



PROJECT MUSE®

Campaign Finance and Political Polarization

La Raja, Raymond J., Schaffner, Brian F.


Published by University of Michigan Press

La Raja, J. & Schaffner, F..

Campaign Finance and Political Polarization: When Purists Prevail.

Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2015.

Project MUSE., <https://muse.jhu.edu/>.



➔ For additional information about this book

<https://muse.jhu.edu/book/42636>

Index

- Abrams, Samuel J., 13–14, 92
- Accountability, 4, 144
- Activists
- donors activist, 24, 38, 60
 - executive committee, 8
 - ideological activists, 16, 22, 61, 116, 120
 - influence of, 112
 - insurgents, 22
 - issue activists, 12, 20–22, 89, 142
 - party activists, 13, 15, 19, 111
 - pro and con, 12
 - purist activists, 22, 61
 - rallying, 6
 - role of, 9
- Adelson, Sheldon, 48, 112, 146
- Aldrich, John, 10–12, 16
- The Amateur Democrat* (Wilson, James Q.), 13
- Amateurs. *See* purists
- American democracy, 1, 3, 15, 88
- American Political Science Association (APSA), 10
- Anti-circumvention, 141
- Anticorruption
- approach, 3, 107, 145, 158
 - consequence of, 151
 - framework, 135
 - laws, 139
 - logic of *Buckley*, 40
 - reform, 159
 - strategy, 4, 75
- Antifederalists, 150
- Antiparty laws impact, 34
- Back door, 39, 150
- Barber, Denise ROTL, 117
- Bartels, Larry, 148
- BCRA. *See* Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act (BCRA)
- Bias
- business, 69
 - electoral, 38
 - of findings, 23
 - ideological, 41, 60–61
 - kind of, 107, 160
 - outcomes, 45, 61
 - participatory, 44, 54
 - representational, 41, 151
 - small donors, 148
 - towards, 128
 - of wealthy, 134
- Big tents, 11–12
- Bimodal distribution, 15, 45, 48, 94, 98, 120
- Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act (BCRA), 3–5, 126, 131, 141, 145, 150–51. *See also* McCain-Feingold Act
- Bipartisan compromises, 17
- Bipartisanship, 91, 100–102

- Brat, David, 17
- Buckley v. Valeo*, 40, 122, 145
- Burke, Edmund, 10
- Burkean goal, 10
- Business groups, 116–17, 126
- Business interests
- benefit seekers, 135
 - campaign funds, 64–65
 - financial rescue plan, 69
 - financing, 125
 - funds from, 84
 - independent spending by, 127
 - model of, 82
 - PACs, 37
 - pragmatic, 114
 - pragmatic interests, 151
 - program policies, 12
 - right-of-center candidates, 153
 - soft money, 126
- Business PACs, 116–17, 125–26
- California Republican Party, 19, 23
- Campaign agenda, 125, 140, 143, 146
- Campaign benefactors, 1
- campaign finance reforms and polarization, 4–6
 - party-centered vs. candidate-centered financing, 2–4
 - political parties and democracy, 6–8
- Campaign contributions, 143
- Campaign finance condition, 159
- Campaign finance laws
- in American states, 5
 - candidate-centered system of, 39
 - candidates affected by, 34
 - changing, 144
 - consequences of, 34
 - corruption, 155
 - critics of, 136
 - donor decision impact, 38
 - effect of, 112, 151
 - effectiveness, 151
 - factional power shaping, 19–20
 - finance struggle, 2
 - flow of money, 105
 - funding limits, 33
 - hydraulics of, 4
 - on ideological polarization, 26
 - importance of, 108
 - inefficiency of, 145
 - influence of, 29
 - information on, 26
 - matter, 30
 - or parties effects of, 33
 - party-centered, 144
 - political donors link with, 34
 - reform, 109
 - significant variance on, 29
 - state and national, 26
 - strength from, 25
 - types of, 30
- Campaign finance regulations, 20, 91, 134, 155
- Campaign finance rules, 36, 110
- Campaign finance system, 39, 134, 136
- Campaign financing, 33–35
- Campaign funds
- allocating, 39
 - control of, 85
 - distributing, 72
 - focus on, 18
 - private contributions, 60
 - proportion of, 84
 - source of, 84
- Campaign money
- campaign financial laws impact, 39–43
 - donors' affect by, 53–54
 - donors' recipients of, 54–58
 - finance system, 39–43
 - individual donors, 37–39
 - limits on contributors, 36–37
 - summary about, 58–59
- Canals vs. dams, 134–36
- Congress effectiveness, 144–47
 - party organization resources, 142–44
 - party-centered finance system, 136–40
 - party-centered system reliance, 140–41
 - political parties as conduits, 141–42
 - pro-party reform implementation, 147–60
- Candidate-centered system. *See also* Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA)

- challengers vs. incumbents under, 120
 - emergence of, 62–64
 - of financing, 39
 - ideological candidates benefit from, 77–79
 - ideological donors, 57
 - incumbents dominate in, 72–76
 - party-centered laws effects, 79–81
 - political parties marginal players, 85
- Candidates
 - highly conservative, 116
 - limits on contribution to, 29
 - moderate, 23
 - nominating favorites, 141
 - vs. parties, 50
 - source of funds to, 34
- Cantor, Eric, 17, 22
- Cash conduits, 159
- Catalist findings, 43–46, 48, 57, 94
- Caucus committees. *See* legislative parties
- Causal claims data, 31
- Causes
 - behalf of, 110
 - partisan, 52
 - of partisan polarization, 5–6
 - underlying, 2
- Central party committee, purists capture of, 23
- Centrists, 17, 19, 62
- Challengers, 117, 120
- Citizen representation, 1
- Citizens United v. FEC*, 7, 40, 122, 125, 145
- Class constituency concerns, 14
- Clean Elections Law, 140
- “Cleansing” effect on polarization, 109
- Clinton, Hillary, 17
- Club for Growth, 12
- Cochran, Thad, 21
- Communications
 - disclosure of, 122
 - means of, 18
- Competitive districts, 67, 71, 81, 84, 90, 116
- Compromise
 - bipartisan, 17, 37, 120
 - demand for, 60, 95, 143, 147
- financing, 97
 - forging support, 16
 - vs. gridlock, 14
 - history of, 151
 - jeopardy with, 22
 - kinds of, 69
 - lack of, 1, 148–49
 - legislation, 92, 106, 116
 - need for, 128, 131, 136
 - of policy, 98, 100
 - tending, 38
 - unions on, 66
- Conceptual models, 15
- Conservative donors, 48, 50–54, 77, 115, 144, 153
- Conservative voters, 17, 22
- Conservatives
 - business favor of, 72
 - donors, 24, 59
 - vs. extremes, 71, 116
 - ideological spectrum, 50
 - vs. liberals, 158
 - on parties, 24
 - social conservatives, 12
- Constituencies, 151
- Contribution limitless, 147
- Contribution limits. *See also* *Buckley v. Valeo*
 - circumventing, 63, 75
 - effects of, 36, 40
 - impacts of, 41, 54, 59
 - imposition of, 115
 - leverage from, 37
 - low contribution limits, 126, 134, 156
 - on parties vs. states, 79
 - states with, 100, 131
 - vs. super PACs, 131
 - use of, 118
 - without, 39
- Contributions
 - earmarking, 141
 - limitless, 147
 - limits of, 36
 - size of, 36
- Contributions limit. *See also* low contribution limits

- Contributions limit (*continued*)
 changing, 147
 circumventing, 63
 as dams, 135
 effects of, 36, 40–41, 54, 63, 134
 grassroots, 54
 ideological donors, 39
 imposing, 156
 purist leverage, 37
 states with, 79, 100, 131
 uses of, 118
- Cooperative Congressional Election Study (CCES), 42–43, 47, 49–51
- Corruption. See also *Buckley v. Valeo*
 avoiding, 117
 combating, 135
 defining, 151
 donation, 38
 vs. ideological polarization, 126, 139, 145
 monumental, 6
 narrative, 37, 150
 opposing, 147
 preventing, 35, 122, 152, 155
 problems of, 3
 quid pro quo, 40, 145
 reducing, 155, 157
 reforms, 157–59
 thwarting, 134
- Corruption in America* (Teachout, Z.), 148
- Cross-filing, 19
- Cruz, Ted, 21–22
- Culture War, 12
- Dams, directed, 135
- Dark money, 155, 159
- Davis, Tom, 129
- Deals, 6, 13, 37, 135, 143
- Default option, 140
- Democracy, 1, 3, 6, 9, 15, 109, 147–50, 155–57, 159. See also American democracy
- Democratic Party
 donors, 51
 extremes of, 116
 ideological donors, 153–54
 labor unions and, 116, 127, 154
 left move, 51, 59
 local, 131
 tension within, 17
- Donor groups, 67, 79, 117
- Donors
 behavior of individual, 37
 bias of, 45
 characteristics of, 44
 demographic profile of, 59
 description of, 114
 extremist nature, 45
 ideological donors, 148
 ideological population, 148
 ideological views, 115
 incentives of individual, 39
 kinds of, 38
 liberal, 50
 motivation, 49
 overlapping, 49
 per capita, 57
 political, 42
 reveal the names of, 136
 very liberal, 52–53
- Downs, Anthony, 9, 12, 16
- Downs's theory, 12
- Downs/Aldrich teams, 16
- Edsall, Thomas, 159
- Effective dams, 110
- Elections, state-level, election patterns, 114
- Electoral bias, 38
- Electoral goals, 8–9, 90
- Electoral resources, 2, 8, 10–11, 13, 96
- Electoral rules, 17–19
- Electoral system, 5, 36, 38, 118, 125, 137, 139
- Equal representation, 151
- Expenditures, party coordination, 145
- Extreme policies, 109
- Extremism, 11, 34, 38, 52, 84, 95, 119, 148
- Factional struggle, 16–17
- Farewell Address (Washington, G.), 2–3

- Favorite candidates, parties, 24
- Favoritism, 153
- Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA), 7, 63, 121, 144–45, 147
- Federal Election Commission (FEC), 137, 146
- Federal party committees, 31
- Finance candidates, 111
- Finance elections, 134
- Finance system
 - asymmetry in, 51–53
 - campaign financial laws impact, 41–42
 - evidence source, 42–43
 - money contributors, 43–47
 - money recipients, 47–53
- Financial autonomy, 147
- Financial laws vs. interest groups, 2
- Financial mediators role, of funding, 24
- Financial parity, 154
- Financial reform, 136
- Financial support, 23
- Financial transparency, 132
- Financing constraints, 24
- Financing elections, 39, 62, 97, 99–100, 120, 144–45, 152, 155, 157, 159
- Financing restriction, 120
- Fiorina, Morris P., 13–14, 92
- First Amendment, 39, 122, 128, 145, 151
- 501(c)4 organizations, 112, 132, 146, 154
- Flow of money
 - accountability, 146
 - into campaigns, 41
 - to candidate types, 34
 - consequences of, 106
 - enabling, 79
 - financing laws shaping, 87
 - ideological candidates and, 86
 - institutional, 88, 105, 148
 - laws affecting, 42, 118
 - by political parties, 59
 - into politics, 135
 - privileging, 62
 - shapes affected, 91
 - stopping into politics, 5, 38
 - through parties, 137
- Forbes 400/ Fortune 500 companies*, 114
- Fragmentation, 136
- Freedom Club State PAC, 129
- Freedom preservation, 155
- Funding, 24, 113
- Funds source, 5
- Fusion ballot, 19. *See also* cross-filing
- Gallup Poll, 157
- GDP and election-related spending, 4–5
- Gingrich, Newt, 48, 112
- Goals
 - Burkean, 10
 - electoral, 8–9, 90
 - ideological, 12
 - narrow policy, 12
 - policy vs. electoral, 9
- GOP donors, 51–52
- Governance
 - laws affecting, 33
 - problems, 25
 - promoted better, 35
 - structure, 21
- Government, matching system
 - approach, 138
- Grassroots, 25, 54, 129–31, 154, 159
- Gridlock, 92
- Group-centric approach, 13–14, 16, 109
- Groups. *See* business groups; donor groups; group-centric approach; interest groups; issue groups; non-party groups
- Groups strategy, 13
- Herron, Michael C., 109
- Hobbes, Thomas, 14
- Hobbesian insiders, 19
- Hobbesian pragmatists, 14, 109
- Hobbesian world view, 9
- Home-style issues, 10
- Hume, David, 151
- Hydraulic theory. *See also* IEs (independent expenditures)
 - of campaign finance reform, 56

- Hydraulic theory (*continued*)
 - of campaign reform, 56
 - IE spending, 121, 133
 - of money, 110
 - partisan money flow, 145
- Hydraulics of campaign money
 - individual donors, 115
 - key findings, 114
 - law limits and independent spending, 121–24
 - laws affecting, 118
 - moderate candidates support, 116–18
 - partisans and independent spending, 124–32
 - party asymmetry, 115–16
 - pragmatists and purists revisioned, 108–10
 - pro-party laws, 120–21
 - transparency lock, 132–33
- Idealist party outsiders, 14
- Ideological activists as party gatekeepers, 16
- Ideological asymmetries, 51
- Ideological candidates, 5, 24, 43, 58–59, 62, 73, 77–79, 81, 85–86, 111, 114–15, 117–18
- Ideological distribution, 9, 15, 45, 48, 68–70, 77, 100
- Ideological donors, 50, 57–59, 61, 65, 81, 91, 111, 114, 117, 121, 125, 128, 137–38, 151
- Ideological extremes, 45, 60, 77, 84, 114–16, 151
- Ideological interest, 148
- “Ideological” money, 58, 109
- Ideological money, 144
- Ideological polarization
 - campaign finance laws on, 26
 - candidate center systems, 24
 - effects of, 112
 - excesses of, 2
 - impact of laws on, 136
 - laws affecting, 34
 - negative consequences, 156
- Ideological poles, 5
- Ideological preferences, 51
- Ideological resistance
 - institutional dimension, 87–91
 - partisan polarization, 91–95
 - partisan polarization in states, 91–95
 - party-controlled money, 95–97
 - party-created campaign, 97–103
 - party-created campaign hypothesis, 97–103
 - in state legislature, 87–107
- Ideological rigidity, 15
- Ideological scale, 45, 48, 50–51
- Ideological scores, 48, 70, 94, 97
- Ideological spectrum, 49
- Ideologues, 144
- IEs (independent expenditures), 120–33, 144
- Incumbency status, 117
- Incumbent(s), 11, 13, 21, 34, 41, 62, 64–66, 68–75, 77–85, 111, 116–17, 119–20, 136–37, 139, 142, 145, 147, 152
- Independent spending
 - effectiveness, 151
 - partisan polarization, 124–32
- Individual donors, 115
- Insider models, 10, 15–16
- Insiders, 8–11, 14, 19–23
- Institutional filter, 128
- Institutional party, 10
- Interest groups, 2–6, 10, 12, 18–20, 24–28, 34, 39, 51, 53, 60–61, 65, 67, 81, 85, 89, 91, 107, 109, 111, 121, 129, 137, 143–44, 146, 159
- Issue activists, 20
- Issue groups, 5, 19, 37, 59, 65–66, 68–69, 72, 74, 77–79, 82, 84–85, 88, 95, 115–18, 120, 125, 127–28, 130, 140, 146, 151, 158
- Kant, Immanuel, 14
- Kantian purists, 14
- Key findings
 - flow of money affected by laws, 118–20
 - ideological donors sources, 113–14

- ideological small donors vs. large donors, 114–15
 - moderate candidates support from party financing, 117–18
 - nonparty party sources of funding, 113
 - party asymmetry notice, 115–16
 - party organization vs. institutional donors, 116–17
 - pro-party laws and legislatures, 120
- Labor, relative to capital, 18
- Labor unions, 82, 116–17, 122, 125–28, 154, 157. *See also* unions
- Laissez-faire policies, on money, 153
- Large donors, 138
- Laws
- complex, 136
 - favoring financial role, 118
 - favoring party organization, 118
 - party limits and independent spending, 121–24
- Leapfrog representation, 92
- Legislative candidates, donors to, 48
- Legislative parties, pragmatic work of, 22
- Legislative polarization, effects of, 30
- Leverage, in party affairs, 18
- Liberal candidates, 128
- Liberal donors, 48, 50, 52–53, 115, 153–54
- Liberals
- position of, 47, 68, 100, 112
 - social, 12
 - views of, 59
- Liberty, 153
- Long coalitions, 13
- Loopholes, 141
- Low contribution limits, 3, 39, 54, 75, 114, 122, 126, 134–35, 157
- Madison perspective, 152
- Madisonian pluralism, 148
- Majority entrance, 88
- Martin, Ken, 129
- Masket, Seth, E., 19
- Matching system approach, 138
- Material benefits, 9, 65, 72–73, 79, 85, 116, 151
- Materialists
- party insiders, 14
 - pragmatists as, 9
- McCain-Feingold Act, 3, 111. *See also* soft money
- McCarty, Nolan, 26, 32, 97, 148
- McCutcheon v. FEC*, 144–47
- McDaniel, Chris, 21–22
- Media coverage, 14, 60
- Median ideologies, 94
- Median voters, 9, 11, 15, 23, 41, 45, 62, 65–68, 85–86, 95–97, 111, 116–17, 121, 140, 151–52
- Mediation, 24, 128, 148
- Mega-donors, 112
- Milyo, Jeff, 27
- Minimalist approach, 136
- Moderate candidates, 30
- Moderate politics, 23
- Moderates, 34, 52, 58–59, 61–62, 66, 69, 71–73, 77, 79, 81, 84–87, 91–92, 97, 101, 114, 116–19, 137–38, 141, 143
- Moderating organizations influence, 23–24
- Moderation as byproduct, 11
- Money. *See also* soft money; wealthy donors
- chase after, 150
 - flow concerns, 153
 - flow of, 41
 - flow rules, 56
 - importance of, 150
 - interested, 149
 - laissez-faire policies on, 153
 - limits to sources, 27
 - per capita, 31, 129
 - problems from, 149
 - raising, 44
 - recipients, 47–53
 - regulating in politics, 117
- MoveOn.Org, 143
- Multiple constituencies, 24
- Murphy, Chris, 109, 119

- Name recognition, 24
- Narrow-issue activists, 20
- National Conference of State Legislatures, 139
- National Institute for Money in State Politics (NIMSP), 34, 39, 43, 72, 124, 128
- National Republican Senate Committee (NRSC), 21
- Network theory, 88–89
- 1974 FECA, 147
- Nomination process, 96
- Nonparty groups, 122, 125, 143, 145, 151, 154
- Nonparty party organization fundraiser, 21
- Nonparty supporters, 5
- Normal distribution, of median voter, 15
- NRA, 143
- One-party districts, 141
- Open systems, 89
- Organization limits, 103
- Outside shadow parties, 25
- Overcomplexity, of regulations, 137
- PAC contributions, 117, 139, 147
- PACs, 27–28, 34, 37, 40, 63, 73, 137, 145. *See also* business PACs; super PACs
- Participatory bias, 44, 54
- Parties
- ban on, 145
 - as competing factions, 15–18
 - enabling funds, 118
 - as filters, 118
 - ideological dancing of, 113
 - ideological divergence of, 11–12
 - meaning of, 7
 - money through, 137
 - perform positive functions in practical politics, 33
 - stronger role for, 120
- Parties controlled by insiders, 8–11
- Parties controlled by outsiders, 11–35
- matter of campaign finance laws, 30
 - party organizations and insiders, 19–24
 - polarizing influence of candidate-centered politics, 24–26
 - state-based empirical approach, 26–30
- Partisan activities, 112
- Partisan asymmetry, 59
- Partisan money, 145
- Partisan network, 61, 89
- Partisan polarization
- attenuation, 11
 - campaign finance laws effects of, 33
 - cause of, 5–6
 - cleansing effect on, 109
 - consequences of, 1
 - effect of, 134
 - finance affecting, 28, 30
 - ideological, 2
 - independent spending effect, 124
 - lessening, 81
 - levels of, 26
 - measure of, 57
 - potential impact, 1
 - representation in the American states, 91–92
- Partisans, 5, 12, 14, 17, 21, 51, 89, 109, 113, 120–121, 123, 125, 132, 142, 145–46, 152–54
- Party
- affairs, 18
 - campaign, 88–89
 - chair, 8
 - coordination, 13
 - discipline, 11
 - duopoly, 7
 - elements of, 109
 - group-centered, 14
 - insiders, 14
 - pragmatic work of leaders, 22
 - restriction of financing, 24
- Party bosses, 3, 8–9, 11, 16, 89, 143, 150
- Party coalition(s), 5, 9, 12–13, 16–19, 25–26, 37, 59, 61, 67–68, 107–8, 112, 127–28, 135, 142–44, 148, 151, 158

- Party committees, 21, 23, 31, 38, 40, 52–53, 58, 63–64, 66, 69, 75, 77, 88–90, 95–96, 125, 141–42, 144–46
- Party constitution groups and activists, 12
- Party contributions for candidates limits, 28
- Party leadership, 5, 8, 11, 13, 15, 30–31, 33, 38, 40, 52–53, 63–64, 66, 68–69, 75, 77, 88–90, 95–98, 125, 142, 144–46
- Party limits
 - absence of, 83
 - effect of, 83, 98, 119–20
 - independent spending and partisan polarization, 124–32, 145
 - individual funds, 80–81
 - polarization after, 104–5
 - prevalence of, 102
 - spending laws, 121–24
- Party machine, 3
- Party organizations
 - behavior, 2
 - fortifying, 147
 - history of, 113
 - insiders parties controlled by outsiders, 20–24
 - institutional mediation, 148
 - laws vs. interest groups, 24
 - leadership, 21
 - leverage, 88
 - mediation of moderation, 128
 - moderating organizations influence, 23–24
 - representative width toward, 20
- Party outsiders, idealists, 14
- Party polarization, 144
- Party system, 25
- Party-building, 145
- Party-centered finance system
 - about, 136–37
 - contribution limits, 137
 - models limits, 137
 - party organization support, 138–40
 - restrictions of, 137–38
- Party-centered laws, 34, 56–57, 62, 79–82, 91, 100, 106
- Party-centered strategy, 141
- Party-centered system, 159
- Party-centered vs. candidate-centered financing, 2–4
- Party-in-service model, 10
- People control rules, 7
- Per capita fundraising, by state parties, 30
- Per capita giving, 31–32
- Pew Research, 157
- Plunkitt, George Washington, 9
- Pluralism, 148, 152
- Pluralist framework, 148
- Pluralist solution, 148
- Pluralist tradition, 136
- Polarization. *See also* ideological polarization; partisan polarization
 - decreased, 137
 - effect on, 112
 - solving, 143
- Polarization ads, 130
- Polarized America* (McCarty, Poole, and Rosenthal), 148
- Polarized politics, 17
- Polarizing influence of candidate-centered politics, 24–26
- Policy demanders, 5, 12–13, 16, 68, 71, 90, 107, 143
- Policy goals vs. electoral goals, 9
- Policy gridlock, 1
- Policy recommendations, 35
- Policy-oriented donors, 79, 85
- Political balance, 88
- Political contributions, patterns of, 34
- Political contributors, 34, 42–43, 47, 138. *See also* Catalist findings
- Political domination, 40
- Political elites, accountable, 109
- Political money, flows of, 4
- Political parties, 2–3, 6–8, 10, 12, 15, 20, 25, 28, 31–34, 36–39, 42, 48, 51, 59, 61–64, 66–67, 71, 75–78, 80, 83, 85–91, 96, 102, 107–8, 111, 113, 115–18, 120–24, 128–29, 136–41, 144–48, 150–55

- Political parties and democracy, 6–7
- Political parties conceptions, 7
- Political reformers, 3
- Political reforms, 25
- Political transparency and accountability, 4, 133, 144
- Politicians
 - ambitions of, 17
 - attention from, 13
 - attention of, 112
 - behaviors of, 143
 - bought off, 150
 - centrists, 62
 - compromise allow, 14
 - contributions, 37, 114, 119
 - depending, 110
 - donations for, 40
 - donors, 41
 - donors use for, 36
 - electoral system, 38
 - evaluations of, 42
 - avored, 40
 - freestanding, 13
 - ideological, 59
 - law changes, 31
 - needs of, 18
 - party domination, 16
 - polarizing, 42
 - pressure, 129
- Politics
 - cost of, 136
 - media coverage of, 14
 - moderating, 96
 - origin, 3
- Poole, Keith T., 148
- Pope, Jeremy, 92
- Populist reform, 146, 151
- Postwar years, 15–16
- Power, benefits of, 109
- Pragmatic ambition, 149
- Pragmatic party organization, 111
- Pragmatist insiders, 11
- Pragmatists
 - disadvantage, 143
 - as materialists, 9
 - moderating tendencies of, 134
 - on nonparty party organization fundraiser, 21
 - party control, 148–49
 - party organization, 21
 - policy concerns, 17
 - vs. purists, 16–17, 19, 111
 - into purists, 113
 - strategic benefit loss, 129–30
- Pragmatists and purists, 16–17, 20, 110–12
- Principals, solidarity on, 10
- Private money, 140, 160
 - use of, 140
- Problems of corruption, 3
- Progressives
 - demographic problems, 150
 - on regulatory state, 17
- Pro-party laws, 146, 158
 - effect of, 112
- Pro-party reform implementation
 - about, 147–49
 - campaign finance reforms, public opinion on, 154–60
 - prevailing narrative, 149–52
 - strategic partnership for gaming, 152–63
- Public blind spots, 15
- Public financing scheme, role of, 139
- Public funds, 138
- Public grants, 139–40
- Purist factions, 22, 25, 37, 67, 69, 90, 105, 124, 135, 143–44, 146, 149
- Purist outsiders, 17, 19–20, 24, 37
- Purists
 - campaign finance laws, 108
 - capture of central party committee, 23
 - party organization, 21
 - policy concerns, 17
 - vs. pragmatists, 16–17, 19
- Rank-and-file members control, 26
- Ranny Index, 32
- Rasmussen poll, 2
- Rechanneling of money, 111
- Redstate.com*, 52
- Reform agenda, 107

- Reform proposals, 136, 148
- Reform strategy, 35, 140–141
- Reform(s), 2, 7, 14, 25, 63, 73, 135, 137–38, 144, 146–47, 150, 152, 155, 157, 159. *See also* Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act (BCRA)
- Regulations
 - of campaign finance, 20
 - overcomplexity of, 137
 - of state parties, 28
- Reiff, Neil, 130
- Relationships
 - establishing, 85
 - inverse vs. direct, 111
 - personal, 65
- Reliance, 140
- Representational bias, 148
- Republic Party of Orange County, California, 23
- Republican candidates, 52
- Republican conservatives, 52
- Republican moderates, 52
- Republican Party
 - central factor, 19
 - conservative activists, 153
 - donors, 52–53
 - faction in, 116
 - factors, 12
 - influence of, 23
 - right shift, 34, 51, 59, 115
- Resources
 - control over, 143
 - and factional power, 18
 - theory of dependency, 7
- Results, catastrophic, 141
- Rights, 128
- Rival party, factions of, 17
- Roll call votes, 26
- Rosenthal, Howard, 148

- Schattschneider, E. E., 16
- Schwarzenegger, Arnold, 20
- Senate Conservatives Fund, 21
- Shadow parties, 25, 125, 152
- Shor, Boris, 26, 32, 97
- Skepticism, 148–49

- Small donors, 38, 42–43, 45, 59, 114, 138–39, 147–48, 152
- Social welfare, 132
- Soft money, 3, 111, 122, 131, 141, 145
- Solidarity on principals, 10
- SpeechNow.org v. FEC*, 122, 125
- Stability, 88
- State legislative, vs. central party committee, 23
- State legislative elections, 114
- State limitation, 122
- State parties, 28, 31, 43, 48, 63, 119, 130–31, 137, 141, 154
- State party financing, 141
- State party platform, 23
- State placed limits, 32
- State political parties, 29
- State-based empirical approach, 26–30
- Super PACs, 4, 40, 112, 125, 130–32, 146, 152, 154
- Supreme Court, 39–40, 145–46
- Swing voters, 67. *See also* median voters
- System-level approach, 4

- Taft, William Howard, 32
- Target Corporation, 126
- Tax payments, to political parties, 139
- Tea Party activists, 17
- Theoretical approach
 - parties as competing factions, 15–18
 - pragmatists vs. purists, 16–17
 - resources and factional power, 18
- Think tanks, 112
- Transparency, 4, 130–31, 144
- TV, 18, 25, 126, 130, 141
- Two-top primary reform, 20

- UCLA approach, 11, 109
- Unequal Democracy (Bartels), 148
- Unions, 7, 27–28, 65–66, 69–70, 72, 74, 76, 82, 84–85, 116–17, 122, 125–28, 131, 154, 157
- United States Brewer's Association, 121
- U.S. Congress, campaign finance laws effects of, 30
- U.S. Constitution, 39

- Very liberal donors, 115
- Vote-by-mail campaign, 130
- Voter mobilization, 130
- Voter signature drives, 154
- Voucher program, 140
- Voucher system, 140

- Warner, Mark, 17
- Warren, Elizabeth, 17, 115
- Washington, George, 2
- Wealthy donors, 3, 36, 39–41, 44, 48, 54, 87, 107, 114, 119, 125, 127–28, 134, 146, 148–50, 152–53, 159–60
- Westminster-style political parties, 15

- Wildavsky, Aaron, 13
- Wilson, James Q., 13
- Winning, focus on, 116
- Winning elections
 - benefits path, 109
 - candidates, 90
 - concern with, 117
 - focus on, 7
 - insider goal, 8–9, 22–23
 - investment in, 67–68
 - political party and, 66
 - power gained through, 8
 - pragmatic orientation, 118
 - premium on, 86