

By all accounts, one of the defining differences in the election was "The Ground Game" . The outreach by the 2 candidates to reach voters "on the ground", in their homes, on their phones, wherever it was possible to make a possible contact. Once the contact was made, the goal was to get them to the polls to vote for their candidate.

You would think that the candidate with the most business experience would be best prepared to build a national organization that ran like clock work and made the final difference in the election. You would be wrong.

In the 2008 election President Obama was able to utilize social media as a call to action and funding and gain a huge advantage over the Republican candidate who couldn't match the online advantage that President Obama created.

In this election it appears that President Obama was able to gain re-election by putting together a national organization that only raised the same amount of funds as the Republican candidate, but was able to better use that funding to put together a ground game "business plan" that was not only better than the Republicans, but had better messaging, voter connection and was better planned, implemented, distributed and executed on than their "far better business people" Republicans.

oh the irony