



## **LIFE BEFORE BCRA**

SOFT MONEY AT THE STATE LEVEL  
IN THE 2000 & 2002 ELECTION CYCLES

By

DENISE BARBER

THE INSTITUTE ON MONEY IN STATE POLITICS

DEC. 17, 2003

TABLE OF CONTENTS

State Parties: Looking for New Dance Partners ..... 3

Summary of Findings ..... 5

State-by-State Rankings ..... 7

Who Gives to State Party Committees? ..... 9

National Committees: State Party Sugar Daddies ..... 10

    Patterns in Giving ..... 11

    Transfers and Trading ..... 11

    Reporting Discrepancies ..... 13

Top Individual Contributors ..... 14

Interstate Trading of Soft Money ..... 19

Top Industries ..... 21

Tables ..... 21

    Table 1: Soft-Money Contributions, 2000 and 2002 ..... 7

    Table 2: Types of Contributors to State Party Committees ..... 9

    Table 3: Soft Money from the National Committees ..... 10

    Table 4: Top 25 Individual Contributors of Soft Money ..... 16

    Table 5: Top 30 Industries Contributing to State Parties ..... 21

Appendices ..... 23

    Appendix A: Soft-Money Contributions by Committee ..... 23

    Appendix B: Soft-Money from the National Committees ..... 26

## STATE PARTIES: LOOKING FOR NEW DANCE PARTNERS

With its ruling this month on the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act, the U.S. Supreme Court heralded in a new era in the way many political campaigns will be financed in this country. But in its ruling, the high court acknowledged that BCRA is by no means the end-all of campaign-finance fixes, noting: "We are under no illusion that BCRA will be the last congressional statement on the matter. Money, like water, will always find an outlet."<sup>1</sup>

Given their role in the past, state party committees will no doubt be major players in helping political money flow where it is most needed. In just-completed research, the Institute on Money in State Politics has found that state political parties raised more than \$1 billion in soft money during the past two election cycles.

The Institute's study, supported by a grant from The Pew Charitable Trusts, examined the campaign contribution reports filed by the two main political party committees in each of the 50 states, for the 2000 and 2002 election cycles.

The study found that almost half of the \$1 billion raised — \$472 million — came to the states from the national party committees, which under BCRA can no longer raise the soft money they shared with the states.

With the prohibitions on national soft money now firmly in place, state committees will be looking for new ways to replace the funds that made up such a large portion of their budgets.

In pre-BCRA days, national committees used the state committees to move soft money into issue ads or other activities that indirectly supported federal candidates. Or they traded their soft dollars with state committees in return for hard-money dollars they could spend directly on federal candidates and election activities. That hard money was more difficult to raise because of the limits on contributions. Soft money, on the other hand, could be raised in any amount for virtually any purpose.

Before Congress passed BCRA, many big contributors gave hundreds of thousands of dollars at both the state and federal levels. Now, these contributors can no longer give unlimited amounts of soft money to the national committees.

But they may now be courted directly by the state parties, which will need to offset the loss of the soft money they once raised from national committees. The state groups may also turn to tax-exempt "527 committees," named for the section of the Internal Revenue Service code under which they are formed. These committees can raise unlimited amounts of money from almost any source to spend on any election-related activity except direct contributions to federal candidates. In anticipation of the high court upholding the ban on soft money to the national parties, these 527 committees have raised more than \$32 million in 2003.<sup>2</sup> State party committees may also turn to independent expenditure committees, which are formed by individuals, companies or PACs to promote an issue or candidate independent of the candidate's campaign effort. As Republican Sen.

---

<sup>1</sup> Opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States on Case No. 02-1674, p. 118, Dec. 10, 2003.

<sup>2</sup> "527 Database Updates," Center for Public Integrity Web site, <http://www.publicintegrity.org/527/updates.aspx>, Dec. 15, 2003.

Mitch McConnell of Kentucky, a chief critic of BCRA, recently put it: "Soft money is not gone, it has just changed its address."<sup>3</sup>

Political party committees are not the only ones adroit in shifting gears in the face of new regulations. In an effort to sidestep the new BCRA prohibitions on contributions and advertising, the National Rifle Association said in early December it may try to buy a radio or TV station and seek to be declared a media outlet. In that way, it would be exempt from the spending limits in the new campaign finance law.<sup>4</sup>

While the BCRA ban on soft money closes one fund-raising door at the federal level, 50 other doors remain wide open in the states. Those doors lead to a financial arena governed by 50 different sets of laws and regulations, many of which are as loose as the federal campaign-finance law was before BCRA. Consequently, tracking the flow of political money across the country could become more difficult.

While the full effects of BCRA remain to be seen, little question exists that state party committees will have to change their *modus operandi* for fundraising. The information in this study of past contributions to the party committees provides a baseline against which to measure post-BCRA changes at the state level.

---

<sup>3</sup> "Court Ruling Affirms New Landscape of Campaign Finance," *The New York Times*, Dec. 11, 2003.

<sup>4</sup> Sharon Theimer, "NRA Wants Its Own TV Network," *Associated Press*, Dec. 7, 2003.

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The Institute on Money in State Politics examined the more than \$1 billion in soft money raised by state party committees in a four-year period and found that almost half of the funds came from the six main national party organizations.<sup>5</sup>

These national committees gave more than \$472 million, or 44 percent of the total raised by state party committees over the two election cycles studied. The three Democratic national party committees gave slightly more than the Republican groups during each of the two cycles. They gave \$142.5 million during the 2000 cycle, while the three Republican national committees gave \$112.5 million. During the 2002 cycle, the Democratic committees gave \$118.2 million, while the Republican groups gave \$98.9 million.

The study found that state party committees in Florida led the pack in soft-money contributions during both election cycles, raising \$153 million over the four-year study period. California committees raised the second-largest amount in both cycles, but trailed Florida's four-year total by a large margin, at \$79.4 million. New York committees were third overall, with a combined total of \$50.3 million over the two cycles.

Like their national counterparts, state party committees also collected millions of dollars from businesses, special interest groups, wealthy individuals and labor unions. After national party committees, state parties relied most heavily on contributions from businesses and special interest PACs.

Those donors gave more than \$200 million over the two-cycle study period, or 18 percent of the total soft money raised. Contributors in this category represented a broad range of economic interests, such as real estate, banking, insurance and utilities. The five top-contributing industries were the same during both election cycles:

- lawyers and law firms, which gave \$44 million over the two cycles;
- real estate interests, \$26.7 million;
- public sector unions, \$21.5 million;
- general trade unions, \$19.4 million; and
- securities and investment interests, \$16.6 million.

With political parties, businesses and special-interest PACs giving a large percentage of the money, individuals had little presence in financing state parties' soft-money accounts. Although individual contributors gave more than \$160 million over the four years, their contributions accounted for just 14 percent of the total raised in 2000 and 16 percent in 2002.

Some individuals did make a mark at the state level, however. The top 25 individual contributors during each of the two election cycles gave \$24.7 million, or 15 percent of the soft money contributed by all individuals over the two cycles.

---

<sup>5</sup> The Democratic and Republican parties each have three national committees: the Democratic National Committee (DNC), Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee (DSCC), Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee (DCCC), Republican National Committee (RNC), National Republican Senatorial Committee (NRSC), and the National Republican Congressional Committee (NRCC).

These top contributors also gave generously to the national party committees. Twenty-three of the top 25 state contributors in 2000 gave a combined \$8.5 million to the national party committees. In 2002, 20 of the top 25 individual contributors gave \$24.9 million to the national committees.

Three individuals gave more than \$1 million each to state party committees during the 2000 cycle. Steven Kirsch, a high-tech entrepreneur in California, gave \$2.15 million to Democratic committees in 10 states. S. Daniel Abraham of Slim Fast Foods in Florida gave \$1.3 million to 19 Democratic state party committees. Bernard Daines of World Wide Packets, a hardware developer for Internet connections in Washington state, gave nearly \$1.2 million to Republican state party committees in five states.

The largest individual donor in 2002 was James Pederson, chairman of the Arizona Democratic Party, who gave \$3.7 million to the Arizona Democratic Party. In distant second was Bob J. Perry of Perry Homes in Texas, who gave \$810,000 to Republican state committees in four states. Third was New Yorker Robert Sillerman of SFX Entertainment, who gave \$702,500, with all but \$5,000 going to the New York State Democratic Party.

Five individuals made the list of top 25 givers in each of the two cycles: Fred Eychaner of Illinois, Stanley Fulton of Nevada, Steven Kirsch of California, John O'Quinn of Texas, and Jay Van Andel of Michigan.

The study also found that state party committees didn't limit their spending to candidates and activities in their own states. They often sent money to their counterparts in other states. Over the two election cycles studied, state party committees gave more than \$6 million to other state committees — \$2.8 million in 2000 and \$3.6 million in 2002.

State parties commonly traded their hard dollars for soft dollars with other state party committees throughout the country, as well as with their national committees. However, with BCRA now confirmed in the main by the U.S. Supreme Court, they can no longer trade with the national party committees. Thus, trades and transfers between state party committees — which can still raise soft money — are likely to increase significantly in future election cycles.

## STATE-BY-STATE RANKINGS

During the two-cycle study period, state party committees across the country raised more than \$1 billion in contributions of soft money — nearly \$492 million in 2000 and \$578.5 million in 2002 <sup>6</sup>

Several factors typically affect the flow of money to state-level party committees, primarily the number of competitive state and federal races in a given election cycle and the varying state regulations governing the type and amount of soft money the committees could accept, as well as any loopholes in those restrictions.

Party committees in Florida, with no limits on contributions, led the pack during both election cycles. During the 2000 cycle, Florida was a hotbed of political activity. Not only was it a battleground presidential state (ultimately more so than anyone predicted), but it also featured an open U.S. Senate race that remained a toss-up throughout the campaign season and several hotly contested U.S. House races. In 2002, relatively little activity occurred with federal level races. But the race for state attorney general and the gubernatorial re-election contest of President Bush's brother, Jeb, saw much action.

California committees raised the second-highest amount in contributions during both cycles, as well, while New York was third overall, with a 2000 rank of fifth and a 2002 rank of seventh.

Soft-money contributions increased \$86 million between 2000 and 2002, as committees in 28 states raised more in 2002 than they did in 2000. The most dramatic increase occurred in South Dakota, where the state committees raised \$12.5 million more during the 2002 cycle — due almost entirely to the influx of funds from the national party committees for the tight U.S. Senate race between incumbent Democratic Sen. Tim Johnson and Republican Congressman John Thune.

Conversely, 22 states raised less during the 2002 cycle than they had in the 2000 cycle. For example, in Washington state, party committees raised more than \$25 million in 2000, but only \$5.8 million in 2002. State party committees in Michigan also raised substantially less in 2002 — \$15 million, or half of the \$30 million raised in 2000. During the 2000 cycle, both Washington and Michigan were battleground presidential states with several other key federal races at stake.

Table 1 below shows the soft money contributions raised by the two state parties in each state, arranged by the total they raised over the two election cycles. For details on how much each state committee raised during the two cycles, see Appendix A.

TABLE 1

### SOFT-MONEY CONTRIBUTIONS, 2000 AND 2002

STATE	2-CYCLE TOTAL	2000 TOTAL	2002 TOTAL	2000 RANK	2002 RANK	2-CYCLE RANK
FL	\$153,055,895	\$71,208,909	\$81,846,987	1	1	1
CA	\$79,383,291	\$40,686,235	\$38,697,057	2	2	2
NY	\$50,344,361	\$24,989,616	\$25,354,745	5	7	3
MO	\$46,431,176	\$23,409,843	\$23,021,333	6	8	4
MI*	\$45,625,403	\$30,140,208	\$15,485,195	3	13	5

<sup>6</sup> Non-contribution income was not included in these totals. Such income includes, for example, interest and dividend income and deposit refunds.

STATE	2-CYCLE TOTAL	2000 TOTAL	2002 TOTAL	2000 RANK	2002 RANK	2-CYCLE RANK
NJ	\$45,514,777	\$13,183,728	\$32,331,048	13	3	6
GA	\$44,609,409	\$14,671,497	\$29,937,911	10	5	7
TX	\$41,220,359	\$10,768,198	\$30,452,160	14	4	8
MN	\$39,904,932	\$14,340,860	\$25,564,072	12	6	9
PA	\$37,511,624	\$20,926,531	\$16,585,093	8	12	10
OH*	\$36,825,404	\$22,031,470	\$14,793,934	7	15	11
VA	\$35,559,117	\$14,445,394	\$21,113,722	11	9	12
WA	\$30,930,016	\$25,112,513	\$5,817,503	4	30	13
IA	\$29,147,789	\$9,974,874	\$19,172,915	18	10	14
IL	\$29,088,602	\$19,230,340	\$9,858,262	9	20	15
NC	\$24,871,941	\$10,012,162	\$14,859,780	17	14	16
AR	\$23,100,289	\$4,668,980	\$18,431,309	27	11	17
CO	\$18,082,439	\$4,052,714	\$14,029,725	29	16	18
WI	\$17,299,589	\$10,168,375	\$7,131,214	15	23	19
NH	\$17,254,297	\$3,504,717	\$13,749,580	31	18	20
IN	\$17,019,236	\$8,953,076	\$8,066,160	21	22	21
NV	\$16,273,603	\$9,854,768	\$6,418,834	19	25	22
AL	\$15,883,124	\$7,477,164	\$8,405,960	23	21	23
SD	\$15,446,947	\$1,506,455	\$13,940,492	37	17	24
KY	\$15,410,379	\$10,090,407	\$5,319,972	16	31	25
AZ	\$14,083,636	\$2,237,370	\$11,846,267	34	19	26
OR	\$13,787,930	\$9,174,952	\$4,612,977	20	33	27
LA	\$13,108,395	\$7,191,774	\$5,916,621	24	29	28
MT	\$12,605,600	\$7,822,780	\$4,782,820	22	32	29
NM	\$11,232,761	\$5,035,869	\$6,196,892	26	26	30
ME	\$8,829,756	\$2,863,523	\$5,966,234	33	28	31
TN	\$8,415,842	\$4,207,207	\$4,208,634	28	34	32
MD	\$8,278,841	\$1,437,314	\$6,841,527	39	24	33
ND	\$7,709,427	\$1,721,869	\$5,987,558	36	27	34
DE	\$7,382,784	\$5,668,590	\$1,714,194	25	39	35
MA	\$5,514,005	\$1,473,250	\$4,040,755	38	35	36
UT	\$5,180,406	\$3,504,247	\$1,676,159	32	40	37
KS	\$4,524,843	\$1,982,001	\$2,542,842	35	37	38
NE	\$4,390,010	\$3,511,422	\$878,588	30	45	39
CT	\$3,871,042	\$1,307,678	\$2,563,363	41	36	40
MS	\$2,834,408	\$1,415,969	\$1,418,438	40	41	41
HI	\$2,540,296	\$484,232	\$2,056,064	48	38	42
OK	\$2,324,107	\$1,090,898	\$1,233,210	42	42	43
WY	\$2,077,457	\$906,727	\$1,170,730	43	43	44
AK*	\$1,617,577	\$732,761	\$884,816	45	44	45
SC*	\$1,444,206	\$799,470	\$644,736	44	46	46
ID	\$1,133,341	\$730,086	\$403,255	46	47	47
VT	\$1,094,746	\$716,119	\$378,627	47	48	48
WV	\$460,759	\$315,800	\$144,959	49	49	49
RI**	\$210,140	\$210,140	\$00	50	50	50
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,070,446,315</b>	<b>\$491,951,084</b>	<b>\$578,495,231</b>			

\*Not all soft money is reported to the state so these figures are lower than the actual amounts.

\*\* Rhode Island 2002 data was not available from the state at the time of publication.



## WHO GIVES TO STATE PARTY COMMITTEES?

State political party committees, like their national counterparts, collect millions of dollars from other party committees, labor unions, businesses, special interest groups and wealthy individuals. This study divided contributions into two types: those from "party sources," which came from party committees, candidate committees and candidates themselves, and those from "non-party sources," such as businesses and other special interests, labor unions, individuals, and contributors who gave small enough amounts that the committees were not required to disclose their identity.

### *The Big Players: Political Parties, Businesses and Special Interests*

The six national party committees were by far the largest source of soft-money contributions to state political parties, accounting for almost half – 44 percent — of the total raised over the two cycles. However, when contributions from the national party committees decreased by \$38 million during the 2002 election cycle, state and federal candidates jumped in to help make up the difference. Candidate committees gave \$54.8 million in 2002, more than double the \$20.3 million they gave in 2000. Candidates also dug much deeper into their own pockets, giving \$4.3 million in 2002, compared with less than \$1 million in 2000. Out-of-state party committees also pitched in to make up the difference, giving more than \$15 million in 2002, compared to \$8.3 million in 2000.

The state party committees also relied heavily on contributions from businesses and special-interest PACs, which gave slightly more than \$200 million over the two cycles, or 18 percent of the total soft money raised by the state parties. Contributors in this category represent a broad range of economic interests, such as real estate, banking, insurance and utilities.

Labor unions had a very small presence in the campaign-finance world of the state parties. They gave \$16.8 million in 2000, or 3 percent of the total raised. Their contributions increased to \$28 million in 2002, but still represented just 5 percent of the total.

Table 2 shows the amounts given by the different types of contributors and the percentages those amounts represent of the more than \$491 million raised in the 2000 election cycle and the \$578 million raised in 2002.

TABLE 2

### TYPES OF CONTRIBUTORS TO STATE PARTY COMMITTEES\*

<b>PARTY SOURCES</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>%</b>
National Party Committees	\$255,112,721	52%	\$217,074,415	37%
In-State Party Committees	\$35,080,124	7%	\$40,872,680	7%
Candidate Committees	\$20,314,676	4%	\$54,771,172	9%
Out-of-State Party Committees	\$8,319,438	2%	\$15,437,685	3%
Candidates' Personal Money	\$882,386	0%	\$4,315,248	1%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$319,709,345</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>\$332,471,200</b>	<b>57%</b>
<b>NON-PARTY SOURCES</b>				
Businesses/PACs	\$78,399,388	16%	\$121,799,575	21%
Individuals	\$69,619,288	14%	\$91,513,805	16%
Labor Organizations	\$16,788,858	3%	\$28,148,567	5%
Unitemized Contributions	\$7,434,204	2%	\$4,562,083	1%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$172,241,738</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>\$246,024,030</b>	<b>43%</b>

\*Contributors arranged by highest percentage in the 2000 presidential election cycle.

## NATIONAL COMMITTEES: STATE PARTY SUGAR DADDIES

The six national party committees were the primary source of soft-money contributions to state party committees over the study period, giving \$472 million of the nearly \$1.1 billion that the two main party committees in each state raised. They gave more in the 2000 presidential election cycle than the 2002 cycle, exceeding \$255 million and accounting for 52 percent of the money the state committees raised in 2000. During the 2002 cycle, national committees gave more than \$217 million, representing 37 percent of the total raised.

The three Democratic national party committees gave slightly more than the Republican groups during each of the two election cycles. In the 2000 cycle, the Democratic committees gave \$142.6 million, compared with the \$112.5 million the three Republican national committees gave. In the 2002 cycle, the Democratic committees gave \$118.2 million to the GOP's \$98.9 million.

During the hard-fought battle for the presidency in 2000, the Democratic National Committee and the Republican National Committee gave \$152.7 million in soft money, or almost one-third (31 percent) of the total raised by the state parties. However, during the 2002 cycle, their contributions decreased dramatically to \$72 million, or just 12 percent of the total raised. Conversely, the four congressional caucus committees substantially increased their giving, from \$102.4 million in 2000 to \$145.2 million in 2002, when control of the U.S Senate and key House seats were up for grabs.

Through November 1999 —the same point in the last presidential election cycle as in the current 2004 presidential cycle — the state committees had already received \$46 million in soft money from the national parties. With the new ban on soft-money contributions to the national committees, state party committees must either tighten their belts several notches or make up for the loss of that money by looking elsewhere for funds. The national party committee funds now may be replaced by other organizations that can still collect unlimited contributions of soft money.

Table 3 below shows the total soft-money contributions from each of the six national party committees during the two cycles. For detailed information on the amounts the two main party committees in each of the states received from the national committees, see Appendix B.

TABLE 3

### SOFT MONEY FROM THE SIX NATIONAL PARTY COMMITTEES\*

<b>NATIONAL PARTY COMMITTEE</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Democratic National Committee/DNC	\$71,612,385	\$25,687,825	\$97,300,210
Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee/DSCC	\$37,766,036	\$54,541,842	\$92,307,878
Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee/DCCC	\$33,190,078	\$37,957,125	\$71,147,203
<b>DEMOCRATIC TOTAL</b>	<b>\$142,568,500</b>	<b>\$118,186,792</b>	<b>\$260,755,291</b>
Republican National Committee/RNC	\$81,067,829	\$46,174,558	\$127,242,387
National Republican Senatorial Committee/NRSC	\$16,093,947	\$37,876,295	\$53,970,242
National Republican Congressional Committee/NRCC	\$15,382,446	\$14,836,770	\$30,219,216
<b>REPUBLICAN TOTAL</b>	<b>\$112,544,221</b>	<b>\$98,887,623</b>	<b>\$211,431,844</b>
<b>OVERALL TOTAL</b>	<b>\$255,112,721</b>	<b>\$217,074,415</b>	<b>\$472,187,135</b>

\* Arranged by total raised in the 2000 presidential election cycle

### *Patterns in Giving by National Party Committees*

The flow of money from national to state committees depended in large part on the level of activity occurring with federal races in a given state. This was most evident with the state parties in Florida, which received \$1 of every \$10 from the national party committees over the two cycles. Florida party committees ranked first in receipts from the national committees in 2000 and second only to Minnesota in 2002. Their combined two-cycle total of \$51.6 million was almost double the total raised by Missouri, the second-ranking recipient of national-party soft money, with \$27.5 million.

Florida was a critical state in both election cycles. During the 2000 election, Florida was a battleground presidential state. Further, the close race for the open U.S. Senate seat between Democratic State Insurance Commissioner Bill Nelson and Republican State Rep. Bill McCollum would help determine which party controlled the U.S. Senate. In addition, Florida was "perhaps the biggest hotbed of tightly contested House races in the country in 2000," according to the Cook Political Report, which conducts independent, nonpartisan analysis of U.S. elections.<sup>7</sup> Although there was no U.S. Senate race in 2002, there were several tight House races. In addition, the President's brother, Jeb Bush, was seeking re-election to the governor's mansion. In fact, the Republican national committees sent \$12.3 million of soft money to Florida — more than double the \$5.1 million that the Democratic national committees sent in the 2002 cycle.

The types of federal election activity in a given state also affected the flow of money from election cycle to election cycle. For example, the state party committees in South Dakota received less than \$1 million from the national groups in 2000. Then during the 2002 cycle, when South Dakota was a critical state on the national scene, the national committees gave \$12 million. An article on the front page of the *Wall Street Journal* noted: "The quintessential 2002 campaign setting is South Dakota, the fourth smallest state, whose House and Senate contests represent nearly 10 percent of all the toss-up races in the country."<sup>8</sup> All eyes were keenly focused on the U.S. Senate race there, with incumbent Democratic Sen. Tim Johnson facing a tough challenge from Republican Congressman John Thune. Johnson narrowly defeated Thune, by just 524 votes.

Michigan provides another example of the contrasts between the two election cycles. National parties gave \$19.6 million to the state party committees in 2000, when Michigan was a battleground presidential state and had a key U.S. Senate race between incumbent Republican Spencer Abraham and Democratic Congressman Deborah Stabenow, who ultimately won the election. In 2002, the amount given by national committees dropped to just \$2.7 million. Conversely, committees in Texas received \$5.3 million in 2000 from the national committees, which then tripled their giving to \$18 million in 2002 to fund the open U.S. Senate race between former Democratic Dallas Mayor Ron Kirk and Republican Attorney General John Cornyn.

### *Transfers and Trading*

While national party committees were able to raise large sums of soft money, limits on the use of these funds prevented the committees from spending them to directly influence federal-level elections, which is their "*raison d'être*." The national party committees therefore gave money to the state party committees not only to help elect state-level candidates, but also to conserve or raise the hard-money dollars that they could use to directly benefit their federal candidates.

---

<sup>7</sup> Competitive House Races from December 20, 2000 Cook Report, Alabama-Florida," *Cook Political Report*, Dec. 20, 2000.

<sup>8</sup> "Control of Congress Lies in a Few Races in Smaller Locales," *The Wall Street Journal*, Oct. 14, 2002, p. 1.

They did this in two key ways:

- They used the state party committees as conduits to pay for issue ads, because the state committees could typically use more soft money to purchase those ads than could the national committees, and,
- They traded their abundance of soft money for hard dollars from the state parties.

Sending soft money to the state party committees gave the national committees greater flexibility with the money they raised at the national level. Under the federal law in place before the passage of BCRA, national parties could raise two types of money: hard money, which was subject to strict limits on how it could be raised and used, and soft money, which could be raised in unlimited amounts and spent in a variety of ways.

Hard money could be used to directly influence federal elections, through direct contributions to federal candidates or payments for ads supporting or opposing a specific candidate. Soft money, however, could not be used to directly influence federal elections. Instead, it was to be used for such "party-building" activities as get-out-the-vote efforts, salaries for party committee staff members, the costs of office space, and helping state candidates get elected.

Federal regulators also determined that soft money could be used to pay for some of the costs of "issue advertisements," which do not directly endorse or oppose a candidate for federal office. But federal rules also set strict limits on the amounts of hard and soft money that had to be used for these ads. For instance, in 2000, the national party committees had to pay for issue ads with 65 percent hard money. They could use soft money to cover only 35 percent of the costs.

State party committees, on the other hand, had a spending mix that was based on the number of state-level and national candidates on its ballot that year and generally could use much greater percentages of soft money in buying issue ads.

Just one example illustrates the advantage of having state committees purchase issue ads with money that originated with a national committee. On Aug. 28, 2000, the Democratic National Committee (DNC) gave the Michigan Democratic Party \$236,135 of hard money and \$393,558 of soft money, for a total contribution of \$629,693. That same day, the Michigan Democratic Party sent *the exact same amounts of hard and soft money* to Democratic Victory 2000, Inc., created in April 2000 to craft issue ads for Democratic presidential nominee Al Gore.

Paying for that advertisement directly would have cost the DNC \$409,300 of hard money (65 percent of \$629,693). But the Michigan Democratic Party paid only \$236,135 in hard dollars because of its more favorable spending mix of 63 percent soft money and just 37 percent of hard money. By sending the money to the Michigan party to pay for advertising costs, the national Democratic committee saved \$173,165 in hard money.

The graphic on the following page illustrates the flow of the contributions detailed above, as well as others from the national Democratic committees to the Michigan state party and the state party's subsequent payments to firms in Washington, D.C., for issue ads.



Multiplied many times over, this practice — which complied with the letter of the law — saved the national party committees tens of millions of dollars during the presidential election cycle. These patterns are explored further in the Institute's September 2003 report detailing the flow of money to and from party committees in 13 states over three election cycles, *"Passing the Bucks: Money Games that Political Parties Play,"* viewable at [www.followthemoney.org](http://www.followthemoney.org).

In its recent ruling, the U.S. Supreme Court upheld not only the ban on soft money to and from the national party committees but also the ban on the use of soft money by state parties to pay for issue ads that clearly identify a federal candidate. Therefore, using the state parties as conduits to pay for issue ads or as sources of hard money is a thing of the past.

#### *Reporting Discrepancies*

It is worth noting the state committees — in their filings with their respective state agencies — reported receiving less soft money than the national committees reported giving them. The national committees, which file with the Federal Election Commission, reported sending \$482 million to the two main party committees across the country over the two cycles. Yet these committees reported receiving \$472 million. Thus a total of \$10 million from the national party committees went unreported to the states over the two election cycles.

The discrepancy in the figures is due in large part to loopholes in state disclosure laws. In several states, for example, committees are not required to report to the state any money they receive that is not spent directly on state elections. This is the case in Alaska, Michigan, Ohio and South Carolina. Consequently, the totals reported to the state agencies are incomplete.

If state party committees do in fact become the repositories for some of the soft money that once went to the national party committees, one unintended consequence of BCRA could be less public disclosure of the flow of soft money.

## TOP INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTORS

Individual donors in general were not prominent players in the arena of state political party campaign finances during the two cycles — they gave 14 percent of the total in 2000 and 16 percent of the 2002 total. However, that may now change since these wealthy donors can no longer write out six-figure checks to the national party committees.

A handful of individuals did have a significant monetary presence at the state level. The top 25 individuals during each of the two election cycles gave a total of \$24.7 million, or 15 percent of the soft money contributed by all individuals during the study period. In addition, 23 of the top 25 contributors in 2000 gave a combined total of \$8.5 million to the national party committees. In 2002, 20 of the top 25 gave \$24.9 million to the national committees. Over the four-year study period, these individuals gave a combined total of \$58 million to state and national party committees.

Three individuals gave more than \$1 million to state party committees during the 2000 cycle:

- Steven Kirsch of Propel Inc. in California, who gave \$2.15 million to Democratic committees in 10 states, was the largest donor overall to the state party committees.
- S. Daniel Abraham of Slim-Fast Foods in Florida gave \$1.3 million to Democratic state party committees in 19 states to rank as the second-largest individual donor. With his additional \$1.6 million to national party committees, he was the largest individual donor overall, giving a total of \$2.9 million in the 2000 election cycle.
- Bernard Daines of the computer hardware company World Wide Packets in Washington state gave \$1.17 million to Republican state party committees in five states.

The 2002 election cycle saw a different lineup of top contributors to the state party committees:

- James Pederson, chairman of the Arizona Democratic Party and a real-estate developer, gave nearly \$3.7 million to the Arizona Democratic Party. His contributions to the party were not without controversy, however, because much of his money was used to help Democratic gubernatorial candidate Janet Napolitano, who ran a publicly funded campaign. Although Arizona's Clean elections law limits the spending of participating candidates, it places no limits on the amount others can spend through independent means.
- Bob J. Perry of Perry Homes in Texas was a distant second, giving \$810,000 to Republican Party committees in four states, mostly to the Republican Party of Texas (\$655,000).
- Robert Sillerman of SFX Entertainment, a New York-based firm that ranks as one of the country's largest producers of live music, theater and sporting events, was the third-largest individual donor. He gave a

total of \$702,500, with all but \$5,000 going to the New York State Democratic Party.

Unlike business and special interest donors, wealthy individuals typically gave to one party or the other, but not both. In 2000, Wayne Hogan of Florida was an exception to this rule. A partner in the Jacksonville law firm of Brown, Terrell, Hogan, Ellis, McClamma & Yegelwel PA, he gave \$432,000 to the Florida Democratic Party (as well as \$1,000 to the North Dakota Democratic Party). But he also gave \$6,000 to the Florida Republican Party.

In 2002, two of the top 25 contributors gave to both parties. Hank Asher, a wealthy data entrepreneur from Florida, gave evenly to both parties — \$110,000 to Republicans and \$115,000 to Democrats. A. Jerry Perenchio of Cartwell Partnership in California also gave to both, although his one contribution of \$1,000 to the Montana Democratic Party seems to be an anomaly, as he gave \$570,000 to the California Republican Party and another \$10,000 to the Florida Republican Party.

The giving by some wealthy individuals extended far beyond the states in which they lived. For example, Fred Eychaner of Newsweb Corp. in Chicago gave \$10,000 to the Illinois Democratic Party during the 2002 cycle, but gave \$427,000 to Democratic Party committees in nine other states. Terry Kohler of Wisconsin gave just \$4,850 to the Republican Party in Wisconsin, where state law limits contributions to party committees to \$10,000 each year. However, Kohler also distributed a total of \$362,000 to Republican party committees in four other states — Michigan, North Carolina, New Jersey and Washington.

Still others shared their wealth only with committees outside of their home states. During the 2002 cycle, for example, four of the top 25 individual contributors gave only to committees elsewhere:

- Steven Kirsch of California gave \$500,000 in 2002 to Democratic state committees in three states — Minnesota, Oregon and New Mexico — but nothing to the California Democratic Party.
- Stephen Bing, a screenwriter from California, gave \$475,000 to Democratic party committees in four states — Minnesota, Iowa, North Carolina and New York. Like Kirsch, he gave no money to the California Democratic Party in 2002.
- Hushang Ansary of TRI International Corp. in Texas gave \$245,000 to Republican committees in New York and Florida, yet nothing to the Texas Republican Party.
- John Walton of Walmart in Arkansas gave \$407,000 to Republican committees in Florida and New Jersey yet nothing to the Republican Party of Arkansas.

With well-heeled donors spreading their wealth across the country, \$1 of every \$5 from individuals came from donors from out of state during the study period. This is bound to increase however, if large donors step up their giving at the state level, now that they can no longer give unlimited amounts to the national party committees.

Large donors will also likely increase their contributions of hard dollars to the national committees, because the high court upheld BCRA's increase in the hard-dollar contribution limits.

Before BCRA, individuals were limited to giving national party committees \$20,000 per year. Now, they can give \$25,000. At the state level, individuals could give no more than \$5,000 to state party committees for certain federal activities, such as get-out-the-vote efforts and voter registration that benefited federal candidates. That limit has now doubled to \$10,000.

It is important to note, however, that to the extent state law allows, individuals can give more than \$10,000 to state party committees, as long as no more than \$10,000 of the money is spent on activities that benefit federal candidates.

Table 4 below shows the contributions from the top 25 individuals in each election cycle. It also includes their soft-money contributions to national party committees, to provide a full picture of their giving at both the national and state levels.

TABLE 4

**TOP 25 INDIVIDUAL SOFT-MONEY CONTRIBUTORS TO STATE PARTY COMMITTEES**

<b>CONTRIBUTOR - 2000</b>	<b>STATE</b>	<b>TO STATE PARTIES</b>	<b>TO NATIONAL PARTIES**</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Kirsch, Steven T.*	CA	\$2,150,000	\$626,000	\$2,776,000
Abraham, S. Daniel	FL	\$1,333,000	\$1,558,000	\$2,891,000
Daines, Bernard	WA	\$1,177,000	\$550,000	\$1,727,000
Carter, Donald J.	TX	\$700,000	\$250,000	\$950,000
Fulton, Stanley*	NV	\$565,000	\$90,000	\$655,000
Hogan, Wayne	FL	\$449,000	\$200,000	\$649,000
Leininger, James	TX	\$425,000	\$72,500	\$497,500
Van Andel, Jay*	MI	\$400,000	\$100,000	\$500,000
Hamm, Edward H.	FL	\$390,000	\$27,000	\$417,000
Opperman, Vance K.	MN	\$319,500	\$505,500	\$825,000
Zilkha, Selim K.	CA	\$275,000	\$100,000	\$375,000
Meyerson, Robert F.	OH	\$250,000	\$202,500	\$452,500
Kadish, Lawrence	NY	\$245,000	\$515,200	\$685,200
Marsh, David H.	AL	\$240,150	\$00	\$240,150
Vanderpol, Ronald	MI	\$240,000	\$00	\$240,000
Coppola, Michelle	NY	\$230,000	\$30,000	\$260,000
Eibensteiner, Ronald	MN	\$225,000	\$50,000	\$275,000
Schwab, Charles R.	CA	\$212,500	\$295,000	\$507,500
Kojaian, C. Michael	MI	\$210,000	\$350,000	\$560,000
O'Quinn, John M.*	TX	\$206,000	\$820,000	\$1,026,000
Eychaner, Fred*	IL	\$205,000	\$924,000	\$1,129,000
Mas, Jorge	FL	\$205,000	\$00	\$205,000
Angelos, Peter G.	MD	\$275,000	\$915,000	\$1,190,000
Levy-Hinte, Jeanne	NY	\$187,000	\$225,000	\$412,000
Pamplin Sr., R. B.	OR	\$175,000	\$15,000	\$190,000
Petrie, Carroll	NY	\$175,000	\$50,000	\$225,000
	<b>2000 TOTAL</b>	<b>\$11,464,150</b>	<b>\$8,470,700</b>	<b>\$19,934,850</b>



<b>CONTRIBUTOR - 2002</b>	<b>STATE</b>	<b>TO STATE PARTIES</b>	<b>TO NATIONAL PARTIES**</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Pederson, James E.	AZ	\$3,684,500	\$250,000	\$3,934,500
Perry, Bob J.	TX	\$810,000	\$00	\$810,000
Sillerman, Robert F.	NY	\$702,500	\$200,000	\$902,500
Perenchio, A. Jerry	CA	\$581,000	\$475,000	\$1,056,000
O'Quinn, John M.*	TX	\$550,000	\$1,140,000	\$1,690,000
Devos Sr, Richard M.	MI	\$525,040	\$4,000	\$529,040
Kirsch, Steven T.*	CA	\$500,000	\$2,030,250	\$2,530,250
Bing, Stephen L.	CA	\$475,000	\$8,675,000	\$9,150,000
Van Andel, Jay & Betty*	MI	\$475,000	\$00	\$475,000
Eychaner, Fred*	IL	\$437,000	\$7,403,500	\$7,840,500
Walton, John	AR	\$407,000	\$50,000	\$457,000
Hughes, Martha E.	TX	\$390,000	\$00	\$390,000
Thompson, Robert M.	MI	\$375,000	\$20,000	\$395,000
Kohler, Terry J.	WI	\$366,850	\$321,000	\$687,850
Spanos, Alex G.	CA	\$355,000	\$389,427	\$744,427
Kohlberg, Jerome	NY	\$322,500	\$100,000	\$422,500
Gund, Louise Laidlaw	CA	\$300,000	\$1,053,000	\$1,353,000
DeGeorge, Lawrence	FL	\$293,060	\$201,702	\$494,762
Buttenwieser, Peter L.	PA	\$262,500	\$925,000	\$1,187,500
Moores, John	CA	\$250,000	\$00	\$250,000
Ansary, Hushang	TX	\$245,000	\$250,000	\$495,000
Fulton, Stanley*	NV	\$230,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,230,000
Kravis, Henry R.	NY	\$226,500	\$250,000	\$476,500
Asher, Hank	FL	\$225,000	\$150,000	\$375,000
Gregory, John	TN	\$225,000	\$00	\$225,000
<b>2002 TOTAL</b>		<b>\$13,213,450</b>	<b>\$24,887,879</b>	<b>\$38,101,329</b>
<b>TWO-CYCLE TOTAL</b>		<b>\$24,677,600</b>	<b>\$33,358,579</b>	<b>\$58,036,179</b>

\* Top contributor in both cycles

\*\* Data compiled by the Center for Responsive Politics (CRP)

Five people made the list of top 25 individual givers in both election cycles:

- Steven T. Kirsch, who launched Infoseek, an Internet navigation service. After selling the company to Disney in 1999, Kirsch started a new e-commerce company called Propel.
- Stanley Fulton, who founded Anchor Gaming, a designer and manufacturer of slot and video gambling machines. The company expanded into casino operations in 1991 and went public in 1994, acquiring Global Gaming Products. In 2000, Fulton retired from Anchor Gaming and sold his family's 40 percent stake back to the company. In exchange for some of the stock, Anchor Gaming sold him its Sunland Park racetrack.
- John M O'Quinn, a founding partner in the law firm O'Quinn Laminack & Pirtle in Houston, Texas. O'Quinn was one of the "Tobacco Five," a group of trial lawyers representing the state of Texas in its lawsuit

against tobacco companies. He is also director of both the Texas Trial Lawyers Association and the Houston Trial Lawyers Association.

- Fred Eychaner of Chicago, who owns Newsweb Corp., a newspaper publishing company that also owns affiliates of the UPN network in Chicago and Denver and three AM radio stations in the greater Chicago area. Eychaner is well-known for his support of Democrats.
- Jay Van Andel, a founder of Amway Corp. along with Richard DeVos in 1959. Headquartered in Michigan, Amway sells more than \$5 billion worth of merchandise annually.

## INTERSTATE TRADING OF SOFT MONEY

State party committees didn't just spend their money on candidates and activities in their own states. They often sent money to their counterparts in other states. Over the two election cycles studied, state party committees gave more than \$6 million to other state committees — \$2.8 million in 2000 and \$3.6 million in 2002.

Why would a state party committee trying to elect people in its own state give its money to candidates and committees in other states? "It's part of a shell game that political parties play to make legal end runs around limits on various types of donations, and the spending strings attached to them," noted an article in the *Deseret News* in Salt Lake City, in describing the contributions a Utah candidate was receiving from party committees around the country.<sup>9</sup>

During the 2000 election cycle, the New York State Democratic Party led the pack in giving to other states, doling out more than \$1 million to party committees in four other states — California (\$483,600), South Dakota (\$386,000), New Mexico (\$135,000) and New Hampshire (\$62,500). When asked why the committee gave so much to other committees, Rodney Capel, political director for the New York State Democratic Party, stated: "Because they ask for it, and we have it to give."<sup>10</sup> What he did not mention, however, is that the New York Democratic Party received hard dollars from these same committees.

During the 2002 cycle, the South Dakota Democratic Party transferred the largest amount of any state committee — a total of \$1.23 million of soft money to Democratic state parties in nine states: California (\$345,000), Florida (\$427,050), Minnesota (\$212,000), New York (\$130,000), Michigan (\$57,500), Kentucky (\$54,600) Kansas (\$30,000), Montana (\$16,667), and Indiana (\$10,700).

In at least two instances, it appears that the South Dakota Democratic Party used money it received from the national Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee (DSCC) to send on to the Kansas Democratic Party. On May 10, 2001, for example, the DSCC sent \$40,000 to the South Dakota committee, which in turn sent \$15,000 to the Kansas Democratic Party. Then again on Jan. 14, 2002, the DSCC sent the South Dakota committee \$11,700. Six days later, the South Dakota Democratic Party sent \$15,000 to the Kansas Democratic Party. In other instances, the transfers were between the committees themselves. For example, during the 2002 cycle, the South Dakota Democratic Party gave \$212,000 to the Minnesota DFL Party, which in turn sent South Dakota \$103,000.

### *The Selling of Federal Dollars*

Trading hard dollars for soft dollars between committees was common throughout the country. For instance, in 2002, the California Republican Party gave \$61,000 in hard money to the Utah Republican Party and \$25,000 to two Utah congressional candidates; in return, it received \$183,000 in soft-money contributions from the Utah Republican Party. According to Brad Martin, executive director of the Montana Democratic Party, state parties often moved their "federal" or hard-money dollars around with a 10 percent to 20 percent rate of exchange for soft money, which spiked as Election Day neared.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Lee Davidson and Bob Bernick Jr., "Money Shuffle aiding Utahn, States swap soft funds for hard in backing Swallow," *Deseret News*, Oct. 31, 2002.

<sup>10</sup> Phone interview with Rodney Capel, political director of the New York State Democratic Party, June 12, 2003.

<sup>11</sup> Interview with Brad Martin, executive director of the Montana Democratic Party, March 31, 2003.

Minnesota party officials were candid in stating that transactions they made with other states were an exchange of hard money for soft dollars. When asked about an \$85,000 transaction between Wisconsin and Minnesota, Minnesota Republican Party Political Director John Kirchner said the Minnesota party was "selling federal dollars," adding that the parties are able to raise "tons of federal dollars" and exchange them.<sup>12</sup>

Yet sometimes the money flowed one way only. For example, the Washington Republican Party transferred \$211,000 in soft money to committees in three other states in 2000 — \$80,000 to the South Carolina Republican Party, \$75,000 to the Colorado Victory 2000 committee, and \$56,000 to the Maine Republican Party. It received no money, hard or soft, in return.

Trading hard money for soft with the national parties, which can no longer occur, was also quite common. The Institute's *"Passing the Bucks"* study found at least 153 trades over the six-year study period, with the national committees raising \$14.6 million in hard dollars from the 13 study states alone, in exchange for \$17 million in soft money.

Now that the national committees will no longer have soft money to send to the states, the trades and transfers between state party committees may increase significantly in future election cycles.

---

<sup>12</sup> Phone interview with John Kirchner, political director of the Minnesota Republican Party, April 9, 2003.

## TOP INDUSTRIES

While party sources were the major source of funds to party committees during both election cycles, non-party sources still accounted for one-third of the soft-money contributions. Among those sources, the five top-contributing industries were the same during both election cycles. Lawyers and law firms, which gave \$44 million, rose to the top in each cycle. They were followed by real estate interests, with \$26.7 million; public sector unions, \$21.5 million; general trade unions, \$19.4 million; and securities and investment interests, \$16.6 million.

Like their national counterparts, state Democratic parties received a much higher percentage of money from lawyers and labor unions, while Republican parties received more money from business interests.

Leading the list of contributors among businesses, special interest political action committees (PACs) and labor unions during the 2000 election cycle was Texas 2000, a PAC funded primarily by lawyers, which gave almost \$2.1 million — all to the Texas Democratic Party. In distant second was the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (IBEW), which gave \$1.34 million to Democratic Party committees in 31 states. Third was the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), which gave \$883,416 to Democratic Party committees in 26 states.

In the 2002 election cycle, the Service Employees International Union (SEIU) was the largest contributor, giving almost \$2.3 million to Democratic Party committees in 17 states. IBEW was again the second-largest contributor, with \$1.6 million to Democratic state committees in 33 states. The Texas 2000 PAC then followed close behind, with \$1.46 million in soft-money contributions, again entirely to the Texas Democratic Party.

TABLE 5

### TOP 30 INDUSTRIES CONTRIBUTING TO STATE PARTY COMMITTEES

<b>TOP INDUSTRIES - 2000</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>TO DEMOCRATS</b>	<b>TO REPUBLICANS</b>
Lawyers & Lobbyists*	\$19,661,686	77%	23%
Real Estate*	\$9,026,847	33%	67%
General Trade Unions*	\$7,807,875	99%	01%
Securities & Investment*	\$7,556,871	23%	77%
Public Sector Unions*	\$7,408,194	92%	08%
Computer Equipment & Services*	\$6,400,602	45%	55%
Insurance*	\$4,370,173	30%	70%
Retired*	\$3,529,516	29%	71%
Health Professionals*	\$3,080,021	27%	73%
Pharmaceuticals & Health Products*	\$3,029,554	54%	46%
Electric Utilities*	\$2,948,597	38%	62%
Business Services*	\$2,844,818	38%	62%
Manufacturing & Distributing*	\$2,830,018	23%	77%
Retail Sales*	\$2,798,076	17%	83%
General Contractors*	\$2,757,052	25%	75%
Gambling & Casinos*	\$2,666,204	32%	68%
Construction Services*	\$2,507,733	43%	57%

Telephone Utilities	\$2,328,208	36%	64%
Oil & Gas*	\$2,242,125	23%	77%
Commercial Banks*	\$2,052,664	43%	57%
TV & Movie Production/Distribution*	\$1,953,613	53%	47%
Business Associations	\$1,939,158	33%	67%
Automotive*	\$1,844,131	12%	88%
Miscellaneous Finance*	\$1,742,514	27%	73%
Forestry & Forest Products	\$1,606,561	15%	85%
Transportation Unions*	\$1,545,828	99%	01%
Lodging & Tourism	\$1,452,146	27%	73%
Air Transport	\$1,347,866	23%	77%
Food Processing & Sales	\$1,314,306	17%	83%
Beer, Wine & Liquor*	\$1,252,426	43%	57%

**TOP INDUSTRIES - 2002**

Lawyers & Lobbyists	\$27,909,997	78%	22%
Real Estate	\$17,710,457	55%	45%
Public Sector Unions	\$14,082,398	92%	08%
General Trade Unions	\$11,654,263	97%	03%
Securities & Investment	\$9,056,869	36%	64%
Insurance	\$7,152,860	33%	67%
General Contractors	\$6,510,403	38%	62%
Health Professionals	\$4,888,459	41%	59%
Retail Sales	\$4,401,149	19%	81%
Commercial Banks	\$3,850,152	34%	66%
Retired	\$3,838,806	33%	67%
Construction Services	\$3,803,499	60%	40%
Telecom Services & Equipment	\$3,791,873	35%	65%
Miscellaneous Finance	\$3,633,500	37%	63%
Pharmaceuticals & Health Products	\$3,508,218	25%	75%
Computer Equipment & Services	\$3,417,421	44%	56%
Gambling & Casinos	\$3,201,993	34%	66%
Tribal Governments	\$3,066,310	56%	44%
Business Services	\$2,919,073	49%	51%
Misc. Manufacturing & Distributing	\$2,899,522	30%	70%
Electric Utilities	\$2,842,292	37%	63%
Hospitals & Nursing Homes	\$2,748,217	36%	64%
Beer, Wine & Liquor	\$2,705,022	40%	60%
TV & Movie Production/Distribution	\$2,502,975	57%	43%
Oil & Gas	\$2,471,358	23%	77%
Transportation Unions	\$2,444,623	97%	03%
Health Services	\$2,204,021	24%	76%
Automotive	\$2,057,817	16%	84%
Miscellaneous Services	\$1,928,173	45%	55%
Food & Beverage	\$1,859,779	26%	74%

\*Also a top-contributing industry in 2002.

## APPENDIX A

### SOFT-MONEY CONTRIBUTIONS REPORTED BY THE TWO MAIN STATE PARTY COMMITTEES

The amounts shown here exclude non-contribution income such as deposit refunds, interest income, the sale of stocks and bonds, and transfers between accounts of the same committee. Totals on our Web site include all income and will be slightly higher than those in the table below.

STATE	COMMITTEE	2-CYCLE TOTAL	2000 TOTAL	2002 TOTAL
AK	Alaska Democratic Party	\$570,936	\$302,507	\$268,429
AK	Republican Party of Alaska	\$1,046,641	\$430,254	\$616,387
AL	Alabama Democratic Party	\$11,144,982	\$5,490,060	\$5,654,922
AL	Alabama Republican Party	\$4,738,142	\$1,987,104	\$2,751,037
AR	Democratic Party of Arkansas	\$11,364,134	\$885,052	\$10,479,082
AR	Republican Party of Arkansas	\$11,736,155	\$3,783,928	\$7,952,227
AZ	Arizona Democratic Party	\$8,906,402	\$947,741	\$7,958,661
AZ	Arizona Republican Party	\$5,177,234	\$1,289,629	\$3,887,605
CA	California Democratic Party	\$45,717,593	\$22,555,756	\$23,161,837
CA	California Republican Party	\$33,665,698	\$18,130,479	\$15,535,220
CO	Colorado Democratic Party	\$9,960,111	\$1,554,115	\$8,405,996
CO	Colorado Republican Party	\$8,122,329	\$2,498,599	\$5,623,730
CT	Connecticut Democratic Party	\$1,346,043	\$598,820	\$747,223
CT	Connecticut Republican Party	\$2,524,999	\$708,859	\$1,816,140
DE	Delaware Democratic Party	\$5,153,386	\$4,199,132	\$954,254
DE	Republican Party of Delaware	\$2,229,398	\$1,469,459	\$759,939
FL	Florida Democratic Party	\$60,615,418	\$33,180,552	\$27,434,866
FL	Republican Party of Florida	\$92,440,488	\$38,028,367	\$54,412,121
GA	Democratic Party of Georgia	\$24,316,230	\$8,378,087	\$15,938,143
GA	Georgia Republican Party	\$20,293,168	\$6,293,400	\$13,999,768
HI	Democratic Party of Hawaii	\$1,386,338	\$201,657	\$1,184,681
HI	Republican Party of Hawaii	\$1,153,958	\$282,575	\$871,383
IA	Iowa Democratic Party	\$18,058,130	\$4,600,945	\$13,457,185
IA	Republican Party of Iowa	\$11,089,658	\$5,373,929	\$5,715,729
ID	Idaho Democratic Party	\$97,271	\$52,033	\$45,238
ID	Idaho Republican Party	\$1,036,070	\$678,053	\$358,017
IL	Democratic Party of Illinois	\$21,388,746	\$13,332,951	\$8,055,795
IL	Illinois Republican Party	\$7,699,856	\$5,897,389	\$1,802,467
IN	Indiana Democratic Party	\$10,538,428	\$5,765,950	\$4,772,478
IN	Indiana Republican Party	\$6,480,808	\$3,187,126	\$3,293,682
KS	Kansas Democratic Party	\$2,840,773	\$999,409	\$1,841,364
KS	Kansas Republican Party	\$1,684,070	\$982,592	\$701,478
KY	Kentucky Democratic Party	\$9,400,010	\$5,943,816	\$3,456,194
KY	Republican Party of Kentucky	\$6,010,369	\$4,146,591	\$1,863,778
LA	Louisiana Democratic Party	\$7,962,567	\$4,386,241	\$3,576,326
LA	Republican Party of Louisiana	\$5,145,828	\$2,805,533	\$2,340,295
MA	Massachusetts Democratic Party	\$2,384,451	\$723,592	\$1,660,859
MA	Massachusetts Republican Party	\$3,129,554	\$749,658	\$2,379,896
MD	Maryland Democratic Party	\$6,632,358	\$1,067,282	\$5,565,076
MD	Republican Party of Maryland	\$1,646,483	\$370,032	\$1,276,451

STATE	COMMITTEE	2-CYCLE TOTAL	2000 TOTAL	2002 TOTAL
ME	Maine Democratic Party	\$4,993,624	\$1,391,527	\$3,602,097
ME	Maine Republican Party	\$3,836,133	\$1,471,995	\$2,364,137
MI	Michigan Democratic Party	\$22,125,038	\$16,451,000	\$5,674,038
MI	Michigan Republican Party	\$23,500,365	\$13,689,208	\$9,811,156
MN	Minnesota DFL Party	\$19,974,483	\$5,167,815	\$14,806,668
MN	Republican Party of Minnesota	\$19,930,450	\$9,173,046	\$10,757,404
MO	Missouri Democratic Party	\$27,078,636	\$14,870,099	\$12,208,537
MO	Missouri Republican Party	\$19,352,540	\$8,539,744	\$10,812,796
MS	Mississippi Democratic Party	\$1,047,128	\$408,447	\$638,681
MS	Mississippi Republican Party	\$1,787,280	\$1,007,522	\$779,758
MT	Montana Democratic Party	\$7,428,977	\$4,166,947	\$3,262,030
MT	Montana Republican Party	\$5,176,623	\$3,655,833	\$1,520,790
NC	North Carolina Democratic Party	\$18,292,679	\$6,823,606	\$11,469,073
NC	North Carolina Republican Party	\$6,579,262	\$3,188,556	\$3,390,706
ND	North Dakota Democratic Party	\$5,217,932	\$1,085,997	\$4,131,935
ND	North Dakota Republican Party	\$2,491,495	\$635,872	\$1,855,623
NE	Nebraska Democratic Party	\$2,448,424	\$1,969,170	\$479,254
NE	Nebraska Republican Party	\$1,941,586	\$1,542,252	\$399,334
NH	New Hampshire Democratic Party	\$8,915,503	\$1,527,344	\$7,388,159
NH	New Hampshire Republican Party	\$8,338,794	\$1,977,373	\$6,361,421
NJ	New Jersey Democratic Party	\$34,282,028	\$7,457,083	\$26,824,945
NJ	New Jersey Republican Party	\$11,232,749	\$5,726,646	\$5,506,103
NM	Democratic Party of New Mexico	\$6,170,464	\$2,303,140	\$3,867,324
NM	Republican Party of New Mexico	\$5,062,297	\$2,732,729	\$2,329,568
NV	Nevada Democratic Party	\$7,665,497	\$4,631,767	\$3,033,730
NV	Nevada Republican Party	\$8,608,106	\$5,223,001	\$3,385,105
NY	New York State Democratic Party	\$23,453,706	\$13,709,194	\$9,744,512
NY	New York State Republican Party	\$26,890,655	\$11,280,422	\$15,610,233
OH	Ohio Democratic Party	\$16,694,169	\$10,317,278	\$6,376,891
OH	Ohio Republican Party	\$20,131,235	\$11,714,192	\$8,417,043
OK	Oklahoma Democratic Party	\$988,819	\$471,130	\$517,689
OK	Oklahoma Republican Party	\$1,335,289	\$619,768	\$715,521
OR	Democratic Party of Oregon	\$6,900,849	\$5,094,505	\$1,806,344
OR	Oregon Republican Party	\$6,887,081	\$4,080,447	\$2,806,634
PA	Pennsylvania Democratic Party	\$21,756,768	\$14,971,373	\$6,785,395
PA	Republican Party of Pennsylvania	\$15,754,855	\$5,955,158	\$9,799,697
RI	Rhode Island Democratic Party	\$147,250	\$147,250	\$00
RI	Rhode Island Republican Party	\$62,890	\$62,890	\$00
SC	Democratic Party of South Carolina	\$1,052,987	\$456,771	\$596,215
SC	South Carolina Republican Party	\$391,220	\$342,699	\$48,521
SD	Republican Party of South Dakota	\$6,434,502	\$757,995	\$5,676,507
SD	South Dakota Democratic Party	\$9,012,445	\$748,460	\$8,263,985
TN	Tennessee Democratic Party	\$2,858,689	\$1,360,163	\$1,498,526
TN	Tennessee Legislative Campaign Committee	\$5,557,153	\$2,847,044	\$2,710,108
TX	Republican Party of Texas	\$14,742,863	\$4,307,722	\$10,435,141
TX	Texas Democratic Party	\$26,477,495	\$6,460,476	\$20,017,019
UT	Utah Democratic Party	\$2,510,968	\$1,729,895	\$781,072



<b>STATE</b>	<b>COMMITTEE</b>	<b>2-CYCLE TOTAL</b>	<b>2000 TOTAL</b>	<b>2002 TOTAL</b>
UT	Utah Republican Party	\$2,669,438	\$1,774,352	\$895,087
VA	Democratic Party of Virginia	\$18,187,403	\$7,749,457	\$10,437,945
VA	Republican Party of Virginia	\$17,371,714	\$6,695,937	\$10,675,777
VT	Vermont Democratic Party	\$347,539	\$187,193	\$160,346
VT	Vermont Republican Party	\$747,207	\$528,926	\$218,281
WA	Washington State Democratic Party	\$15,169,679	\$11,781,063	\$3,388,617
WA	Washington State Republican Party	\$15,760,336	\$13,331,450	\$2,428,886
WI	Democratic Party Of Wisconsin	\$7,000,273	\$4,605,953	\$2,394,319
WI	Republican Party Of Wisconsin	\$10,299,316	\$5,562,422	\$4,736,895
WV	West Virginia Democratic Party	\$193,984	\$165,800	\$28,184
WV	West Virginia Republican Party	\$266,775	\$150,000	\$116,775
WY	Wyoming Democratic Party	\$441,305	\$159,934	\$281,371
WY	Wyoming Republican Party	\$1,636,152	\$746,793	\$889,359
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$1,070,446,315</b>	<b>\$491,951,038</b>	<b>\$578,495,231</b>

\* Rhode Island 2002 data was not available from the state at the time of publication.

## APPENDIX B

SOFT-MONEY CONTRIBUTIONS FROM THE NATIONAL PARTY COMMITTEES,  
AS REPORTED BY THE STATE PARTY COMMITTEES

STATE	2000 TOTAL	2002 TOTAL	2-CYCLE TOTAL	2000 RANK	2002 RANK	2-CYCLE RANK
FL	\$34,205,846	\$17,382,417	\$51,588,263	1	2	1
MO	\$14,610,233	\$12,924,611	\$27,534,844	6	6	2
VA	\$9,596,853	\$15,508,808	\$25,105,661	10	4	3
MN	\$5,224,337	\$18,159,280	\$23,383,617	17	1	4
TX	\$5,270,414	\$17,086,293	\$22,356,707	16	3	5
MI*	\$19,611,684	\$2,657,079	\$22,268,763	2	25	6
PA	\$14,816,456	\$4,754,509	\$19,570,965	5	13	7
CA	\$15,555,487	\$1,823,368	\$17,378,855	3	29	8
NY	\$12,596,038	\$4,691,866	\$17,287,904	8	14	9
AR	\$2,758,180	\$13,690,598	\$16,448,778	25	5	10
GA	\$3,496,149	\$12,903,921	\$16,400,071	22	7	11
WA	\$15,066,134	\$1,113,026	\$16,179,161	4	33	12
OH*	\$13,416,251	\$2,137,572	\$15,553,823	7	27	13
IA	\$4,408,149	\$10,996,612	\$15,404,761	20	10	14
NH	\$2,350,743	\$12,408,281	\$14,759,025	27	8	15
IL	\$11,418,975	\$1,486,887	\$12,905,862	9	32	16
SD	\$780,520	\$12,046,790	\$12,827,310	35	9	17
WI	\$7,817,452	\$4,499,937	\$12,317,389	12	15	18
NC	\$5,819,893	\$5,012,249	\$10,832,142	14	12	19
KY	\$7,995,451	\$2,754,851	\$10,750,302	11	23	20
OR	\$7,781,411	\$2,013,574	\$9,794,985	13	28	21
MT	\$5,699,930	\$2,922,761	\$8,622,691	15	21	22
NV	\$4,936,555	\$2,914,790	\$7,851,345	18	22	23
LA	\$4,695,453	\$2,946,789	\$7,642,242	19	20	24
CO	\$1,232,624	\$6,172,880	\$7,405,504	31	11	25
NM	\$3,303,302	\$3,832,474	\$7,135,775	23	18	26
ME	\$1,592,778	\$3,860,563	\$5,453,341	30	17	27
TN	\$2,799,660	\$2,332,069	\$5,131,728	24	26	28
DE	\$4,214,864	\$246,774	\$4,461,638	21	38	29
ND	\$529,900	\$3,883,441	\$4,413,341	37	16	30
AZ	\$1,003,390	\$3,143,479	\$4,146,869	33	19	31
IN	\$2,390,608	\$1,723,171	\$4,113,779	26	30	32
AL	\$1,057,850	\$2,663,534	\$3,721,384	32	24	33
UT	\$2,138,422	\$490,569	\$2,628,991	28	36	34
NE	\$2,013,447	\$117,085	\$2,130,532	29	41	35
MD	\$237,654	\$1,697,223	\$1,934,877	40	31	36
MS	\$883,081	\$570,327	\$1,453,408	34	35	37
OK	\$569,679	\$678,531	\$1,248,210	36	34	38
NJ	\$290,771	\$254,443	\$545,214	39	37	39
WY	\$297,362	\$202,707	\$500,069	38	39	40
WV	\$205,000	\$119,770	\$324,770	41	40	41
ID	\$194,500	\$45,779	\$240,279	42	44	42
KS	\$106,274	\$106,736	\$213,010	43	42	43

<b>STATE</b>	<b>2000 TOTAL</b>	<b>2002 TOTAL</b>	<b>2-CYCLE TOTAL</b>	<b>2000 RANK</b>	<b>2002 RANK</b>	<b>2-CYCLE RANK</b>
HI	\$43,138	\$88,992	\$132,130	45	43	44
AK*	\$47,031	\$00	\$47,031	44	47	45
RI**	\$20,000	\$00	\$20,000	46	48	46
MA	\$8,000	\$5,000	\$13,000	47	45	47
VT	\$4,791	\$2,000	\$6,791	48	46	48
CT	\$00	\$00	\$00	49	49	49
SC*	\$00	\$00	\$00	50	50	50
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$255,112,721</b>	<b>\$217,074,415</b>	<b>\$472,187,136</b>			

\* Not all soft money receipts are reported to the state, so totals are less than the amount actually received.

\* Rhode Island 2002 data was not available from the state at the time of publication.