

- I. Introduction
- II. The costs of campaigning
 - A. Trends
 - 1. Overall
 - 2. General election Table 2-1, p. 34
 - 3. Pre-nomination Table 2-2, p. 35
 - B. Causes: mass media, polling, fund-raising costs
- III. Sources of support
 - A. Individuals
 - 1. Fat cats
 - a. Origin
 - b. Partisan advantage
 - 2. Grass-roots
 - a. Origin
 - b. Partisan advantage
 - B. Parties
 - 1. Origin
 - 2. Partisan advantage
 - C. PACs
 - 1. Origin
 - 2. Partisan advantage
- IV. Finance legislation Box 2-1, p. 41
 - A. Goals
 - 1. Costs of campaigning Table 2-3, p. 42
 - 2. Sources of support
 - 3. Partisan advantage
 - 4. Two-party system
 - B. Provisions Box 2-2, p. 43
 - 1. Public disclosure
 - 2. Contribution limits
 - a. Individuals
 - b. PACs
 - 3. Spending limits
 - a. Trigger
 - b. Pre-nomination
 - c. General election
 - 4. Matching funds
 - a. Eligibility
 - (1) Major party candidates
 - (2) Minor party candidates
 - b. Source
 - C. Loopholes:
 - 1. Soft money (1972-2000)
 - a. Origin: 1971 FECA & 1979 amendments (see pp. 38 & 40)
 - b. Definition: unlimited contributions to national party committees for distribution to state & local affiliates
 - c. Partisan advantage
 - d. Impact on fat cat & PAC influence
 - e. Outlawed by the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act (BCRA) of 2002; upheld by USSC in 2003
 - 2. Independent spending (Wayne terms this 'nonparty spending')

- a. Origin: *Buckley v. Valeo* (1976), p. 39
 - b. Definition: spending by individuals or 527 non-profit groups who do not directly contribute to a candidate or party, but support that candidate or party by independently funding political advertisements or other campaign-related activities that are not coordinated with the candidate or their party
 - c. Partisan advantage
 - d. Impact on fat cat & PAC influence
 - e. The Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act (BCRA) of 2002 outlawed independently funded political advertisements that mention candidates by name within 30 days of a primary election & 60 days of a general election
3. Rejecting public funding
 - a. Advantages
 - (1) No limit on personal funding
 - (2) No limit on overall spending
 - b. Examples
 - (1) Primaries (Connally '80; Forbes '96 & 2000; Bush in 2000 & '04; Dean & Kerry '04)
 - (2) General election (Perot in '92)

V. Impact

A. Revenue Table 2-4, p. 46

1. Individual contributors
 - a. Money
 - b. Goods and services
 - c. Independent spending
 - d. Personal funds
 - e. Borrowing
 - f. Previous campaign war-chests
 - g. Non-cash contributions (especially from artists, actors, & musicians)
2. Nonparty groups
 - a. PACs
 - (1) Contributions
 - (2) Independent spending
 - b. Non-connected organizations
 - c. Tax-exempt foundations
3. (Pre-candidacy) leadership PACs – pioneered by Reagan in 1977
4. Matching funds and government grants Figure 2-1, p. 48; Box 2-3, pp. 50-51
 - a. "Catch" to accepting
 - b. Consequences; lesser-known candidates & late entrants
5. Convention and election grants
6. Hard and soft money

B. Expenditures

1. Short-fall of matching fund COLAs Table 2-5, p. 54
2. Front-end loading in pre-nomination stage
3. State limits and media costs
4. Republican advantage in independent spending Figure 2-6, p. 51
5. Republican advantage in soft money spending Table 2-4, p. 46

C. Competition between parties and candidates Box 2-4, pp. 51-53

1. Factional conflict
2. Incumbent advantage in general election

VI. Money and electoral success

A. Relation to electoral success

1. \$ --> success
2. Potential success --> \$

B. Relation to tightness of race

C. Nomination v. general election impact

D. Early v. late stage in either

VII. Summary