Campaign Finance and Political Polarization

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

Published by University of Michigan Press

Schaffner, Brian F. and Raymond J. La Raja.
Campaign Finance and Political Polarization: When Purists Prevail.

For additional information about this book
https://muse.jhu.edu/book/42636

For content related to this chapter
https://muse.jhu.edu/related_content?type=book&id=1665277
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)
Index

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
groundwater, 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
Index

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
Ideologue, 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
Mediation, 24, 128, 148
Mega-donors, 112
Milyo, Jeff, 27
Minimalist approach, 136
Moderate candidates, 30
Moderate politics, 23
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 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 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 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 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
depend on, 110
donations for, 40
donors, 41
donors use for, 36
electoral system, 38
evaluations of, 42
favored, 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
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
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
United States Brewer’s Association, 121
U.S. Congress, campaign finance laws effects of, 30
U.S. Constitution, 39
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very liberal donors</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote-by-mail campaign</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voter mobilization</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voter signature drives</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voucher program</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voucher system</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warner, Mark</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren, Elizabeth</td>
<td>17, 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, George</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster-style political parties</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildavsky, Aaron</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, James Q.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winning, focus on</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winning elections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>benefits path</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>candidates</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concern with</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>focus on</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>insider goal</td>
<td>8–9, 22–23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>investment in</td>
<td>67–68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>political party and</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>power gained through</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pragmatic orientation</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>premium on</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>