human Services has exercised its authority under this law to enact a decision that violates the First Amendment right to freedom of religion.” • “From delving deep into concerns with the approval of drugs and medical devices, to investigating aspects of Obamacare that will be devastating to businesses, families, and the business of health care – learning what ails our current health care system is key to getting it fixed.” • “A key component to reform must include a serious look at medical liability tort reform.” 	<p>free market solutions, Obamacare, Obamacare "punishes Americanpeople and businesses", unconstitutional, Founders, failing bureaucracy</p>

<p>Financial Reform</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “MORE LAWS ARE NOT THE ANSWER” • “When it comes to Wall Street, the problem is not a lack of laws, but a lack of government competence.” • “Congress can pass all the laws it wants, but if the agencies charged with enforcing the laws are incompetent more laws won’t help the situation. They will, of course, increase our taxes because more laws mean more bureaucrats, more agencies and more departments.” • “I find it astonishing that the President of the United States, assisted by liberals like Nancy Pelosi and Ann Kirkpatrick, think that the “problem” with Wall Street is simply not enough laws and regulations.” • “I disagree with President Obama’s premise for “financial reform”; that is, his assertion (assisted by the liberals in Congress) that but for more laws and regulations, this would not have happened. This is simply not the case.” • “What is needed is true oversight and competent investigations and prosecutions.” • “The far Left, like Ann Kirkpatrick, Nancy Pelosi and President Obama, look at the problems on Wall Street and instinctively believe the problem is a lack of laws.” • “The real problem is the incompetence and ineptitude of the federal bureaucracy already in place that is supposed to be watching the store.” • “But President Obama and Ann Kirkpatrick remain silent on that issue, apparently not wanting to criticize the federal government they worship.” • “But simply passing “more” laws to address fraud misses the point—we have plenty of laws. We need oversight and enforcement. We need better government, not bigger government.” • “I am running for Congress to make our country better and get it back on track. I will not be a knee-jerk lawmaker like Ann Kirkpatrick and Nancy Pelosi, whose first instinct is to spend more of our money and pass more laws, without ever looking at the root cause of problems.” • “Please support me. If I retake this seat for common sense conservatives, we can push back the far Left and prevent it from further taking root in our free country.” 	<p>"More laws are not the answer", less regulation needed, government incompetency, Obama & Pelosi, liberals in Congress, far Left, bureaucracy failure, common sense</p>
<p>Defense</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “In Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution, the founding fathers empowered Congress to: “Provide for the common Defense. . . To raise and support Armies . . . (and) to provide and maintain a Navy.” The security of the American citizens is one of the sole constitutional duties of the federal government.” • “All branches of government should be better stewards of taxpayer dollar, including the Department of Defense. Common-sense reforms would go a long way towards addressing our debt crisis.” • “We can turn a national debt crisis into a national security crisis. A strong national defense is vital to the security of the American people and integral to our local economy.” • “He has been a strong advocate of Arizona’s unique defense assets, such as the Yuma Proving Ground, one of the largest military installations in the world and one of the largest employers in our state, located in the 4th District.” • “A strong national defense is good for our economy and our country.” 	<p>Constitution, Founding Fathers, Common sense, strong national defense, important for economy</p>

Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “When our founders wrote the U.S. Constitution, they did not envision the Federal Government playing a heavy handed role in the education of America’s children.” • “Our education system must be refocused at the state and local level.” • “Dr. Gosar supports school choice policies that enable parents to decide where their children will be educated.” • “America’s children deserve the best education possible.” • “Dr. Gosar is committed to implementing education reform that gets the federal government out of our schools and makes the system more accountable directly to parents.” 	Founding Fathers, Constitution, supports local control, school choice
-----------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------

Source: Data collected by the author from Paul Gosar’s official campaign website, <http://www.gosarforcongress.com/>

Table 7a: Joe Heck- Status and Election Results

Candidate Status	NOT Incumbent
Defeated Incumbent in Primary Election	No
Defeated Incumbent in General Election	Yes

Source: “Nevada 3rd District Race Profile.” *The New York Times*. 2010. <http://elections.nytimes.com/2010/house/nevada/3>

Table 7b: Joe Heck- Campaign Rhetoric

Candidate Name	Joe Heck	Physician, O.D., Veteran, Colonel in Army Reserves
House Seat Won	NV-3	
Source	http://heck4nevada.com/	
Issues (As featured on candidate's website)	Rhetoric (Words being used to describe the issues)	Keywords/ Key Phrases
Health Care	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The Obama health care take over hurts patients and cuts \$500 billion from Medicare.” • “Joe Heck’s solution supports Nevada’s families by protecting the patient-physician relationship and reducing health care costs.” • “Joe Heck is working to protect Medicare for Nevada’s seniors and preserve it for future generations.” 	"Obama health care", reducing costs, protect Medicare

Jobs and the Economy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “streamline federal workforce development programs to cut red tape and get Americans back to work.” • “Joe Heck’s plan to fast track the tourist visa process will bring much needed economic growth to Southern Nevada and help businesses open and put Nevada men and women back to work.” 	streamline, cut red tape, economic growth
Government Spending	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “ reduce extravagant government spending including cracking down on fraud and abuse in federal programs and terminating wasteful programs that are costing the taxpayers.” • “Joe Heck has pushed for an audit of the Federal Reserve and for a vote on a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.” 	reduce government spending, audit the Fed, balanced budget amendment
Energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “increase domestic oil production to help bring down gas prices.” • “Joe Heck also supports efforts to develop alternate sources of energy like wind, solar, geothermal and hydro power as part of a long range solution to the energy crisis” 	increase domestic oil production, supports alt. energy sources
Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “help homeowners who are underwater” • “give folks who lost a home to foreclosure a second chance at homeownership and the American dream.” • “puts the interests of Nevada families and homeowners first.” 	underwater, second chance, families and homeowners first
Excessive Regulations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Joe Heck knows that excessive government regulations hurt the economy and cost jobs.” • “stop new government regulations during this time of scarce jobs and high unemployment. “ 	excessive gov’t regulations, hurting economy, losing jobs, high unemployment
Protecting Veterans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “to preserve and protect our military personnel, our veterans, their families and survivors.” • “the benefits of every service member who has sacrificed for his or her country must be safeguarded.” • “we have a responsibility to deliver on the promises made to those who have volunteered to serve our country.” 	protect veterans rights, responsibility

Source: Data collected by the author from Joe Heck’s official campaign website, <http://heck4nevada.com/>

Table 8a: Mick Mulvaney- Status and Election Results

Candidate Status	NOT Incumbent
Defeated Incumbent in Primary Election	No
Defeated Incumbent in General Election	Yes

Source: “South Carolina 5th District Race Profile.” *The New York Times*. 2010.
<http://elections.nytimes.com/2010/house/south-carolina/5>

Table 8b: Mick Mulvaney- Campaign Rhetoric

Candidate Name	Mick Mulvaney	Lawyer, J.D./Real Estate/Restaurateur
House Seat Won	SC-5	
Source	http://www.mulvaneyforcongress.com/	
Issues (As featured on candidate's website)	Rhetoric (Words being used to describe the issues)	Keywords/ Key Phrases
Role of Government	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “I believe in the United States Constitution.” • “I believe in the concept of a limited federal government.” • “I believe that the federal government’s primary duty is to safeguard our personal freedoms so that we can reach our highest potential as individuals.” • “in just a generation Washington has gone from “Ask not what your country can do for you...” to “We will guarantee your GM warranty.”” • “ I don’t want to live in a nanny state or under a government that thinks it should be Big Brother.” • “ I believe what you do in your own home or in your private life is your business.” • “At the same time neither is it the government’s job to institutionalize the corruption of American culture and history, or to legislate the wholesale destruction of our traditional community values.” • “The best balance comes in recognizing and honoring the limitations on the federal government – and the primacy of the people and the states – set forth in the Constitution.” 	Constitution, limited federal govt, personal freedoms, bailouts-"GM Warranty", "nanny state", corruption of American culture, traditional values

<p>Spending/Budget</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The solution from Washington? Spend more money that we don’t have. Any place other than Washington, that would sound crazy...because it is.” • “But that’s exactly what the current Administration is pushing and Members of Congress like John Spratt are rubber stamping.” • “We are on the verge of bankrupting the country, debasing the currency, and throwing the economy into a death-spin. “ • “That kind of irresponsibility is unacceptable to taxpayers and unfair to our children and grandchildren.” • “The deficit spending must end. Now.” • “It is time for the federal government to live within its means.” 	<p>govt spending, Obama administration, rubber stamping members of Congress, bankruptcy, debasing currency, economic failure, unacceptable, unfair, live within means</p>
<p>Education</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The first step in moving America’s schools forward is to repeal the No Child Left Behind program. That program has been an enormous unfunded mandate on our teachers and schools.” • “ The money is being spent in the wrong way.” • “The second step would be to shift much more control to local school districts and away from Washington, D.C.” • “the Department of Education is fast becoming part of the problem, not part of the solution. “ • “I do not support closing the Department of Education, however. I believe that agency can truly help by instituting national standards for history, math, and science education.” • “Spending on education represents more than half of our state budget. It represents a very small portion of the federal budget. Therefore, since states are forced to put education at the top of their priority list. The federal government should give them much, much more control.” 	<p>repeal NCLB, control to local school districts, DOE problematic, budget, state control</p>

<p>Jobs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “We are learning first hand the cruel lesson that the larger the government is, the less responsive it is to the people” • “Nowhere is this more apparent than in the so-called stimulus bill, which we were told would create millions of new jobs and keep unemployment below 8%.” • “even though the “stimulus” (Recovery Act) has only created more debt and the unemployment has remained at 9.4% or higher for 17 straight months” • “Simply demanding jobs, or conjuring them up with deficit spending, does not solve the problem” • “Make the government live within its means” • “ Repeal Obamacare.” • “Let business create jobs.” • “Don’t Raise Taxes.” 	<p>large government, stimulus bill, more debt, more unemployment, deficit spending, live within means, "Repeal Obamacare", business creates jobs, "don't raise taxes"</p>
<p>Health Care</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Does the health care system need reform? Absolutely. Is more government control the answer? Absolutely not.” • “The solutions can be found... in more personal control and free market competition, less government intervention, and some common-sense reforms.” • “This means private purchase and ownership of policies (and the portability that goes with it), interstate competition, an end to the anti-trust exemption for insurance companies, and a crackdown on frivolous malpractice lawsuits.” • “We need to repeal Obamacare and start again.” 	<p>health care reform, less government, more personal control, common sense, private purchase, "Repeal Obamacare"</p>
<p>Social Security</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “I am committed to doing whatever it takes to protect social security” • “Social security is a contract, not a benefit program.” • “the surest way to preserve social security is to reign in government spending and turn around our economy. “ • “A deficit reduction coupled with an increase in revenues (due to an improved economy) will quickly bridge the budget gap and ensure a solvent social security system.” 	<p>Protect social security, is a contract, control govt spending, deficit reduction</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">Bailouts</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Simply put: no more bailouts.” • “Failure is just as much a part of our free market system as success. In fact, business failures are often the genesis of tremendous innovation and improvement.” • “The Wall Street bailouts rewarded those who were “too big too fail” ... and big enough to have considerable pull in Washington. “ • “Cap-and-Trade Energy independence, green technology, and innovation is something we should pursue as a nation.” • “However, we shouldn’t seek to accomplish that by taxing people based on questionable science.” • “Neither should we ignore domestic energy resources – coal, natural gas, oil – because of baseless claims regarding global warming.” • “I believe that making it easier to drill for and use domestic resources, build nuclear power plants, and develop new technologies is the best formula for ending the current energy regime, which essentially has us empowering governments and groups that are markedly anti-American.” 	<p style="text-align: center;">No more bailouts, business failures lead to innovation & improvement, more taxes not the answer, explore alt. energy sources, domestic drilling, nuclear power plants</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Illegal Immigration</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Few people remember, but Ronald Reagan was the last President to sign an amnesty bill.” • “the solution to our illegal immigration problem must begin with securing our borders (not with a deal).” • “Border security doesn’t just mean building a fence, though. It also means more border patrol and a better use of technology (sensors, drones, etc.).” • “We must also back up our border security by enforcing immigration laws on our streets and in our towns.” • “Not only is the federal government currently ignoring immigration laws, but many cities and local governments are as well.” • “Congress should also provide businesses with the tools they need to verify the citizenship of each person who applies for a job.” • “Finally, we must keep track those with work or travel visas.” 	<p style="text-align: center;">Ronald Reagan, securing borders, fence, border patrol, technology, enforcing laws, failure of current federal govt, track visas</p>

<p>Energy</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Energy independence, green technology, and innovation is something we should pursue as a nation.” • “However, we shouldn’t seek to accomplish that by taxing people based on questionable science.” • “Neither should we ignore domestic energy resources – coal, natural gas, oil – because of baseless claims regarding global warming.” • “I believe that making it easier to drill for and use domestic resources, build nuclear power plants, and develop new technologies is the best formula for ending the current energy regime, which essentially has us empowering governments and groups that are markedly anti-American.” 	<p>Energy independence, innovation, taxes not the answer, use domestic resources, domestic drilling & nuclear power plants</p>
<p>Transparency</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “I remember President Obama’s promise to televise the debate the health care bill on C-Span – only to ignore that promise only months later.” • “People need to have confidence that the system works, and that laws are applied evenly and fairly to all.” • “The best way to do this is to simply let people know what is going on with their own government.” 	<p>Obama, health care bill, let people know</p>
<p>Sanctity of Life</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “I believe that life begins at conception.” • “ For me, and my wife Pam, that is more than just a political theory or ideology. It is what we saw, first hand, with our own triplets.” • “Once you see what we saw, and lived what we lived, being pro-life is not about politics it is about, well, life.” 	<p>pro-life, not about politics</p>
<p>Foreign Policy</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The number one priority for the federal government is to provide for a strong national defense.” • “We must also accept that protecting our families here sometimes means we must become involved in areas far away.” 	<p>strong national defense, protect families, troop deployment necessary</p>

Term Limits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Before I got into government, I opposed term limits, as I believed that 1) the ballot box was the ultimate term “limiter,” and 2) high turnover among accountable, elected officials would give more power to unelected bureaucrats.” • “After just three years in the legislature, I have changed my mind. With gerrymandering — where lawmakers pick the voters, instead of voters picking the lawmakers – the ballot box has lost much of its power.” • “Put another way: having seen government up close, I have learned my lesson. I support term limits.” 	Impose term limits, gerrymandering
Note: Website has been update for 2012 election		

Source: Data collected by the author from Mick Mulvaney’s official campaign website, <http://www.mulvaneyforcongress.com/>

Table 9a: Marlin Stutzman- Status and Election Results

Candidate Status	NOT Incumbent
Defeated Incumbent in Primary Election	No
Defeated Incumbent in General Election	No

Source: “Indiana 3rd District Race Profile.” *The New York Times*. 2010. <http://elections.nytimes.com/2010/house/indiana/3>

Table 9b: Marlin Stutzman- Campaign Rhetoric

Candidate Name	Marlin Stutzman	Farmer/Trucking Owner
House Seat Won	IN-3	
Source	http://gomarlin.com/	
Issues (As featured on candidate's website)	Rhetoric (Words being used to describe the issues)	Keywords/ Key Phrases
Life	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Simply put. I’m prolife.” • “The Declaration of Independence states that our inalienable rights are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.” • “Life is listed first in that famous line in the Declaration of Independence and it’s first with me, too.” • “Protecting innocent life—of the born and preborn—is very dear to me.” • “I believe life begins at conception, but the duty of protecting life doesn’t end with the birth of a child.” • “Valuing life is a basic principle of America’s founding, and honoring life is showing honor to the creator of all life.” 	<p style="text-align: center;">Declaration of Independence, pro-life, valuing and honoring life is a basic American principle, "honor to creator of all life"</p>

<p>Jobs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The most crucial issue facing Indiana today is creating jobs for Hoosier families.” • “One need not look outside our own state to see the devastating effects of a struggling economy.” • “In March of 2009, Elkhart County’s unemployment rate hit 18.9%.” • “The New York Times even said that Elkhart represented the, “white-hot center of the meltdown of the American economy.”” • “Now is not the time for federal government to continue to burden the greatest entrepreneurial minds and most productive workforce in the world.” • “Deficit spending, unsustainable government programs, and a crippling national debt are the sources of the relentless government intervention we see in the form of higher taxes, excessive regulation, and hostility toward investment.” • “Couple that with hot-button issues like Cap and Trade, card-check, government-run healthcare, and poor energy policy and it creates a climate that drives Hoosier jobs over state lines or overseas.” • “I support creating a market-friendly environment for businesses to operate and grow.” • “lowering taxes on businesses, eliminating taxes on capital gains and investments, promoting sound energy policy, investing in our infrastructure, and opposing the latest market-killing schemes such as Cap and Trade, government-run health care, and card check.” • “The free market didn’t create the problems we face now in the economy, but it can create the solution.” • “The very future security and viability of Indiana, and our nation, depends on creating good-paying jobs, and as your Congressman I will be an aggressive advocate for job creation in Indiana.” 	<p>creating jobs, "devastating effects of a struggling economy", high unemployment, federal govt failures, deficit spending, unsustainable govt programs, national debt, relentless govt intervention, high taxes, excessive regulation, "government-run healthcare", free market is the solution, lower taxes on businesses needed, sound energy policy</p>
-------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p>National Defense</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “While our government has become too intrusive in nearly every part of our lives, the politicians in DC have forgotten the Federal government’s primary job, which is to protect the American people.” • “I believe in the simple – but powerful – axiom of President Ronald Reagan: Peace through strength.” • “Our current leadership in the White House has shown more concern for the legal rights of our enemies than it has demonstrated the will to defeat those enemies.” • “The constant handwringing by the President and the liberals on Capitol Hill is a danger to Americans, and it sends the wrong message to our allies who are looking to the United States to lead the way against the enemies of free people.” • “Weakness and indecision is not an option.” • “we must use our strength and relationships with other democracies around the world to send a message that free people will always stand together against despotism, tyrants, and radical Islam.” • “our elected officials must be committed to the men and women on the frontlines. “ • “Those who are willing to give the last full measure to ensure our way of life deserve more than just our thanks.” • “I firmly believe they have earned a special place among the citizenry, and deserve the utmost respect from those in public service.” 	<p>govt is too intrustive, protect American people, Ronald Reagan, Obama, "liberals on Capitol Hill", use strength, support troops</p>
<p>Card Check</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “I oppose card check.” • “The so-called Employee Free Choice Act (EFCA) does anything but give workers freedom of choice.” • “A secret ballot is the bedrock of free and fair elections and removing it only opens the process up to intimidation and coercion.” • “The EFCA is also extremely destructive to businesses and job-creation.” • “It’s bad for workers, bad for employers, and only gives government more control.” 	<p>opposes card check, supports secret ballot, EFCA harms business and job-creation, EFCA would give govt more control</p>

<p>2nd Amendment</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “I have a consistent track record of firm support for gun owners.” • “I’m a member of the NRA with an A rating, and during my time in the Indiana legislature, I helped author and pass Indiana’s lifetime handgun permit.” • “The 2nd Amendment is not about hunting or sportsmen. Too many politicians and anti-gun interests have diluted the meaning of the 2nd Amendment down to merely something for those that enjoy the outdoors.” • “It’s not. It’s a basic, untouchable right that the Founding Fathers revered so highly, they included it in the Bill of Rights.” • “It’s one of our Constitutional guarantees as citizens of a free society, and in an unsafe world, it’s a guarantee to protect our families and our homes.” • “Those that don’t share this view continually seek to erode our Constitutional rights.” 	<p>Supports 2nd Amendment, NRA member w/ A rating, Founding Fathers, Bill of Rights, meaning of 2nd Amendment has been diluted, basic right, Constitution, free society</p>
<p>Energy</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Our nation defines itself by our self-determination and independence.” • “our continued dependence on foreign energy, largely from countries that do not have our interests in mind, conflicts with that spirit of self-determination.” • “From continuing to develop our nation’s traditional fossil fuels such as coal, oil, and natural gas, to encouraging the expansion of renewable energy sources such as wind, solar, bioenergy, hydropower, nuclear, and geothermal, we must make the United States energy self-sufficient.” • “Whether it is bio-fuels like ethanol and soy diesel, or developing the largest wind farm in the Midwest at Fowler Ridge, Indiana is a leader in energy self-reliance, and needs a leader in Congress to move our energy policy forward.” 	<p>Self-determination, independence, recent dependence on foreign energy, need for developing alternative energy sources, use of domestic resources</p>

<p>Cap and Trade</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Cap and trade is a direct attack on Indiana’s economy.” • “The cost to either meet the emissions cap or trade for more credits will be passed on to Hoosier families, or simply drive our manufacturing jobs overseas.” • “Indiana would be one of the hardest hit states in the country.” • “The effects of such a system would be devastating to Hoosier families: skyrocketing energy costs, job losses, and families with shrinking household incomes. I oppose taxes—both direct and indirect—and a cap and trade system is just another hidden tax on Hoosiers, and I strongly oppose it.” 	<p>opposes cap and trade, would harm families through higher costs, job loss, and tax increases</p>
<p>Bailouts</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I would never support a federal bailout of private business. • “ In a free enterprise economy, businesses have the opportunity to succeed, and sometimes, even the opportunity to fail.” • “Washington Millionaires have been taking your family’s hard-earned tax dollars to bailout AIG, Wall Street, the auto industry, and others who take money from your family’s success and gives it as a reward to those that have been irresponsible.” • “It’s not how a small business works, and it’s not how a free market economy should work.” • “As your Congressman, I won’t reward corrupt or bad businesses by voting for a bailout.” 	<p>No to bailouts, free enterprise economy, "Washington Millionaires"</p>

<p>Spending and Taxes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “We must address the real cause behind why politicians are raising our taxes in the first place: runaway government spending.” • “I do not support tax increases in any form, but taxes are the symptom of a much more inherent problem in Washington.” • “Washington has bought in to the myth that it can spend its way out of trouble. Government spending is so far out of line that raising taxes has unfortunately become the only response Washington politicians know.” • “Washington can learn a lot from Hoosier families: common sense, setting priorities, and not spending more than you have.” • “Thousands of families across Indiana set their family’s budget every day without the aid of a Harvard Economist.” • “That’s why I support common sense spending solutions such as a balanced budget amendment and putting an end to earmark spending.” • “I believe our fundamental spending priorities should include a strong national defense, immediately securing our borders, and developing our nation’s infrastructure.” • “we must look to shrink government bureaucracy.” • “ I would also work to simplify the tax code and make it less hostile toward families that wish to save and invest in their future by eliminating unjust taxes like the Estate Tax” 	<p>"Runaway government spending", does not support "tax increases in any form", Washington, common sense, live within means, balanced budget amendment, strong national defense, securing borders, "shrink government bureaucracy" simplify tax code, eliminate estate tax</p>
<p>Homeschooling</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “I believe in real educational choice” • “homeschooling is a fundamental option that parents should be able to choose freely and without concern for added burdens from the government.” • “The decision to home school your children should never be affected by a government that stands in the way of your rights as a family.” 	<p>educational choice, homeschooling</p>

<p>Education</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Nowhere has the federal government’s mind-set of spending its way out of trouble been more evident than in its approach to education.” • “we have seen more and more money poured into public education resulting only in slipping test scores and students left further and further behind.” • “I believe it’s time we demand accountability for how our educational dollars are being spent.” • “That’s why I support increased competition in the educational system by giving tax credits to families that send their children to private or choose to home school.” • “Competition and choice are the driving forces behind innovation, and empowering parents to choose the best education for their child will increase their opportunity to succeed in an increasingly competitive market.” • “I strictly support maintaining local control of education, and empowering teachers to teach by concentrating educational spending on the classroom, and not on bureaucracy.” 	<p>wasteful govt spending, accountability, tax credits needed, school choice, competition, local control fo education, not bureacracy</p>
------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p>Health Care</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “I do not support any expansion of government-run health insurance.” • “this isn’t the first time the federal government has tried to “fix” healthcare.” Referring to the HMO Act of 1973. • “Time and time again, history has shown the best intentions of the government have the worst consequences on people.” • “The United States has the best health care in the world, but we agree there are some serious concerns with how that care is provided” • “Independence, choice, and competition are the keys to innovation and enduring solutions.” • “I believe that health insurers should be in competition for American’s business.” • “I support expanding free market solutions such as Health Savings Accounts to include all citizens, increasing tax credits for businesses that provide healthcare, and comprehensive tort reform that will lead to increased access to health care and a decrease in premiums and overall cost.” • “I unequivocally support a total repeal and replacement of the deceptively named Patient Protection and Affordable Healthcare Act.” Also known as Obamacare 	<p>No to "government-run health insurance", independence, choice, competition, free market solutions, "total repeal" of Obamacare</p>
<p>Immigration</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Since our nation’s founding, the United States has been a beacon for immigrants to come and share in the opportunities of a free and welcoming nation.” • “illegal immigration not only jeopardizes those opportunities for everyone, but presents a serious threat to national security” • “No immigration policy can begin without first securing our borders. Border security is a basic function of the federal government” • “we will not see true immigration reform until Washington has the resolve to enforce the laws already in place.” • “I do not support amnesty. Nor do I support continuing to subsidize social welfare for illegal immigrants.” • “Securing our borders and making the process equitable and honest, for citizens both current and prospective, are my priorities for immigration reform.” 	<p>nation's founding, "beacon for immigrants", illegals are threat to national security, securing borders, enforce laws, no amnesty, no subsidizing social welfare</p>

Source: Data collected by the author from Marlin Stutzman’s official campaign website, <http://gomarlin.com/>