

THE BEST ELECTIONS\$ MONEY CAN BUY

How Big Money in Politics Predetermined Who Ran For Office and Who Won in the 2000 Elections

Table of Contents

I. Executive Summary	2
II. Preface	2
III. The 2000 Elections	3
a) Money was a Key Determinate in Election Outcomes	3
b) The Majority of Campaign Contributions Came From a Small Number of Large Donors	4
c) Many Qualified Candidates Couldn t Run or Lost Because of Money	5
IV. The State of Our Democracy	6
a) Large Donors Elect Candidates	6
b) The Millionaire Phenomenon	7
V. The Problem of Money in Politics Has Been Mischaracterized	8
VI. Conclusions	9
VII. Examples From 46 States	10
a) The South	10
b) The Mid-Atlantic	16
c) New England	20
d) The Midwest	22
e) The Plains	25
f) The Southwest	28
g) Mountain	30
h) The West	33
VIII. Methodology	36
IX. Appendix A: General Elections Won By the Biggest Fundraiser in Each State	
X. Appendix B: Primary Elections Won By the Biggest Fundraiser in Each State	
XI. Appendix C: Uncontested Senate and House Races in 2000	
XII. Appendix D: Contested Senate and House Races in 2000	

I. Executive Summary

The problem with big money in politics is that it unduly influences which candidates can run for office and win elections, and what issues are at the forefront of the political agenda. Yet, many advocates for campaign finance reform have narrowed their critiques of money in politics to the exchange of political favors or access for soft money. Soft money is unlimited contributions from individuals, labor unions and corporate treasuries to political parties. The continued focus on this type of legislative corruption overshadows a more fundamental problem of large contributors influencing election outcomes. The findings of this study point to a corruption of process that would not be solved by current congressional efforts to eliminate soft money. In the 2000 elections, our analysis of campaign finance data indicates that money was a key determinate in election outcomes, that the majority of campaign contributions came from a small number of large donors, and that many candidates couldn't run or lost because of money.

- **Money was a key determinate in election outcomes.** According to data from the Federal Elections Commission (FEC) analyzed by U.S. PIRG, congressional candidates who raised the most money won 93%* of the seats in Congress.¹ Winning candidates out-raised their opponents by a margin of 2.6-to-1, with the winners raising \$1.2 million on average and the losers raising an average of \$533,000. (Numbers are from pre-election reports downloaded from the FEC on November 3, 2000.)
- **The majority of campaign contributions came from a small number of large donors.** Contributions recorded by the FEC as of November 1, 2000 indicate that less than a fraction of one percent of Americans (0.15%) made a contribution of \$1000 or more to a candidate, Political Action Committee (PAC), or party.** These large contributions of \$1000 or more made up nearly 70% of all itemized campaign funds received from individuals.
- **Many candidates for Congress in 2000 could not compete with campaigns backed by wealthy interests.** U.S. PIRG conducted interviews with more than 50 candidates who didn't run for Congress, dropped out before the election, or lost the race primarily because of money. These stories highlight the influence of large hard money donations on the electoral process - starting with people's decision of whether or not to run for office.

II. Preface

Sometimes we die not because of an acute illness, but from a long chronic disease. Those are sometimes the toughest to detect and to treat.

--Gary Harrison, former congressional candidate in Texas

Elections provide the ultimate opportunity for big money interests to advance the campaigns of sympathetic candidates and shape the political landscape of the coming years.

* The following races were undecided as of midday November 7 and were not included in the analysis: District 22 in Florida between Shows and Bloom, District 12 in New Jersey between Holt and Zimmer, and the Washington senate race between Gorton and Cantwell.

** Based on the most recent FEC download made available on November 1. Due to slow keypunching of data, all contributions may not be included.

Because so much is at stake in every election, it is no surprise that candidate fundraising has been steadily increasing since 1974 when Congress passed the Federal Election Campaign Act. In 1978, shortly after the law was passed, congressional candidates raised a total of \$199 million. Twenty years later in 1998, total fundraising reached \$781 million, an increase of 292%.² During the same period, wages of average Americans increased by only 129%.² As campaign costs continue to rise, candidates have a greater incentive to seek out contributions from the largest donors. Today, running for federal office is not really open to all Americans because of the high costs involved. Instead, only a small proportion of the population that has access to large funds can afford to run. This leaves ordinary citizens with fewer choices of candidates who really reflect their interests or concerns. It results in leaders who may have very different priorities than the country at large.

III. The 2000 Elections

The 2000 elections were the most expensive cycle in the history of the country. According to the Center for Responsive Politics, total political spending by candidates and parties in the 2000 elections is expected to total more than \$3 billion, a 25 percent increase over the last presidential elections in 1996. Political parties raised record amounts of unlimited soft money contributions. Senate and House candidate fundraising, or hard money, through the first 18 months of the 2000 election cycle was 40% greater than two years ago.³ Also in the 2000 elections, we saw unprecedented numbers of independently wealthy candidates and million-dollar campaigns. The most obvious example was in the New Jersey senate race where the political novice and former executive Jon Corzine successfully bought the primary and general elections by spending more than \$54 million by October 18, 2000, including more than \$52 million of his own money.

Also in the 2000 elections, the large donor community was particularly effective in anointing candidates of their choosing. In the presidential race, Gov. George W. Bush is a good example. Thanks to the help of his *Pioneers* — individuals who each gathered a hundred \$1000 contributions for his campaign — Bush was able to raise \$15 million in contributions before he even entered the contest. This deterred all but the most resolute challengers. Other candidates, Elizabeth Dole, Dan Quayle, Lamar Alexander, and Rep. John Kasich (R-Ohio) were not favored by the large donors. All dropped out before a vote was cast.

The large increase in soft money contributions during the 2000 election cycle was also extremely influential in determining the outcomes of a number of high-profile races. However, unlike hard money, soft money is almost always used to help campaigns that have already proven themselves by attracting large donor support, and is rarely spent in the primary elections. For this reason, soft money has little impact over which candidates run for office or win their parties nomination. This is the part of the process where the majority of grassroots campaigns are defeated by well-funded opponents.

a) Money was a Key Determinate in Election Outcomes

In today's world of television-centered, high-priced campaigns, money has become the cornerstone of a successful race. While presidential candidate Steve Forbes' campaign and other personally funded campaigns have shown that money alone does not guarantee success, the lack of big money almost always precludes success. This problem has been exacerbated by the media and other political forecasters who, early in a race, look toward candidate fundraising as an indicator of competitiveness. If money raised really reflected citizen support, this might be an

accurate measurement. Instead, judging a candidate on his or her total receipts disadvantages grassroots candidates who may have broad support from small donors, but have raised less money overall than a candidate who primarily collected \$1000 contributions. In any case, on Election Day, the big money candidates came out on top. Using the most recent financial reports filed with the FEC by November 3, 2000, U.S. PIRG found that:

- **Candidates who spent the most money won 93% of Senate and House races.** (See Appendix A for state breakdown and exceptions.)
- **Winning candidates outspent their opponents by a ratio of 2.6-to-1, with the winners spending \$1.2 million on average and the losers spending \$533,000.**

[Note: The following races were undecided as of midday November 7 and were not included in the analysis: District 22 in Florida between Shows and Bloom, District 12 in New Jersey between Holt and Zimmer, and the Washington senate race between Gorton and Cantwell.]

The impact of special interest money can be even greater during the primary elections, where money can provide the necessary momentum to get a campaign off the ground. History confirms the importance of early fundraising in the presidential elections. Every presidential candidate since 1976 who has raised the most money in the year prior to the election has won the their party s nomination.⁴ Money also plays a big role in determining election outcomes in the congressional primaries.

- In the 2000 primary election cycle, **93% of candidates who raised the most money won their party s nomination.** (See Appendix B for state breakdown and exceptions.)

b) The Majority of Campaign Contributions Came From a Small Number of Large Donors

Although fundraising is on the rise, most citizens still aren t giving. U.S. PIRG analysis of data on file with the FEC as of November 1, 2000 provides a snapshot of campaign financing in the 2000 elections. The data shows that:

- **Fewer than one out of 200 people or .45% of Americans gave a hard money contribution of \$200 or greater to a candidate, PAC, or party.**

For donors giving more than \$1000, the numbers get even smaller. Contributions entered by the FEC by November 1, 2000 indicate that:

- **Fewer than 428,000 people had made a hard money contribution of \$1000 or more — less than a fraction of one percent of Americans (0.15%).**

These large contributions from a very narrow segment of the population are the fuel that drives most viable campaigns. U.S. PIRG found that the vast majority of money raised from individual contributions of \$200 or more, entered by the FEC by November 1, 2000, was from large donors.

- **Contributions of \$1000 or more accounted for 70% of all itemized funds received from individual donations.**

c) Many Qualified Candidates Couldn't Run or Lost Because of Money

As money is viewed by many as the major factor in determining the viability of a campaign, potential candidates who do not have significant personal wealth or a network of large donors find themselves at a serious disadvantage. Many of these qualified candidates either elect not to run, drop out, or lose the race because they can't compete with well-funded opponents. Republican consultant Ed Gillespie who worked for Ohio Representative John Kasich's unsuccessful presidential bid says about the 2000 elections, "We're turning the nominating process of both parties into lifestyles of rich and famous. Some very good candidates never even got to the point where voters got to say one way or another about how they felt about them."⁵

There are also some candidates who almost certainly could raise the funds necessary to run for office, but choose not to because of a personal disdain for fundraising. In New Jersey, retiring Senator Frank Lautenberg and the top potential candidate for his seat, Governor Christine Todd Whitman, both cited fundraising as the reason behind their decisions not to run. In January of this year, the New York Times listed "the all-consuming nature of modern campaigns, [and] the extraordinary demands of fund-raising" as reasons why potential candidates were deterred from running.⁶ Similarly, an extensive survey by the University of Colorado in 1997⁷ found that the prospect of "having to raise large sums of money to fund [a] campaign" strongly discouraged 34% of potential House candidates from running.

U.S. PIRG has interviewed many candidates from across the country who either dropped out or decided not to run for federal office in 2000. Here's what a few of them said: (More stories can be found in Section VII.)

ATTORNEY GENERAL FRANKIE SUE DEL PAPA, DROPPED OUT OF SENATE RACE IN NEVADA: I looked at the Senate race and found that the money was not going to be with me. Elections should be conversations about issues not auctions to the highest bidder. It's too bad. We want different voices at the table, yet when elections are foreclosed to some because the moneyed interests aren't going to support them, what does that say?

GREEN BROOK MAYOR PATRICIA WALSH, DROPPED OUT OF A CONGRESSIONAL PRIMARY IN NEW JERSEY: I had to raise a phenomenal amount of money in a short period of time. I couldn't do it with a team of volunteers. We did well, but not well enough. I was prepared to quit my job and go door-to-door, but I knew I still wouldn't be able to compete on the same level, so I had to face reality.

CONSTRUCTION COMPANY EXECUTIVE WAYNE BROKAW, DROPPED OUT OF A CONGRESSIONAL PRIMARY IN WASHINGTON: We had an army of people but the issue came down to money. I have lived here so many years, but someone came in from the coast with a lot of money. You're not going to compete with money... It's a sad day.

BUSINESSWOMAN KATIE DELAHAYE PAYNE, POTENTIAL CANDIDATE FOR CONGRESS IN NEW HAMPSHIRE: I may care desperately about the state of New Hampshire, or I may be good at public policy, or I may be a well-educated woman, but that's not what counts. The thing people wanted to know was: can I raise a million dollars. If that's the criteria, I don't want to run.

MUSTANG CITY MANAGER, DROPPED OUT OF A CONGRESSIONAL PRIMARY IN OKLAHOMA: [The campaign] turned into a money issue I was spending 100% of my time prostituting myself out to raise money This new game has nothing to do with performance and everything to do with money. It s virtually impossible for grassroots candidates to make it.

IV. The State of Our Democracy

If you wonder why there is such cynicism and apathy [in politics] it s because it s widely perceived that money controls everything, so why should I vote when I have no shot of being heard?

-- Kevin McAllister, City Council President, Cranston, Rhode Island

As fundraising continues to play an even more prominent role in American politics, it has begun to alter not only the legislative priorities of the country, but also the very people we elect as leaders. When competitive candidates raise the majority of their money from a very small and wealthy segment of the population, fundraising ability is no longer an accurate measurement of a candidate s popularity among the general public. It becomes far more likely that those candidates who are winning the million dollar congressional contests are, instead, a better reflection of the large donors and special interests who fund their campaigns than of ordinary citizens in their district.

Recent academic studies support the notion that our politicians do not reflect the same interests as the majority of Americans. Lawrence R. Jacobs of the University of Minnesota and Robert Y. Shapiro of Columbia University found in their recent book *Politicians Don t Pander* that Congress is out of step with the public s concerns more often than not: We have found a dramatic decline of political responsiveness to the wishes and preferences of the public on major policy decisions in at least the past 20 years. The researchers say that today s policy makers are less receptive to the opinions of voters than they are to the extreme ideological elements of their parties, to their contributors, and to special interests.

a) Large Donors Elect Candidates

Large donors can make or break a campaign. Candidates who attract support from the donor community early in the race have a significant fundraising edge that helps deter other challengers who are not backed by big money. Both presidential candidates in the 2000 election cycle benefited enormously from the support of large donors. By the end of 1999, Vice President Al Gore had raised nearly \$29 million while Gov. George W. Bush had raised more than \$68 million. Three-quarters of both their totals came from maximum \$1000 donors, according to the Center for Responsive Politics. On the other hand, former presidential candidate Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.) had raised \$13 million during the same period, but raised only one third of his total funds from maximum donors. Because relatively few of McCain s donors gave maximum contributions, the breadth of his support was not accurately reflected in his fundraising totals. For this reason, many grassroots candidates who raise the majority of their contributions from small donors find it difficult to compete with money-laden candidates.

Candidates who ran in congressional races across the country also recognize the power of large campaign donors. Geoffrey Yoste, a former congressional candidate in Mississippi said in an interview with U.S. PIRG: The guys who give money have been in the loop for years and

they have friends across the country who can also give \$2000 - \$1000 from the friend and \$1000 from his wife. What is terrible is that the handful of large money people try to control the system. In his race, Yoste says, A few folks got behind the guy they wanted and I was cut out of the race.

In Indiana, former congressional candidate Andrew Phipps also spoke to U.S. PIRG about the influence of large campaign contributors: When the folks with the deep pockets get involved, then other people with money get in lock step. If a candidate can get out there early and get money and influential people committed to him, it has a multiplier effect. People of means know 10-20 other people who can also give \$1000 and never miss it.

In an opinion piece printed earlier this year in the Philadelphia Newspapers, former Congressman and 2000 senate candidate Peter Kostmayer shines a spotlight on how modern day campaigns are financed:

Not only didn't I talk to voters, the only time I saw them was on the elevator in a Center City Philadelphia building on my way to an office where I dialed for dollars, nearly every day. My fund-raising staff of six - no press secretary, no field organizer, no volunteer coordinator, no research assistant - gave me the names of people who could do two things: give money - hopefully, the legal limit of \$1,000 - and raise money. I spent my days talking to people about money, money, money. That was my new world in 1999 - *very small, very narrow, and very rich*. (Emphasis added.)

Political contributors as a class are hardly representative of the American population. According to a national survey funded by the Joyce Foundation during the last presidential election year, in 1996, of those who gave contributions of more than \$200 to a congressional candidate, 95% were white, 80% were male, 50% were over 60 years of age, and 81% had annual incomes greater than \$100,000. These numbers are very different from the population of the United States at that time: 17% were non-white, 51% were women, 12.8% were over 60, and only 4.6% declared an income of more than \$100,000 on their tax returns.

b) The Millionaire Phenomenon

A secondary trend in recent elections has been the growing number of multi-millionaire candidates who are willing to fund their own campaign. The Democratic and Republican parties have encouraged this trend by recruiting wealthy candidates. This allows the parties to direct their resources to other races. According to the most recent FEC reports filed by candidates as of November 3, 2000, 149 congressional candidates had contributed more than \$100,000 to their own campaign.

Although many self-funded campaigns don't work, some do. New Jersey's new Senator, Jon Corzine, is a particularly good example of an effective self-funded candidate. With no previous political experience, this multimillionaire and former CEO of Goldman Sachs Investment Firm was able to defeat two long time politicians, former Governor and Congressman Jim Florio in the primary, and Congressman Bob Franks (R-N.J.) in the general election. By spending a million dollars per week on political advertisements and hiring a dozen well-paid consultants, Corzine's showing in the polls jumped from six percent last November to 56 percent in May. At the beginning of his ad campaign in mid-March, Corzine trailed Florio by 22-57; 75% of those surveyed had no opinion about Corzine. Only three months later, Corzine had successfully raised his public image and solidly defeated Florio in the June 6 primary by 16

percentage points, 58-42. Corzine went on to beat Representative Bob Franks \$5 million dollar campaign in the general election. Corzine has proven that money can buy an election.

The millionaire phenomenon is troubling for several reasons. First, millionaires are hardly representative of the citizens they are supposed to represent and may not understand the concerns of ordinary people. Millionaires only make up 2.6 percent of the population, according to J.P. Morgan Banking research. Second, self-funded candidates discourage capable people of ordinary means from running for office. For instance, attorney and former Democratic state Chairman Thomas Byrne raised nearly \$400,000 from individuals before dropping out of the New Jersey senate race in November 1999. He didn't feel he could compete with Corzine's multi-million dollar campaign. The increasing number of millionaire candidates is yet another symptom of a campaign finance system gone wrong. In the 106th Congress, Roll Call magazine reported that 97 Senators and House members are millionaires (18 percent), although the actual number may be well over a 100 - due to multiple low estimates of individual assets. This year, joining Jon Corzine in Washington, D.C. is wealthy car alarm magnate, Darrel Issa, from California's 48th district. Issa loaned his campaign \$3.1 million to defeat retired US Marine Corps Officer Peter Kouvelis, out-raising him by a margin greater than 150-to-1.

V. The Problem of Money in Politics Has Been Mischaracterized

Many political pundits, reporters, and reform organizations — including the PIRGs at times — have narrowed their critique of money in politics to the buying of political favors by wealthy special interests. While, buying of access and influence from elected officials *is* a problem in an election system controlled by the moneyed interests, it is a secondary problem. Large political donors, not average Americans, decide who can run for office and win elections. Most special interests have little need to buy legislators' votes if they can buy the whole election. Many legislators are already receptive to and have similar political goals as the moneyed interests who fund their campaigns. Similarly, the problem with access peddling is not so much that granting access and influence to active supporters of a campaign or political party is an inherently corrupting process. Rather, the problem is that the price tag for access is unobtainable to more than 99% of all Americans. If money in politics were limited and every citizen could afford to buy access and influence, reformers would have little to complain about.

By focusing solely on the secondary problem of special interest corruption of the legislative process, reformers are setting themselves up for defeat in the political arena. Solving this problem will not solve the overarching problems with money in politics. We could eliminate soft money contributions and effectively reduce the problem of undue access and influence. Yet, large donors would still dominate elections, and political apathy would persist.

Members of Congress have reinforced the notion that the buying of access and influence is the primary problem with money in politics. While some reform-minded Senators do talk about the more fundamental problem of big money influencing the electoral process, it is usually clouded with examples of the appearance of corruption in the legislative process. For instance, Senator Russ Feingold (D-Wis.) supports a system of public financing of elections — a reform that really would diminish the influence of wealthy interests on elections. Yet, during his opening remarks on campaign finance reform on October 14, 1999, he spoke almost entirely to the problem of special interests influencing legislation:

Soft money causes Americans, time and time again, to question the integrity and impartiality of the *legislative process*. Everything we do is under scrutiny and subject to

suspicion because major industries and labor organizations are giving our political parties such big piles of money. Whether it is the telecommunications legislation, Y2K liability, the bankruptcy bill, defense spending, or health care someone out there is telling the public, often with justification, in my view, that Congress cannot be trusted to do what is best for the public interest because the major affected industries are giving us money while those bills are pending in committee or debated on the floor (Emphasis added, Congressional Record, S12577).

Ironically, reform-opponents like Sen. Mitch McConnell easily find fault with arguments based on special interest corruption of the legislative process. During the Senate debate on campaign finance reform on October 14, 1999, Sen. McConnell quotes Sen. McCain as saying that he is trying to eliminate soft money which has corrupted the legislative process, and We are all corrupted. To which, McConnell demands proof of *quid pro quo* corruption and asks (Congressional Record, October 14, 1999, S12588): Who gave the money? How much was it? Where did it go? How did it affect my actions with respect to the Appropriations Committee?

Arguing about whether or not any given senator may have changed his or her position on an issue because of a contribution, will not progress the debate on campaign finance reform. If reformers really want to get big money out of politics, the focus should be on how large contributions, both soft and hard, corrupt the process by influencing who can run for office and who wins elections. This is the problem that goes far deeper than soft money contributions to political parties. This is why Americans are losing faith in the political process.

VI. Conclusions

The stories of candidates across the country who lost an election, dropped out, or did not run for office because of money are neither isolated nor surprising. In a system that overwhelmingly favors the biggest spender, candidates must be prepared to win the battle of the bucks. When a handful of large donors can effectively determine who runs for office, who wins elections, and what issues are at the top of the political agenda, our elected officials are likely to lose touch with the concerns of the ordinary citizen. Furthermore, a system where the doors are wide open to the independently wealthy, yet remain shut to the majority of Americans, is both discriminatory and undemocratic.

Reformers should stop making the case for changes in campaign finance laws solely because politicians are selling access or are being influenced by wealthy interests. While these are important problems, they miss the larger problem of wealthy interests influencing *election outcomes*. Politicians who win office only by virtue of outspending their opponent are no more qualified for elective office than athletes who use performance-enhancing drugs are qualified for the Olympics. The point is that they may not have won the race in the first place, not just that they need to clean up their act. To restore democracy, we need an elections system that ensures that voters, not donors, determine who runs for office and wins elections.

To restore equity and vitality in political campaigns, Congress should lower contribution limits to an amount that ordinary citizens can afford. As many candidates have told us, a very small group of \$1000 donors currently dominates our electoral process. Congress should also set caps on the use of personal wealth in campaigns and limits on total campaign expenditures. Further, candidates should be required to raise all or most of their funds from within their district. Small contributions should be encouraged by providing tax credits for donors giving less than

\$100, and candidates should be given free media time so that candidates who are not backed by big money can compete.

A ban on the unlimited soft money contributions to political parties would be a good first step toward these goals, but by itself would do little to significantly change who runs for office and who wins elections. None of the potential candidates interviewed in this paper were forced out of the race due to soft money.

VII. Examples From 46 States

a) The South

ALABAMA:

Arthur Davis, Attorney Lost the 7th District Democratic Primary

Arthur Davis is a 32-year-old African-American lawyer from Montgomery, Alabama. Before starting his own private practice, Davis worked for federal Judge Myron Thompson and served as assistant U.S. Attorney for four years. This year, Davis made an unsuccessful bid for the Democratic nomination in Alabama's 7th district, the poorest in the country.

By December 1, Davis' campaign had raised \$11,000, much less than the \$100,000 he thought he needed to attract support from larger donors. "It's a catch-22. We managed to be competitive and run a campaign without a lot of money because we had a strong volunteer team and a powerful message, but we weren't able to raise enough money to persuade the donor community. The donor community is a fairly exclusive clique. They didn't know me or know any of my sponsors," Davis reflected. If not for his lack of finances, he believes he "had a chance to win. There is no question money influenced the election. We did well in the areas where we campaigned and poorly in the areas where we couldn't afford to buy media," he recalled.

Representative Earl Hilliard easily won reelection in the 7th district. By October 18, he had raised just under half a million dollars. His opponent, Republican Ed Martin had raised \$16,000 by the same date.

ARKANSAS:

Judy Smith, Social Worker Lost the 4th District Democratic Primary

Judy Smith is a social worker in a very poor district, Arkansas fourth. She was elected to the State House in 1990, a position she gained with only \$7,000 by unseating a 24-year incumbent. After eight years in the legislature, Smith left because of term limits. A volunteer with a teen pregnancy program, Smith believes in serving her community and decided to run for Congress in the 4th district. Having been a state legislator who was capable of impacting the lives of my constituency, I thought I could do even more as a congresswoman, she said.

Smith, an African American, found fundraising to be a challenge. People told me, "You're not man enough or white enough to get the money." Despite the hurdles, Smith raised

\$225,000. However, it was not enough to defeat Michael Avery Ross, a state senator and businessman who had raised nearly a million dollars by the May primary.

Smith recognizes the importance of money in campaigns. Money is the factor that is most important. If you can't be seen on TV, count yourself out, she commented. This importance, Smith said, is leading to the public's disillusionment with the politics. The system keeps good people out, she said. People truly believe that if you aren't a person of means, you have no chance. Wealthy people can attract money from their circle of friends who are also wealthy. It's a critical problem. Money could be the number one reason why people are deterred from running, Smith concluded.

On November 7th, Democrat Michael Ross narrowly defeated incumbent Representative Jay Dickey. Both candidates spent more than a million dollars apiece on the race. By October 18, Dickey had \$1.52 million in receipts and Ross had \$1.47 million.

FLORIDA:

Greg Trude, Small Businessman Dropped out the 4th District Republican Primary

Greg Trude, a small business owner and motorcycle salesman, dropped out of the 4th district's Republican primary when he realized that it would be impossible for him to raise enough money to effectively compete. I got out knocking on doors, but it's so hard to raise money. It's the most fixed system, he said. I raised enough money to get on the ballot (\$10,000), but it seems like the person who has the most money always wins, Trude noted.

When Tillie Fowler stepped down, Trude said of his district's retiring congresswoman, all the papers said the new candidate was this attorney. He was referring to Ander Crenshaw, an ex-state Senate President, banker and 1994 gubernatorial candidate. Because of Crenshaw's early support from the media and the political leaders, he was able to raise half a million dollars to win the nomination. Trude believes that the Constitution intended for normal guys to run, but the prominence of money in elections is preventing good candidates from seeking office.

Ander Crenshaw was the victor in the 4th district's open seat, raising \$820,000 by October 18. His opponent, Thomas Sullivan, had raised \$111,000 by the same date.

Lori Edwards, State Representative⁸ Dropped out of the 12th District Democratic Primary

A Florida state Representative and communications consultant, Lori Edwards describes herself as a solidly middle class. She has won four elections for the Florida state House and has never had to spend more than \$350,000 on a race. Running for Congress, Edwards thought was really doable and also a natural progression. Yet in October 1999, she dropped out the race after five months of campaigning.

Edwards says that All of a sudden the price tag for this race was going up to \$1 million and so she dropped out. Not because she didn't think she could do it, but because she didn't want to: My experience in the State Legislature showed it can be done, but I never had to beg for a million dollars. Edwards has since settled on running for supervisor of elections in Polk County. She says: The cost of the race is a manageable one, and the outcome of the race will depend much more on my grass-roots effort, talking to people, shaking hands.

State Representative and citrus grower Adam Putnam raised nearly a million dollars by October 18th and defeated Democrat Michel Stedem to win the 12th district open seat. Stedem's campaign had \$577,000 in receipts by the same date.

GEORGIA:

Chip Warren, Police Union Official Lost the 7th District Democratic Primary

On July 18, Chip Warren lost the Democratic nomination for Congress in Georgia's 7th district to Roger Kahn, a Democratic fundraiser and wealthy businessman. Warren, a former police officer, is currently vice president of the Atlanta Police Union and coaches youth football in his free time. Although he admits that all three candidates were qualified, he believes money did make the difference in the race.

"It is somewhat disquieting that it takes that kind of money to run for office," Warren said. I was idealistic — a man of the people. Yet, it is so hard raising money, he reflected. Chip Warren's grassroots campaign raised \$40,000 mostly from small donors giving between \$50-\$100, he said. We did everything we could. We worked 18 to 19 hours a day shaking hands, but couldn't reach enough voters without more money. I had no paid staff. Even my campaign manager volunteered," he reflected. Warren is unsure of what he would have done differently, but he knows the system needs changing.

Representative Bob Barr successfully held on to his seat in Georgia's 7th district, narrowly defeating businessman Roger Kahn. By October 18, Barr had raised \$3 million and Kahn had \$3.7 million.

KENTUCKY:

Russ Maple, Jefferson County Commissioner Dropped Out of the 3rd District Democratic Primary

Russ Maple has been a successful player in local Kentucky politics for many years. He has won four elections, two primaries and two general, and has sat on the Jefferson County school board. As Jefferson County Commissioner, he serves 700,000 constituents. However, after raising \$100,000 for a House bid in three or four months, Maple dropped out of the third district Democratic primary. When I saw the amount of money that had to be spent and what it had to be spent on, I was disgusted, he said.

Thinking back, Maple admits that one of his biggest mistakes was going to Washington, D.C.: When I really got inside I was disappointed. You need to pay for consultants who tell you you need to hire a pollster who tells you you need to hire a media person. Finally, you need to hire someone else to make you sit in a room and call people for more money. It's like a dog chasing its tail. Maple says that under the current system only the wealthy can run for Congress. For those who don't have personal wealth, he suggests looking at a more local race. I wanted to run a race like a commissioner's race, but the consultants told me it can't be done," he said.

Representative Anne Northup raised \$2.4 million by October 18 to win reelection in the 3rd district. In the same period, her Democratic opponent, state Rep. Eleanor Jordan raised nearly \$1.6 million.

LOUISIANA:

Jack Capella, Jefferson Parish District Attorney Potential Republican Candidate in 1st District

Jack Capella has been the Jefferson Parish District Attorney since 1996. Prior to that, he served as an assistant district attorney and as a special prosecutor in the attorney general's office. He is also a Gulf War veteran. In 1999, he ran in a special election to replace Representative Bob Livingston. However, he decided not to run for the seat this year because again, he says, it was a situation where money plays out overall.

Capella noted the incumbent's personal wealth and the significance of money in elections as influential factors for his decision not to run. The reality of congressional elections is that money is the mother's milk, he said. Adding, It is the first and primary consideration for all of us aspiring candidates. Speaking more fundamentally about our campaign finance system, he said: What it creates is such a large gap between the haves and the have-nots that people we elect have no contact with the people they need to help - their constituents. From the perspective of a local politician, Capella says we need to reduce the amount of money that can be spent on elections. The machine of politics is inherently corrupt at its core, he concluded.

Representative David Vitter won the primary and general elections, both on November 7, raising \$2.3 million by October 18. He defeated Democrats Michael Armato and Cary Deaton who had each raised less than \$5,000 for the race.

MISSISSIPPI:

Geoffrey Yoste, Morning Talk Radio Host Lost the 4th District Republican Primary

Geoffrey Yoste graduated from college in 1988 and has since gained political experience working for Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott and the governor of Mississippi. Yoste is now a morning talk radio host. After running a shoe string campaign, Yoste lost the fourth district GOP primary to Dunn Lampton, a prosecutor and 1998 candidate.

Yoste says that Lampton had help from Washington, giving him access to large funds. Yoste raised just under \$46,000. I raised all I could get, said Yoste, I didn't raise money in Washington; I'm not running in Washington, he added, contrasting his campaign to that of his opponent. In smaller states, like Mississippi, Yoste says, money is a particularly big problem, because there are fewer people who can give large amounts. According to Yoste: The guys who give money have been in the loop for years and they have friends across the country who can also give \$2000 each - \$1000 from the friend and \$1000 from his wife. What is terrible is that the handful of large money people try to control the system. They try to anoint someone. Yoste believes that the system undermines democracy. Just having influence and friends doesn't make you a good candidate. A few folks got behind the guy they wanted and I was cut out of the race, he concluded.

Representative Ronnie Shows narrowly defeated Dunn Lampton to win reelection, outspending him by 2-1. By October 18, Shows had raised \$1 million and Lampton had \$447,000.

SOUTH CAROLINA:

Mike Seekings, Attorney Lost the 1st District Republican Primary

Mike Seekings has been practicing law in South Carolina since 1988. This past March he entered the 1st district race for the Republican nomination and successfully raised \$34,000 in three months. By the June 13 primary, \$1.2 million had been pumped into the election. The top two vote getters in the election out-raised the four other challengers, one of them being Mike Seekings, by hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Seekings cites money as a reason behind his defeat. "Money does have an influence. Elections are about name recognition and you always need money for that." According to Seekings, in order to run you need to build political capital, and that puts wealthy candidates at an advantage. "They have an automatic war chest," he says.

Grocery chain executive and republican nominee Henry Brown won the 1st district open seat election on November 7. Brown raised \$567,000 by October 18 to defeat Democrat Andrew Black who raised \$420,000 in the same period.

TENNESSEE:

John Jay Hooker, Attorney Lost Democratic Primary for Senate

John Jay Hooker has been involved in government since 1958, working with people such as John F. Kennedy, Robert F. Kennedy, Jesse Jackson, Ross Perot and Bill Clinton. As Robert Kennedy's assistant in 1961, Hooker played an important role in getting the Justice Department involved in *Baker v. Carr*, a Supreme Court case that established the one man - one vote principal, considered by some to be the most important decision made by the Warren Court. Hooker also ran in Tennessee's gubernatorial primary in 1966 and won the Democratic nomination. This year, in an attempt to unseat incumbent Senator Bill Frist, Hooker narrowly lost the primary by 925 votes to consultant and college professor Jeff Clark. Two weeks prior to the election, Clark had raised \$150,000. Hooker raised and spent no money on his campaign.

Hooker says he lost the primary because he did not take contributions or use personal wealth. An outspoken advocate for campaign finance reform, he has challenged the constitutionality of all campaign contributions and has filed a lawsuit claiming that monetary contributions discriminate against those who cannot contribute, thus violating the 14th Amendment. Hooker is for public financing of elections or for making contributions so small that everyone can give - \$100 or less. He also says that *Buckley v. Valeo*, where the Court ruled that spending limits were unconstitutional, was a horrendous decision. Madison never intended the First Amendment to be a vehicle for privately financed elections, he added. The Constitution is not designed to create an oligarchy.

Senator Bill Frist easily won reelection, raising more than \$4.2 million by October 18 and outspending Jeff Clark by a margin greater than sixteen-to-one. Clark had raised \$265,000 by at the time.

VIRGINIA:

Meyera Oberndorf, Mayor of Virginia Beach Potential Democratic Candidate in the 2nd District

In 1976, Meyera Oberndorf became the first woman ever elected to the Virginia Beach City Council. She served on the council for 12 years and played a lead role in passing a referendum calling for the direct election of the mayor. In 1988, Oberndorf ran in the first mayoral election ever, becoming the first female mayor of Virginia Beach. Last year, many people in the district approached her about running for Congress in the 2000 elections. The local Democratic Chairman agreed that she would be a very credible candidate.

Money was the major factor in Oberndorf's decision not to run. To run you have to have millions and millions of dollars. If you're middle class and idealistic, without a personal fortune, it can be discouraging, she said. One of the reasons why she finds fundraising so hard is that most ordinary citizens can't afford to give very much money. \$1000 is pricey for a middle class family, she says. They could use the money to buy two months of dancing school or karate class for their children. Oberndorf also commented on the problems with our current campaign finance system: Our system is beginning to favor people who are born into wealth or who have amassed a great personal fortune so they can match public contributions dollar to dollar.

State Senator and stockbroker Edward Shrock, who had raised just more than a million dollars for his campaign by October 18, won the 2nd district's open seat. His opponent, Attorney Jody Wagner, had raised \$953,000 at the same date.

b) The Mid-Atlantic

DELAWARE:

Mike Miller, Small Businessman Democratic Nominee for At-Large House Seat

Mike Miller ran a hard core grassroots campaign to unseat incumbent Rep. Mike Castle. But, in the end, money triumphed. An active member in his Delaware community, Miller makes a living as a small business owner and tax accountant. He is also the youth director at his church, active with the NAACP, and directs various activities like the Martin Luther King celebration.

Miller had to fight the money, not the issues. We had a hard enough time raising even the money we did, he said. For candidates who are not wealthy or self-employed, Miller says, running for office is a challenge. He suggests limiting campaign spending because we need some way we can make it a fair process for everyone to compete.

Miller raised \$32,000 by October 18. By the same date, incumbent Representative Mike Castle raised \$629,000 to win Delaware's only congressional seat.

MARYLAND:

John Ewald, Teacher Lost in 6th District Democratic Primary

John Ewald has been a Maryland teacher for 14 years. Currently the Chairman of his middle school's physical education department, Ewald has gained governmental experience through working with the state legislature on educational issues and by serving on the Maryland State Association of Physical Education and Dance. Born in the 6th district, Ewald was encouraged to run for Congress by people throughout the area, but lost the Democratic nomination to congressional aide Don DeArmon.

Ewald says that his opponent's monetary advantage allowed DeArmon to market his message much better than he could. We wore our shoes out trying to make sure people knew who we were, Ewald remembers. His campaign did not have the luxury of sending direct mail and could only afford to purchase a small amount of time on cable TV. I'm not a politician, I'm a teacher, Ewald stated, so it was very hard to raise money. His experience running for office has given him new insight on our political system. Wealthy candidates have a better chance, said Ewald. The way our system is set up is that it's available to anyone, but it's incredibly difficult unless you are wealthy or have wealthy friends, he added. He fears that the amount of money does turn people away from politics in many ways - as a voter and a candidate.

Ewald raised \$13,000 in the primary. Representative Roscoe Bartlett raised \$216,000 by October 18 to defeat the Democratic nominee, Don DeArmon. DeArmon's campaign had raised \$253,000 at the time.

NEW JERSEY:

Thomas Byrne, Former Democratic State Chairman Dropped Out of Democratic Senate Primary

On November 20, 1999 former Democratic state Chairman Thomas Byrne dropped out of the primary for New Jersey's open senate seat. Despite raising more than \$400,000 from individuals, Byrne was eventually forced to exit the race because of financial difficulties. Money decided my fate, he said. The party was looking for someone who could afford to spend one million a week on TV ads for at least five weeks. Byrne believes that political leaders in the North calculated that multimillionaire candidate Jon Corzine had a much better chance of coming up with the necessary \$5 to 6 million. Although most voters in New Jersey were undecided when Byrne dropped out of the race, a Gannett poll conducted before his decision found former Governor and Congressman Jim Florio leading the Democrats with 31 percent, Byrne with 13 percent, and Corzine with 6 percent.

When asked about the problems with the current system, Byrne responded: The current campaign finance system requires so much money that certain offices aren't open to everyone. He also cited too much special interest money in politics and the perverse 1976 Supreme Court decision, *Buckley v. Valeo*, where the Court ruled that political money is analogous to constitutionally guaranteed free speech, and therefore, cannot be restricted.

Thomas Byrne was competing for the senate seat vacated by Senator Frank Lautenberg, who resigned because he didn't want to raise money or spend his own for another race. Last year, Gov. Christine Todd Whitman was considered a strong potential candidate for this seat, yet she also turned down the opportunity because of fundraising reasons. On Election Day, Jon Corzine, was declared the victor. He defeated Rep. Bob Franks who had raised almost \$5 million by October 18. Corzine had spent more than \$54 million on the race by October 18, including \$52 million of his own money.

Patricia Walsh, Green Brook Mayor Dropped Out of the 7th District Republican Primary

Patricia Walsh was born in Union County and has lived in Somerset County for 20 years. She has a long history of civic service and life experience in New Jersey's 7th congressional district. A registered nurse for 30 years, Walsh is currently working in homecare and is the mayor of Green Brook. She has also served on the local township committee. After encouragement from many people in the district, Walsh decided to run for Congress. Three and half months later, she sent her volunteers home and ended her bid because of resources. In a race where a number of the candidates had wealthy backgrounds and strong political ties, Walsh found it difficult to compete financially. I entered the race late and I had to raise a phenomenal amount of money in a short period of time. I couldn't do it with a team of volunteers. We did well, but not well enough. I was prepared to quit my job and campaign full time - go door to door - but I knew I still wouldn't be able to compete on the same level, so I had to face reality, she reflected.

When asked about the problems with our current campaign finance system, she said: Many people comment that only the wealthy are in politics. I say look at the system. You can use unlimited funds from your personal fortune, and the wealthy know a hundred people to call and get \$1000 from. It's a catch-22. It puts good candidates at a disadvantage. One of the candidates in this race said from the start he would spend a million dollars on this primary. Walsh advocates for caps on the amount that candidates can spend in any one election.

Candidates worry about money when they should be talking about issues, she commented. Although Walsh lost the wealth primary this year, she's not ruling out a future challenge. I enjoy government and am good at getting things done. I'm a people person and people have contacted me since my withdrawal; they want me to come back again, she says.

Patricia Walsh raised \$32,000 before she dropped out. The Republican nominee Mike Ferguson, a community college professor, won the \$3 million contest for New Jersey's 7th district seat. He had raised \$1.8 million by October 18, which included a \$650,000 personal loan. His opponent, MaryAnne Connelly raised \$1.7 million by the same date.

NEW YORK:

Bob Elliot, Croton-on-Hudson Mayor Dropped Out of the 19th District Democratic Primary

A five-term mayor of Croton-on-Hudson and an active member of his community, Bob Elliot raised \$70,000 for his congressional bid in the 19th district — and then dropped out for financial reasons. I was naive enough to think that I could go up against personal funding, Elliot said. I felt that I could have raised enough money to run a race, but it's a millionaire's game, he continued.

Shortly after entering the race, Elliot became discouraged by the way campaigns are financed. "You don't know how ugly and corrupt the system is until you run and find out where the money flows from," he said. He thinks that the campaign finance system "deters certain candidates from running. Asking people for money is a bear of a job." After Elliot dropped out of the race, no other candidates stepped in to challenge his former opponent, Larry Graham, who had raised nearly \$400,000 (a third coming from his own pocket) by the September primaries.

Representative Sue Kelly defeated and out-spent Democratic Nominee Larry Graham in the general elections. She raised \$811,000 by October 18, while Graham raised \$435,000 in the same period.

PENNSYLVANIA:

Peter Kostmayer, Former Congressman Dropped Out of Senate Democratic Primary

A former U.S. Representative of 14 years, Peter Kostmayer is the executive director of Zero Population Growth (ZPG), the oldest grassroots population organization in the U.S. Before his work with ZPG, Kostmayer worked on environmental justice issues as the Regional Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency for the Mid-Atlantic. Despite his vast experience, Kostmayer pulled out of the Senate race in December 1999 after becoming disillusioned with the current campaign finance system.

Kostmayer spent most of 1999 raising money. I hired six people and we worked seriously from 8 a.m. to 8 p.m. every day raising money - no press, field, or issues operation. Everyone we talked to had said that doesn't matter if you don't have the money to get on television. This was a very different experience for Kostmayer from when he first ran for Congress in 1976. In an opinion editorial printed in the Philadelphia Newspapers, Kostmayer wrote: In the Philadelphia suburbs, campaigning door-to-door like an old-fashioned salesperson

was, for me, the key to victory in the 70s I met thousands of people, if only briefly. But, always, I was listening to the people I wanted to represent.

Kostmayer tells a very different story about his recent experience running for Senate where people told him he had to raise \$50,000 every week, the amount he had raised for his entire congressional campaign in 1976. This, he feels, is a serious problem that not only repels good people but also attracts those who like fundraising. Politics, Kostmayer says, has become a financial business. I think many people are unwilling to raise that kind of money. It's not an ideological issue, but the single most important factor in American politics. Many people don't run or fail because of it. Kostmayer advocates for free TV time and public financing of elections, or lowering the legal contribution limits. In his opinion piece he also says that some of the burden for change is on the American people. After 10 elections, I know this much: If voters insist on real change, they actually get it once in a while.

Peter Kostmayer raised \$344,000 before he dropped out of the Senate primary. The race turned out to be one of the most expensive in the country, with three of the candidates in the Democratic primary raising more than a million dollars. Fundraising in the general election was also high. After raising \$8.3 million by October 18, Senator Rick Santorum defeated television journalist and Democratic nominee Ron Klink, who had raised \$3.6 million by the same date.

WEST VIRGINIA:

Ken Hechler, Secretary of State Lost the 2th District Democratic Primary

Ken Hechler is no stranger to the political arena. Currently West Virginia's Secretary of State, Hechler served in the U.S. Congress for 18 years from 1959 to 1977. In addition to his work in the legislative branch, Hechler is a World War II veteran, has worked as an assistant to President Truman, taught politics at a number of universities across the country, and is the author of six books. This year Hechler spent \$350,000 in an unsuccessful attempt to return to Washington, D.C. from West Virginia's 2nd district.

The winner of the 2nd district primary, Jim Humphreys, an attorney and former state senator who made millions of dollars on asbestos litigation, put more money into the race than all three of his opponents combined. Humphrey was virtually an unknown before the election. On January 28, 2000, the Charleston Gazette reported that Ken Hechler had 24 percent of the Democratic vote. The other two candidates, Delegate Mark Hunt and state Sen, Martha Walker, had 9 and 8 percent respectively, and Jim Humphreys had less than that, according to a poll conducted by Hunt's campaign. Hunt later dropped out before the primary to pursue a state senate seat.

Hechler calls the race a classic example of how frequent appearances on television, for which Jim Humphrey's spent \$1.7 million of his \$3 million, convince voters that he is a real TV star of the first magnitude. Hechler noted that the election outcomes precisely followed the expenditures, yet he felt that spending more would have gone against [his] principals.

A strong proponent of campaign finance reform, last year Hechler joined the 90-year-old activist Granny D for 530 miles of her trek across the country. He says that big money in elections turns people away from participating in the process: "People become discouraged when they see large amounts of money being spent. Money casts a long shadow which can block out

old-time retail politics. Hechler believes that the political playing field must be leveled and advocates for limits on campaign expenditures.

Educator and state Delegate Shelley Moore Capito narrowly raised a million dollars by October 18 and defeated Jim Humphreys in the general election. Humphreys put \$5 million of his own money into the race, bringing his total receipts to almost \$6.5 million by October 18.

c) New England

CONNECTICUT:

Paul Vincent Valenti, Watertown City Councilor Democratic Nominee for Congress in the 6th District

Paul Valenti went to public high school in Connecticut and has been involved in both college and local politics. A lawyer by trade, Valenti also serves his community as a city councilor in Watertown and, this year, decided to challenge Representative Nancy Johnson for the 6th district's congressional seat. [I ran] because I believe in public service and would like to see a better way to finance campaigns, he said. Living by his words, Valenti vowed not to take or seek any money from Political Action Committees (PACs). He says that by not taking special interest money, I'd be a much more objective advocate and representative of the average, ordinary people. However, Valenti's low-budget campaign did not win him the election and on November 7, he lost to Congresswoman Johnson.

Money has a tremendous effect on election outcomes, Valenti said. Although people were receptive to his campaign, he says that his opponents' money made it hard to run a grassroots campaign. Today's society is increasingly mobile and transient, that it's hard to reach people, and it's hard to compete against an air campaign, he commented. He also reflected on the growing political apathy among Americans: I don't think that it is coincidental that as campaign money increases, public participation decreases.

Rep. Nancy Johnson raised \$1.4 million by October 18 to defeat Paul Valenti, who had raised just under \$10,000 by the same date..

MASSACHUSETTS:

Joe Fountain, Teacher Lost 2nd District Democratic Primary

Joe Fountain is a middle school special education teacher who has been involved with politics forever. The University of Massachusetts graduate ran for city council in 1993 and has worked as an aide in the state House. Running against Congressman Richard Neal this year was a challenge. Fountain ran a grassroots campaign and crisscrossed the whole district, he says, yet lost the primary in mid-September.

Fountain believes that money was a major factor in the campaign: Fundraising was a lot harder than I thought. I had hoped people would come out purely on ideology. Fountain had the chance to get some important endorsements from the labor community and other ideological groups who agreed with his positions, but was told that he would first have to raise \$100,000 to show that he could buy the necessary media. It's a catch-22, said Fountain. Even if people agree with you a hundred percent of the time, unless you have the money, they aren't going to

support you. I wasn't able to break the threshold, he concluded. To remedy the situation, Fountain suggests publicly financed elections, free television time, and ten year term limits.

Joe Fountain raised less than \$5,000 for the primary. Representative Richard Neal was unopposed in the general election and had raised more than \$600,000 by October 18.

NEW HAMPSHIRE:

Katie Delahaye Payne, Consultant Potential Democratic Candidate in the 1st Congressional District

Katie Delahaye Payne is a Portsmouth businesswoman with a background in journalism and public relations. Her company, the Delahaye Group, helps Fortune 500 companies measure the effectiveness of their marketing programs. Payne was a potential candidate for the first congressional district, but chose not to run because fundraising is not what [she] does well.

According to Payne, the amount of money in the campaign posed an ethical dilemma for her. "I had mixed feelings," said Payne. "It was exciting that all these groups wanted to give me money, but where do you draw the line?" Payne says that people didn't care where she stood on issues, and only focused on her ability to raise money. "I may care desperately about the state of New Hampshire, or I may be good at public policy, or I may be a well-educated woman, but that's not what counts. The first thing people wanted to know was: can I raise a million dollars? It grossed me out," said Payne. "If that's the criteria, I don't want to run."

Payne's number one issue is campaign finance reform. She believes that there is too much corporate influence in campaigns, advantaging candidates with connections outside of the state. The real danger with the current system is that people are buying their way into office. That's not a meritocracy," she said.

Incumbent Rep. John Sununu successfully won reelection in the first district, raising \$484,000 by October 18 to defeat his Democratic opponent Martha Fuller Clark. Clark raised \$638,000 in the same period.

RHODE ISLAND:

Kevin McAllister, Cranston City Council President Lost the 2nd District Democratic Nomination

Kevin McAllister has spent a good deal of his life in public service and currently serves as the president of the Cranston City Council. Prior to getting his law degree, McAllister worked for the federal government in Washington, D.C. from 1974 to 1978. Now a small businessman, McAllister continues to be involved in various community activities. Yet, despite his experience in local government, running for Congress was a whole new game. In the 2nd district Democratic primary, McAllister challenged against Secretary of State Jim Langevin, who had raised \$900,000 by the primary, and executive director of the state's National Association of Social Workers Kathleen Coyne-McCoy, who had raised \$700,000. Langevin won the nomination.

Obviously, money had a tremendous effect, said McAllister who had made campaign finance reform his biggest issue. Refusing to accept money from special interests and PACs, McAllister took in about \$50,000 in individual contributions. Everyone says [fundraising] is a

necessary evil in order to get into office, but you can't play the game and then say you want to change the rules, he said.

Part of the problem, McAllister says, is that early in the race the press makes assumptions about who is a viable candidate based on money and people believe it. It's a self-fulfilling prophecy, he said. Very wealthy people who are well-connected who know all the right special interest people are favored. Commenting on the state of our democracy, McAllister says, If you wonder why there is such cynicism and apathy it's because it's widely perceived that money controls everything, so why should I vote when I have no shot of being heard? The most successful candidates seem to be the ones who maximize the fundraising. It's a sad state of affairs, he concluded.

James Langevin easily won the general election for the 2nd district, raising almost a million dollars, including a \$350,000 personal loan, by October 18. His opponent, Republican Robert Tingle, had raised less than \$5,000 in the same period.

d) The Midwest

ILLINOIS:

John Vivoda, Construction Manager Potential Republican Candidate in the 6th District

John Vivoda is a native of the Chicago suburbs. Aside from being a construction manager and civil engineer, Vivoda serves his community as a member of the Glen Ellyn School Board. Despite his strong civic sense, John Vivoda chose not to run for the GOP House nomination in the 6th district primary because, he says, I didn't have a quarter of a million dollars in my account.

Vivoda acknowledges that it is difficult for someone who is not wealthy to win a seat in government. To run a campaign, Vivoda would have to have taken time off work and lose four months of pay. Under the current system, "a poor middle class shrub like me doesn't have a chance, he said.

The candidate who did receive the nomination and went on to win the November 7th election was incumbent Rep. Henry Hyde. In office since 1974, Hyde is a powerful voice in Congress and served as the chief manager of President Clinton's impeachment in the House and in the Senate trial. As a well-known figure, Hyde raised \$2.4 million by October 18. His opponent, Democrat Brent Christensen, had raised \$160,000 by the same date

INDIANA:

Andrew Phipps, Radio Gospel Show Host Dropped out of the 2nd District Republican Primary

Andrew Phipps is a radio gospel show host who has been on the air since 1975. He's also a retired teacher and a lifetime resident of the 2nd district. Despite his tremendous grassroots base and good name recognition, as he says, Phipps found it difficult to raise the big money that was needed to run a competitive congressional race. In February, prior to the filing deadline, he withdrew from the second district's open seat race primarily because of health reasons.

His short-lived run for office was eye-opening. Money was a problem, Phipps admits. One reason, he believes, is that average citizens, like his radio listeners, cannot contribute much. I was appealing to common sense and common people, Phipps said. However, he notes, wealthy people are able to donate large sums of money to political candidates. When folks with the deep pockets get involved, then other people with money get in lock step. If a candidate can get out there early and get money and influential people committed to him, it has a multiplier effect. People of means know 10 to 20 other people who can also give \$1000 and never miss it, said Phipps.

The emphasis on money is having a detrimental effect, Phipps says, on candidate selection. We are losing a lot of good people because of the stereotypical illustrations that politics is dirty and because of the money, he concluded.

Andrew Phipps raised \$40,000 before dropping out of the race. The open seat election went to Mike Pence, an attorney and radio talk show host, who raised nearly a million dollars by October 18. His opponent Robert Rock raised \$370,000 by the same date.

MICHIGAN:

Jack Brandenburg, Businessman Dropped out of the 10th District Republican Primary

If there was a definition of a working stiff, I m one, said Jack Brandenburg, a 26 year resident of the 10th district. Brandenburg built a business from scratch, Blue Water Industrial Supply, and feels there is more room in government for entrepreneurs. However, he dropped out of the primary election in his district because he didn t think he would have enough money to run a competitive race, despite a \$275,000 promise from the Republican Party.

I seriously question the emphasis that was put on fundraising. I was pretty naive, said Brandenburg. He says that he would have needed at least \$2 million to run a competitive race against the twelve-term incumbent Rep. David Bonior. Brandenburg believes that reforms are needed in campaign financing. I wish we could work out a system to cap the amount a candidate can spend, said Brandenburg. It deters people. I think you have to have a certain amount of seed money behind you when you start and you have to have the ability to raise money, he concluded.

By October 18, Rep. Bonior had raised \$2.1 million for his campaign. His opponent in the general election was Republican Thomas Turner, who raised \$18,000 in the same period.

MINNESOTA:

Steve Miles, M.D., Professor Dropped out of Senate Democratic Primary

A bioethicist, professor of medicine, and gerontologist at the University of Minnesota, Dr. Steve Miles believes he is the kind of outside candidate the system should be able to recruit. Miles, a native Minnesotan, has been active in the Democratic Party for 20 years and is an avid health care reform advocate. When the party endorsed state Sen. Jerry Janezich in the primary, Miles, despite raising more than a quarter of a million dollars from individuals, was forced to end his bid for Senate. Without the endorsement, he says, he could not afford to run.

I had to forego a year's worth of income and also put a half year's income into the race, said Miles. Because of the difficulties in financing a campaign, Miles says that only two types of people are able to run for office without a party endorsement: those who can self-finance their campaigns and those who have social or political circles who can put forth the money it takes to run. The winner of the primary was, in fact, a wealthy candidate who was willing to fund his own campaign, department store heir Mark Dayton. In the course of the election, Dayton put in \$6.7 million of his own money. There were also two other wealthy candidates in the primary: trial attorney Michael Ciresi who gave \$4.7 million in personal funds to his race and Rebecca Yanisch, former Minneapolis community development director, who put \$1.9 million into her own campaign.

Miles believes that serious reforms are needed in order to rectify the injustices of our political system. He favors earlier primaries and public financing and opposes an increase in the contribution limits. Raising the limits would be irrelevant. It would only increase the disproportionate amount of money from a small number of wealthy donors and would simply increase the power of the very wealthy, he said. Miles also believes that the media should be required to devote time to the candidates, and that political ads should be barred one week before the election.

Mark Dayton narrowly defeated Senator Rod Grams to win the general. Dayton ran a largely self-funded campaign with receipts totaling \$8.7 million by October 18. Grams raised more than \$5 million in the same period.

OHIO:

Ramona Whisler, Nurse

Lost the 12th District Republican Primary

Ramona Whisler is an active Columbus citizen and has been a public health nurse for 32 years. Concerned about the state of America's health care system, Whisler hoped to help repair it in the House of Representatives. However, the election did not go in her favor. Money dominated the open seat primary, and the Republican nomination went to the well-funded realtor and state House Majority Leader Pat Tiberi.

Campaigning for Congress was difficult for Whisler. I put my career on hold. It's a huge sacrifice. You have to be willing to give up a lot, she said. Whisler conducted a grassroots campaign knocking on doors, but now believes that it is impossible to do this successfully without special interest backing.

Money totally shaped [the election], said Whisler. Tiberi would have been a total unknown without all those TV commercials. As far as name recognition goes, at the beginning of the race, he was at the bottom, she continued. After witnessing the impact of money on the election, Whisler understands why so many people are apathetic. Going door-to-door many people told her: The decision has already been made before I vote, so why bother. Money talks, said Whisler. Candidate's end up representing the party and the people who pay for their campaigns, not their district.

Whisler raised \$11,000 for the primary. Realtor and state House Majority Leader Pat Tiberi, the Republican nominee, raised \$2.1 million by October 18, to win the race. His opponent Columbus Councilwoman Maryellen O Shaughnessy raised \$1.2 million in the same period.

WISCONSIN:

Lew Mittness, Former State Representative Dropped out of the 1st District Democratic Primary

Frustrated by Congress' failure to pass gun control legislation, Lew Mittness, a former state legislator, briefly ended his retirement and decided to run for Congress in Wisconsin's 1st district. Mittness, a former teacher, has a long history in local government. He served on the Wisconsin Assembly from 1965 to 1975 and spent four years on the Wisconsin Public Service Commission. He has also served on the Janesville City Council and the Janesville School Board.

Lew Mittness' bid for Congress was short-lived. When the incumbent Representative Paul Ryan put out a statement saying he had a million dollars, Mittness had had enough. "I got discouraged. Every corporation in America had contributed to his campaign," said Mittness. "In order to compete I would have had to spend the several hundred thousand dollars I had saved for retirement," he said.

Mittness believes that the system's structure leads to an unfair advantage for the rich: "Our system deters anyone who's not a multi-millionaire from running for Senate and for Congress. Unless you're wealthy or know people who can raise money from people who are wealthy, you can't break through. Since his bid, Mittness has become very cynical about our democracy. The government doesn't represent the people anymore. It represents these special interest groups and the super wealthy. They've bought Congress. We have lost our democracy," he concluded.

Lew Mittness raised less than \$5,000 before dropping out. Representative Paul Ryan had raised almost \$1.3 million by October 18 and soundly defeated his Democratic opponent Jeffrey Thomas on Election Day. Thomas had raised \$10,000 by the same date.

e) The Plains

IOWA:

Paul Dahl, Librarian Potential Democratic Candidate in 2nd District Primary

Paul Dahl is a medical librarian and a lifelong resident of Iowa. He mentors junior high school students in his free time and is on the board of directors for an organization that works with physically disabled children. After some consideration, Dahl decided not to run for Congress in the 2nd district. He realized that he could neither raise significant money nor campaign effectively while working full time.

"You have to be able to raise money," Dahl said. "When I thought about running, people would say you don't have the financial means or the background to run. You need to raise at least \$100,000 to be seen as legitimate," he added. According to Dahl, to run a competitive campaign, it takes twenty years making the connections with the people and organizations. He believes there are too many special interests groups that finance elections.

Dahl is a supporter of campaign finance reform because it takes a substantial amount to run and very few of us are independently wealthy. "I believe any citizen should be able to run and the decision should be based on the primary elections, not on how much money you have or

your opponent has, he says. A supporter of limited campaign spending, Dahl feels that, We need to look to the courts. If money is speech, then the poor have no speech.

Representative Jim Nussle raised \$757,000 by October 18 and easily won reelection in the 2nd district. His Democratic opponent was Dubuque County Supervisor Donna Smith, who raised \$66,000 by the same date.

KANSAS:

Carlos Nolla, Attorney Democratic Nominee in the 4th District

Carlos Nolla is a Wichita attorney and active member of the Kansas School of Effective Learning, a local job training and education program. As someone who spent over eight years working his way through college with loans and Pell grants, Nolla recognizes that money is real power. This year, Carlos Nolla went door-to-door to raise \$264,000 by October 18 for his bid for Congress in the 4th district. He admitted, The hardest part about being a challenger [was] raising money, and the part I hate[d] most [was] raising the money.

On November 7, he lost to incumbent Rep. Todd Tiahrt, who out-raised him by more than a 2-to-1 margin. Tiahrt had raised nearly \$653,000 by October 18. According to Nolla, "The system allows for people who aren't all that effective to stay in power because they get the money." He believes that when money becomes a priority in politics, "we start losing our democracy." Nolla feels that "money controls the message and distorts us from looking at candidates in a clear and honest way."

MISSOURI:

Steve Hill, U.S. Attorney Potential Democratic Candidate in Missouri's 6th District

Steve Hill first became involved in politics in 1982 when he served on Representative Ike Skelton's reelection campaign. He also worked on the Clinton/Gore presidential campaign in 1992 and managed a campaign for Senator John Glenn. From 1986-1993 Steve Hill worked for a Kansas City law firm. He currently serves as a U.S. Attorney in Kansas City. Earlier this year, the *St. Joseph News-Press* referred to Hill as the candidate of choice.

Money was one of the reasons why Hill decided not to enter the congressional race. Fundraising is a great concern when you only have 10 weeks to campaign. I'm not independently wealthy. From a practical standpoint, I was not concerned about the issues or developing positions that would be consistent with how I vote, but I was concerned about the money, he said. When I was getting ready to run, I had the opportunity to talk to many candidates, and everyone brought up money, Hill reflected.

Phil Tate, Director of Business Expansion and Attraction Potential Democratic Candidate in 6th District

Phil Tate has been involved in politics for almost three decades. His experience ranges from working on the campaign of former Congressman Terry Litton in 1972 to serving as a member of the local school board and city council. In 1986, he made a successful bid for a seat in the Missouri House of Representatives. Tate served until 1997 when he resigned to take the

position of Director of Business Expansion and Attraction in the Missouri Department of Economic Development. He has been considered a congressional candidate in the 6th district since 1992.

According to Tate, fundraising is an enormous consideration for a possible congressional run because one's effectiveness to raise funds determines your viability as a candidate. Tate is also concerned with the impact of donations on the political process. The "greatest long term threat to the success" of our government is the overriding problem of the fundraising system as it "eats away at our institution, disenfranchising the electorate.

The 6th district open seat race went to the Republican nominee and state Senator Sam Graves, who raised \$801,000 by October 18. His opponent Steve Danner, Former state Senator and son of Rep. Pat Danner, raised more than \$627,000 in the same period.

NORTH DAKOTA:

Duane Sand, Former Navy Officer Republican Nominee for Senate

Duane Sand, a former Navy officer, was unchallenged in the primary election. As a Republican running for Senate in a heavily Republican state, he thought that, except for his opponent's money, his chances of winning were good. However, running against incumbent Kent Conrad was no easy task. Sand struggled to raise enough funds to compete with Conrad's \$2 million campaign.

According to Sand, in a state like North Dakota where there is not much money to be raised, it is difficult for home grown people without outside connections to compete. As he points out, incumbents stay in until they die. With a budget of a little more than \$100,000, Sand spent five months traveling across the state, going to every single town. You can reach all of them, Sand said. Even so, his grassroots approach did little to counter Conrad's money. It's hard to get the message out, and the voters suffer because they don't hear both sides, Sand reflected.

Senator Kent Conrad will remain North Dakota's senator for another six years. According to FECInfo, 96 percent of the contributions that had been entered by the Federal Election Commission by November 1 were from out of state. Sand had raised more than \$320,000 by October 18.

SOUTH DAKOTA:

Steven Sandven, Wisseton-Wahpeton Sioux Tribe General Council Lost Democratic Primary for the At-Large House Seat

As the Wisseton-Wahpeton Sioux Tribe General Council, Steven Sandven has high visibility on the Native American reservations of South Dakota. He has also served as a federal prosecutor and is currently starting a law practice in Sioux Falls. Despite putting 40,000 miles on his vehicle in the six to eight months preceding the primary, Sandven lost the election to water development association manager Curt Hohn.

Sandven says that his bid for Congress gave him a first-hand education on the difficulties of grassroots campaigning, particularly in rural areas. People don't realize that [money] is a

problem out here because campaign spending tends to be less, but candidates must have the money for media or be able to travel long distances. You need to go full time at least a year out and that filters out a lot of potential candidates" He also noted that in order to win, a candidate has to be established in the political community or have \$100,000 to \$200,000 to spend. If I were to do it again," said Sandven, "I would do a lot of studying on how to maximize free media. Otherwise I'd have to sell a house to run."

Sandven raised \$6,000 dollars in the primary. Representative John Thune defeated Curt Hohn in the general election. Rep. Thune raised more than a million dollars by October 18. Hohn raised \$106,000 by October 18..

f) The Southwest

ARIZONA:

Tom Chabin, Coconino County Supervisor Potential Democratic Candidate in 6th District

Tom Chabin has served two terms as Coconino County Supervisor and says he has been politically involved since age 10 when he began campaigning for candidates. Since moving to Arizona in the early 1970 s, Chabin s big issues have been restoration of forests and increasing the Native American entitlement funds. Yet, after much consideration, monetary and family reasons discouraged Chabin from running for Congress this year.

Although he says that in many respects it was something I really would have liked doing, Chabin could hardly imagine what his life would be like or raising the kind of money to defeat a formidable fellow like incumbent Rep. J.D. Hayworth — and what would have been mining money, he said of Hayworth s funding. While meeting with the Democratic Party in Washington D.C., Chabin was told that were he to run, he would have to spend 20 hours a week fundraising. The whole bottom line was money, he recalls and added, The time of William Proxmire and low budget campaigns are long gone.

Representative J.D. Hayworth raised \$1.2 million by October 18 to defeat Democrat Lawrence Nelson s \$31,000 campaign.

NEW MEXICO:

Robert Perls, Small Business Owner Dropped Out of 1st District Democratic Primary

Robert Perls is a small business owner and an active volunteer in New Mexico. He has devoted a large amount of time to his community, coaching youth soccer and serving as PTA president. Perls also served in the New Mexico state House from 1992 through 1996. This year, he decided to take the next logical step and run for a seat in the U.S. House of Representatives.

After failing to convince his opponents to abide by voluntary spending caps, Robert Perls dropped out of the first district race because of financial difficulties. It was the most frustrating aspect of my political career to learn that the main factor of viability was money, he said. Perls also noted the influence of special interest money on the outcome of the election: My politics appeal to a large constituency, but I'm not 100% with the unions or the trial lawyers. In the

primary, the moneyed interest groups support the candidate that is 100% aligned with their interests, and I'm not that kind of person.

Perls raised \$440,000 before dropping out. Rep. Heather Wilson won the election and had raised \$1.9 million dollars by October 18. Her opponent, Democrat and U.S. Attorney John Kelly, had raised \$1.1 million by the same date.

OKLAHOMA:

Huey P. Long, Mustang City Manager Dropped Out of 6th District Democratic Primary

Huey Long is the city manager of Mustang, Oklahoma and has been in government for 30 years. After raising \$11,000 for a congressional bid, Long dropped out of the 6th district primary on December 31, 1999 because of insufficient funds. " We have totally lost sight of citizen democracy in this country. I was spending 100 percent of the time prostituting myself out to raise money. I loved being part of the process, but it was disgusting. My goal was \$1000 a day, but that wasn't enough, he said.

In the past 30 years that he has been involved with local government, Long has also observed some fundamental changes in our political system. According to him, "This new game has nothing to do with performance and everything to do with money. The days of town-to-town stump speaking are long gone. Either you have the personal wealth or you borrow against your assets. You have to have money."

After raising \$531,000 October 18, Congressman Frank Lucas defeated the Democratic nominee, Rep. Randy Beutler, who had raised \$551,000 by the same date.

TEXAS:

Marc Warren, Veterinarian Lost 24th District Republican Primary

Marc Warren is a retired veterinarian and former member of the Air Force. He has also worked at Stanford University and spent a year in Washington, D.C. as a congressional fellow. This year, Warren ran in a four-way contest for the Republican nomination in the 24th district. At the beginning of the race, Warren says that all four candidates were unknown. Yet, by the primary, the influence of money was apparent. On March 14, the Republican nomination went to the biggest spender, James Bryndan Wright, a former aide to House Majority Leader Dick Armey.

Warren admits that money impacted the election. I thought that maybe someone with age, experience, and background would have a better ability to stand up to the incumbent, he said. I was very naive. I thought it would be a level playing field, but Bryndan had the edge, he continued. Warren ran a grassroots campaign and reached out to different groups in the area, but had little money for advertisements or mailings. They lambasted me pretty well, he recalls. Warren feels strongly that something must be done. Although, he is unsure of how to level the playing field other than giving each candidate a certain amount of money to spend. It's obscene, Warren says of our campaign finance system. Once a champion is picked, for whatever reason, it's over. Look at George W. Bush. You can buy a race, he exclaimed.

Marc Warren raised \$36,000 by the primary. Representative Martin Frost successful held on to his seat in the 24th district, raising almost \$2 million by October 18 to defeat Bryndan Wright. Wright had raised \$213,000 at the time.

Gary Harrison, Nurse Anesthetist
Lost the 5th District Democratic Primary

Gary Harrison is a criminal defense attorney, nurse anesthetist, and the owner of a nurse placement agency. He also does *pro bono* work in his district and has worked in the healthcare field for 20 years. During his campaign for Congress, Harrison drove his truck around the district visiting local communities. However, on election day, his grassroots campaign lost to the big money. Harrison was competing against Regina Montoya Coggins, a lawyer and owner of a media relations firm, for the nomination. By the March primary, Coggins had raised more than \$600,000, ten times more than Harrison. I do believe money influenced the race, Harrison said. She beat us in three mail-outs one week before voting, he said, adding that Coggins had a good network and ability to raise money.

Harrison says we need some kind of reform in the way that campaigns are financed. The system is unfair to people on a limited income. As much as you think this is a democracy, there is no question that if you can't pay, you can't play he said. I don't want to see a Congress made up of millionaire attorneys, or in ten years, maybe dot-com millionaires. Everyone has to have a belief that they can be a congressman, not necessarily that they are going to be, but a belief that they can, he added.

When only a small group of the population runs, Harrison worries that the winner may not be representative of the district. For example, he says, if you are a senior on a limited income, you don't have a lot of money to contribute to those candidates who are going to fight for you. They'll give five dollars, but they can't compete with the doctors or trial lawyers who can afford to give \$1000 to elect the people who will vote in their direction, he says. Using a health care analogy to illustrate the systemic problem with our campaign finance system, Harrison says, Sometimes we die not because of an acute illness, but from a long chronic disease. Those are sometimes the toughest to detect and to treat.

Harrison raised \$77,000 by the March primary. Representative Pete Sessions defeated Democratic nominee Regina Montoya Coggins in the general election. By October 18, both candidates had raised more than \$1.5 million. Sessions had raised \$1.7 million and Coggins had \$1.5 million.

g) Mountain

COLORADO:

Larry Johnson, Teacher
Lost in 2nd District Republican Primary

On August 8, Larry Johnson narrowly lost the Republican nomination in Colorado's 2nd district to consulting executive Carolyn Cox. The reason, Johnson thinks, is because of money. Larry Johnson has lived in Colorado for fourteen years and is a social studies teacher in a local secondary school (grades 6-12). He's also an attorney and practices law on the side.

To win, Johnson says, "you need one of two things: a dynastic name like Udall or Bush, or a million dollars." Johnson says that his experience has taught him that money becomes particularly crucial at the end of the campaign, when candidates must respond to negative attack ads. If you can't respond you'll lose the race," he stated. Johnson's campaign suffered because they couldn't respond to three mailings his opponent sent out just days before the election. Johnson suggests free network television time for candidates as one possible way to remedy the situation. He said, "Networks should be required to give candidates at least five minutes at the beginning and end of the campaign."

Larry Johnson raised less than \$5,000 for his primary bid, losing to Carolyn Cox, a retired business executive and GOP activist. Incumbent Mark Udall won the November 7 election, raising nearly \$1.2 million dollars by October 18. Cox's receipts came to half a million by October 15.

IDAHO:

Craig Benjamin, Chemical Engineer Lost in 1st District Republican Primary

Craig Benjamin grew up in neighboring Washington State and has a truly unique background. Familiar with country life, Benjamin has also worked in the public sector and has entrepreneurial and non-profit experience. With a degree in chemical engineering, Benjamin went into the oil refining business for several years before going to preaching school in Texas. This year, Benjamin made a run for Congress in the 1st district.

In a very crowded primary election, the Republican nomination went to Lt. Governor and agribusiness executive Clement Otter, who had raised more than \$600,000. Craig Benjamin was holding a full time job while campaigning and relied on the help of friends. Although he believes that it can be done with little money, he admits that not having any money for ads was difficult to overcome. According to Benjamin, people take you seriously in politics if you have money. The media has a self-fulfilling prophecy. If they think you are not viable, you're not. And money makes you viable, he said.

Benjamin feels strongly that running for office shouldn't be about money or sound bites, it should be about the principles on which we stand. In office you'll need to face many issues that aren't hot buttons, so people need to know what your principles are. He also made a point of telling people where he stood on the issues before asking for money, rather than just sending out stuff to get money back. Next time, Benjamin admits, he'll have to be a little more aggressive.

Craig Benjamin raised just under \$10,000 in the primary. On Election Day, Lt. Gov. Clement Otter sailed into victory. He had loaned his campaign \$200,000, bringing his total to \$928,000 by October 18. The Democratic nominee, Linda Pall, had raised \$62,000 in the same period.

MONTANA:

John Driscoll, Army National Guard Colonel Lost Senate Democratic Primary

John Driscoll is a former public service commissioner and a past speaker of the Montana state House. Now a colonel with the Montana Army National Guard, Driscoll entered the senate primary in December 1999 after completing his active tour of duty in Washington, D.C. Driscoll

was surprised to find that many large organizations that would have supported me based on my past record, had already endorsed my opponent prior to the filing deadline. Driscoll believes his opponent's early endorsements and their contributions hurt his campaign and may have cost him the election.

Campaign contributions to elected office are screening out what would otherwise be a straight forward decision, Driscoll said of modern elections. The sizzle [of money] is selling people, he continued. According to Driscoll, his opponent, Brian Schweitzer, also received financial help from the Democratic National Campaign Committee before the filing deadline, which made it even harder for Driscoll's low budget campaign to compete. \$1000 is more than any of my friends had, Driscoll said, contrasting his campaign to that of Schweitzer's.

Driscoll raised \$14,000 in the primary. On November 7, Brian Schweitzer lost the election, despite raising \$1.7 million by October 18, to the incumbent Senator Conrad Burns. Burns raised more than \$3.5 million in the same period.

UTAH:

Senator Scott Howell, State Senate Minority Leader Democratic Nominee for Senate

State Senator Scott Howell grew up in Utah and attended Dixie College on a football scholarship. After finishing his schooling at the University of Utah, he worked for IBM for 20 years as the policy director for North America. Howell decided to run for Congress because of his concern for educational issues. He contrasts his campaign, which he claims raised 99% of its funds from small donors within the state, to that of his opponent, Senator Orin Hatch. Hatch raised the majority of his money from out-of-state and won reelection after spending more than \$2 million dollars.

Money [had] a tremendous effect on the campaign, said Howell. He believes that if his campaign had had more money to get their message out, we'd win hands down. Howell continued, We [had] to compensate by doing it the old fashioned way — grassroots and door-to-door. A supporter of campaign finance reform, Howell says, It's not a level playing field. Incumbents and mega-corporations have taken elections out of the hands of citizens, This, he believes, is why the average citizen feels disenfranchised with the process. The founding fathers envisioned people of all means and nature to be able to run, he continued. Howell suggests limiting campaign spending and also thinks that the media needs to take a bigger responsibility for educating voters about the candidates.

By October 18, Senator Hatch had almost \$2.8 million, while Howell raised \$163,000.

WYOMING:

Dino Wenino, Massage Therapist Lost the At-Large Republican Primary

Dino Wenino is a massage therapist who decided to run for his state's only seat in the House of Representatives. Knowing his chances of winning were slim, he entered the Republican primary because he had specific issues that stirred his passion and because he felt that it would not be healthy for the democracy if the incumbent, Barbara Cubin, went unchallenged.

Money has a huge impact on politics, said Wenino. Ordinary folks don't run because they don't have the money, time, or the resources, he continued. Wenino suggests lowering the \$1000 contribution limit so people like myself can give to politicians. I can do \$100, but I can't do \$500 or \$1000. At least [if the limits were lowered] I would feel I have as much of an influence as the moneyed people do, he said. Wenino also mentioned how difficult it was to compete with Rep. Cubin's name and money. Money is influence. Most contributions come from the moneyed interests — in Wyoming it's the timber, mining, and oil companies. People involved in those industries are the ones giving \$1000, he commented.

Dino Wenino raised less than \$5,000 in the primary. Representative Barbara Cubin easily won reelection this year. By October 18, she had raised \$570,000 to defeat Democrat Michael Allen Green. Green had raised less than \$5,000 at the time.

h) The West

CALIFORNIA:

William Griffith, Teacher Lost in the 48th District Republican Primary

William Griffith, a 44-year-old high school math teacher, refers to himself as a regular guy who decided to run for Congress. In his free time he runs a mathematics television program and announces for the San Diego Padres baseball team. The 48th district was an open seat race with 10 Republican's competing in the primary. On March 7, the top vote getter was Darrell Issa, the wealthy car alarm magnate who had given half a million dollars in personal funds to his campaign. Griffith found the experience to be eye-opening.

"Money dominated the election," said Griffith. Everywhere I went I got a tremendous response, but I couldn't get my name out. Darrell Issa sold his firm to campaign, but I was just a teacher running a campaign after school and on the weekends," he continued. Griffith says that his experience has made him realize the power of money in politics. "I was naive to think that I could win on message Money talks. People associate success with big bucks," he said.

Griffith raised less than \$5,000 in the March primary. Darrell Issa went on to win the general election with a personal loan of more than \$3 million, bringing his total receipts to \$3.5 million by October 18. His Democratic opponent, Peter Kouvelis, reported a fundraising total of \$21,000 on June 30.

HAWAII:

David Bourgoïn, Attorney Lost 1st District Democratic Primary

David Bourgoïn is an attorney and a real estate broker who runs a television production company on the side. He is also the director of Hawaii Organic Farming and one of the founders of HOPE (Home Organic Produce Cooperative), which he recently promoted at the United Nations. In his bid for Hawaii's 1st congressional seat, Bourgoïn was defeated by Congressman Neil Abercrombie.

Bourgoïn ran a low budget, grassroots campaign and concluded that, Money is the key to winning an election today. You can't just go to neighborhood boards. Bourgoïn stress the

importance of being able to buy television and newspaper ads. Anyone that has a good platform and that is good before the cameras can win if they have the money to buy television and be in front of the public all the time. According to Bourgoin, it is difficult to raise funds without ties to special interests. Unless you have a lot of labor union support or a segment of the economy that has money behind you, it's an uphill battle. Money, he notes, also deters many candidates. Most people don't run because they know it's expensive. Money is the biggest reason. Bourgoin believes that the media should cover campaigns more thoroughly so that unknown candidates would get free media access and diminish the importance of money in politics.

Representative Neil Abercrombie raised \$700,000 by October 18 and was reelected by a large margin. The Republican nominee, Dr. Philip Meyers, had raised \$14,000 by the same date.

NEVADA:

Frankie Sue Del Papa, Attorney General Dropped Out of Democratic Senate Primary

Nevada Attorney General Frankie Sue Del Papa says that she has "good luck" when it comes to winning elections without raising tremendous amounts of money. She has won four statewide races, and was outspent by a 2-to-1 margin in her last race for attorney general. In addition to being the first female to hold her current office, Del Papa has spent over three decades in public service, as a member of the Nevada University System Board of Regents, as Nevada Secretary of State, and as chairperson of the Nevada Domestic Violence Prevention Council. However, after raising \$300,000 by September 1999, Del Papa ended her bid for senate citing a disdain for fundraising. I've observed many races and all anyone is doing for breakfast, lunch, and cocktails is raising money. I fundamentally don't want to live like this, she said.

Del Papa also realized that she was not going to be able to raise enough money to adequately compete in the Senate race. She expressed her disgust with the emphasis of money over ideas in politics. Elections should be conversations about issues not auctions to the highest bidder. It's too bad. We want different voices at the table, yet when elections are foreclosed to some because the moneyed interests aren't going to support them, what does that say? said Del Papa. She believes that in order to achieve fairness in the political system, spending caps must be implemented.

By October 18, former Congressman John Eric Ensign raised almost \$4.5 million to win Nevada's open Senate seat on November 7. He defeated Democrat Ed Bernstein, a local television host and attorney, who had raised \$2.3 million in the same period.

OREGON:

Randy Frankie, Marion County Commissioner Potential Republican Candidate in 5th District

Randy Frankie has been the commissioner of Marion County for 21 years. A native Oregonian, he grew up on a family farm and is often considered a potential candidate for Congress. Frankie doesn't think he'll ever run for federal office. I'm not soured on government spending or public service...but, in an open seat race, you'd see a lot more people come in who would have more money than me, he says. Family reasons and time spent on an airplane also factor into his decision not to go to Washington.

Frankie doesn't hide his distaste for political fundraising. He admits that he has to prepare himself for several weeks before raising money. I find fundraising difficult and not fun, he says. I've raised millions for non-profits and I don't mind that, but to raise money for yourself and your campaign is very different. The commissioner also commented on how the campaign finance system favors those with money. Anymore, he said, you have to be a millionaire yourself — the money gives you immediate credibility — or you have to have been in the process for an incredibly long time with incredibly good connections. It's more and more of a closed process, he said.

Representative Darlene Hooley raised more than \$800,000 by October 18, winning reelection in the 5th district. Her Republican opponent, businessman and rancher Brian Boquist, had raised almost \$150,000 by the same date.

Alice Schlenker, Businesswoman **Lost in 1st District Republican Primary**

Alice Schlenker is the owner of Alice Communications, a media and marketing company. After serving on the city council for two years, Schlenker became mayor of Lake Oswego, a position she held for eight years. She has also played an active role in the League of Oregon Cities and currently serves on the Ethics Commission for the state of Oregon. This year, Schlenker ran for Congress in the 1st district.

Ninety-four thousand dollars later, Alice Schlenker lost the primary to state Senator and businessman Charles Starr. According to Schlenker, Money was a very, very significant factor in race. People thought I would win, and underestimated how much impact money would have, she said. You can't do it without money in this day and age, she continued. Schlenker finds many problems with the current system. The costs have escalated to such a degree that when you're told you have to raise a million dollars, your eyes glaze over. You know you have to do it, but you really don't know how. It's all expectations and everyone is bought into the idea that you need to raise millions of dollars, she commented.

The 1st district contest was won by incumbent Representative David Wu who raised nearly \$1.5 million by October 18 and spent more than a million dollars on the race. The Republican nominee, Charles Starr, raised \$263,000 by the same date.

WASHINGTON:

Wayne Brokaw, Construction Company Executive **Dropped Out of 5th District Democratic Primary**

Wayne Brokaw has spent hundreds of hours a year trying to make a difference. A Vietnam veteran, Brokaw makes a living as a manager for a construction company. Seeing the need for change in our government, Brokaw filed his papers and entered the 5th district congressional race. With his background in labor relations and support from the business community, Brokaw's campaign received more than 300 endorsements from different groups in the area. Brokaw admits he is still blown away by all the support he had. People came to me and said we need someone who understands what the needs and values of the people are. The people in the community said run. We had an army of people and we did it without fanfare because we believed in what we were doing, he reflected.

Despite the swell of citizen support when Brokaw entered the race, he was forced to reevaluate his campaign when a well-funded challenger emerged. On June 1, 2000, he dropped out of the primary. We could have hung in there, he reflected, but we had to be smart and if he's getting money from outside the district, it's not appropriate for us to try and compete. It's a sad day. I'm disturbed that this is what we've come to. Brokaw admits that money is extremely influential in determining election outcomes. You can't fight the money, he says and suggests giving candidates a lump sum for them to spend however they want. Then people like me have a chance, he said.

Before dropping out, Brokaw raised \$15,000. Representative George Nethercutt won reelection in the 5th district, raising nearly \$1.5 million by October 18 to defeat the Democratic challenger, Tom Keefe. Keefe raised \$459,000 by the same date..

VIII. Methodology

The percentage of candidates who raised the most money and won the general election was determined from summary campaign finance data through October 18, 2000 downloaded from the Federal Elections Commission (FEC). The most recent filings available were used for candidates who had not filed pre-general financial reports by November 3. The following races were undecided as of midday November 7 and were not included in the analysis: District 22 in Florida between Shows and Bloom, District 12 in New Jersey between Holt and Zimmer, and the Washington's senate race between Gorton and Cantwell. The 62 races with candidates without a major party opponent were considered in the analysis and were counted as races won by the biggest spender. The average amount raised per unchallenged candidate was greater than \$555,000, according to FEC reports.

The percentage of candidates who raised the most money and won the primary election was determined by analysis of post-primary total receipts, as recorded on FECInfo (www.FECInfo.com). Races that were unopposed were considered in the analysis and included in the count of races won by the biggest fundraiser.

The amount of money raised by winning and losing candidates is based on October 18, 2000 summary campaign finance data downloaded from the FEC. The most recent filings were used for candidates who had not filed pre-general financial reports by November 3. Candidates who did not raise or spend more than \$5,000 were not required to file with the FEC. For all analyses, these candidates were assumed to have raised the maximum amount of \$4,999. The ratio of money raised by winning vs. losing candidates was found by dividing the total funds raised by the winning candidate by the total from losing candidate. Averages were found by dividing the total money raised by the number of races.

The number of races where the winner out-raised their opponent by a ratio greater than 5-to-1 was determined by subtracting the total money raised by the losing candidate from the total money raised by the winning candidate in each race. As mentioned above, candidates who did not file with the FEC were assumed to have raised \$4,999.

All itemized contributions given by individuals were downloaded from the FEC on November 3, 2000. Due to slow keypunching of data, all contributions through November 2000 may not be included. The number of Americans who gave \$200 or more to a candidate, PAC or party was found by totaling the number of individual contributions on file with the FEC as of November 3.

The actual number of people giving may be much smaller, as multiple contributions from the same person were not considered.

The number of Americans who gave a hard money contribution of \$1000 or more was determined from individual contributions downloaded from the FEC on November 3. Contributions of \$1000 or more were counted and summed to find the number of Americans giving these contributions and the total amount received from these donors. This sum was then divided by the total money received from all individuals giving \$200 or more. Again, the actual number of people giving contributions of \$1000 or more may be much smaller, as multiple contributions from the same person were not considered.

U.S. population estimates are from the U.S. Census Bureau.

U.S. PIRG s Democracy Advocate Julia Hutchins conducted phone interviews with all potential or former candidates quoted in the paper. Potential congressional candidates were identified by Politics1.com or National Journal s CongressDaily.

- Potential candidates were asked the following questions: Why did you decide not to run for office? Did the fundraising demands influence your decision? What are some of your thoughts about having to raise so much money? What are some of your thoughts about our current campaign finance system?
- Candidates who dropped out of race were asked: What were some the reasons why you dropped out of the race? What influence did money or fundraising have on your decision to drop out? Does money have an influence on election outcomes? What are some of your thoughts about our current campaign finance system?
- Candidates who lost an election were asked: How did money shape the election or affect your bid? Does money have an influence on election outcomes? What would you do differently if you were to run again? What are some of your thoughts about our current campaign finance system?

¹ Races that were unopposed in the general or primary election were included in the number of races won by the biggest spender or fundraiser.

² *Pushing the Limit: The Impacts of Raising Federal Limits on Contributions to Campaigns*, U.S. PIRG Education Fund, July 1999.

³ *Who s Paying for This Election: A Mid-October Snapshot of Campaign Funding in the 2000 Elections*, Center for Responsive Politics, October 2000.

⁴ Ferraro, Thomas. *Presidential Contenders Cut By Donors, Not Voters*. Reuters, Washington, D.C., October 21, 1999.

⁵ Marcus, Ruth. *Dollars Dictate Field s Early Exits*. Washington Post, October 21, 1999.

⁶ Toner, Robin. *Willing Contenders at a Premium in Fierce Fight to Rule Congress*. New York Times, Jan. 3, 2000.

⁷ Maisel, L. Sandy and Stone, Walter J. *Candidate Emergence Study Report to Respondents*. University of Colorado, January 1998.

⁸ Source of quotes and background information is from a New York Times article, *Willing Contenders at a Premium In Fierce Fight to Rule Congress*, written by Robin Toner on January 3, 2000.