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- Political advocacy via board members and executives
  - Board members give at high rates: Of a sample of 412 board members from 37 major corporations, only 46 have not made political donations (28 of whom are foreign nationals).
  - Trend whereby corporations recruit former Members of Congress or lobbyists to serve on their boards
    - e.g. *Al Gore* (Apple, Frito-Lay, Midwest Ventures), *Sam Nunn* (Chevron, Coca-Cola, General Electric, Texaco, Dell), *Dick Gephardt* (Ford Motors, United States Steel, Centene, Aravo, Spirit Aerosystems, Embarq, CenturyLink, Extend Health)
## Political Spending by Non-Profits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Election Cycle</th>
<th>Federal Lobbying</th>
<th>Independent Expenditures</th>
<th>Transfers to 527s</th>
<th>Federal PAC Contributions</th>
<th>State Elections</th>
<th>Ballot Campaigns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$484M</td>
<td>$42.0M</td>
<td>$100.7M</td>
<td>$55.1M</td>
<td>$44.5M</td>
<td>$119.3M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$611M</td>
<td>$22.5M</td>
<td>$26.9M</td>
<td>$72.5M</td>
<td>$70.6M</td>
<td>$163.9M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$780 M</td>
<td>$77.6M</td>
<td>$29.4M</td>
<td>$71.7M</td>
<td>$57.5M</td>
<td>$158.8M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$1,012 M</td>
<td>$155.9M</td>
<td>$46.8M</td>
<td>$72.7M</td>
<td>$56.6M</td>
<td>$110.6M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Political Spending by For-Profit Corporations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Election Cycle</th>
<th>Federal Lobbying</th>
<th>Independent Expenditures</th>
<th>527s</th>
<th>Federal PAC Contributions</th>
<th>State Elections</th>
<th>Ballot Campaigns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$3,318M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$96.8M</td>
<td>$281.9M</td>
<td>$269.6M</td>
<td>$269.6M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$3,035M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$90.1M</td>
<td>$340.6M</td>
<td>$403.6M</td>
<td>$403.6M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$3,835M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$115.5M</td>
<td>$387.1M</td>
<td>$334.8M</td>
<td>$334.8M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$5,177M</td>
<td>$15.5M</td>
<td>$140.6M</td>
<td>$400.1M</td>
<td>$287.0M</td>
<td>$287.1M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Political Spending by For-Profit Corporations

- Ballot Campaigns
- State Elections
- Federal PAC Contributions
- 527s
- Independent Expenditures
- Federal Lobbying

$ Millions
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Election Cycle</th>
<th>Disclosed Corporate $</th>
<th>501(c) transfer to 527</th>
<th>Ind. Exp. (No Disclosure)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$100.7M</td>
<td>$7.2M</td>
<td>$107.9M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$26.9M</td>
<td>$5.1M</td>
<td>$32M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$29.4M</td>
<td>$91.2M</td>
<td>$120.6M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$15.5M</td>
<td>$46.8M</td>
<td>$142.6M</td>
<td>$189.4M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- There was **at most** $205M in corporate expenditures in 2010, or 5.6% of all federal expenditures.
Disclosure of Outside Spending

Outside Spending by Disclosure, Excluding Party Committees

Donor Disclosure Analysis of Outside Spending 1990 - 2010
Outside Spending in Federal Elections

- Communication Costs
- Electioneering Communications
- Independent Expenditures
- Federal 527s

Millions $

2004: 450
2006: 150
2008: 250
2010: 350
2012: 100
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- Collected contributions to state and federal elections for a sample of 50 mega-donors to super PACs
  - Among the largest all-time donors are Bob Perry ($98.6M), Sheldon Adelson ($15.8M), Steven Bing ($85.9M), A J Perenchio ($42M), and Richard Devos ($58.5M).
  - In total, these 50 individuals have donated over $611M
    - $435M donated during the 2004-2008 Election cycles
    - $117M donated during the 2010-2012 Election cycles
  - \textbf{The implication}: Mega-donors found ways to donate unlimited amounts to politics before \textit{CU}. \textit{CU} and super PACs have just made giving easier by removing uncertainty and reducing organizational burdens.
Data Sources

- FEC.gov
- opensecrets.org (Center for Responsive Politics)
- Followthemoney.org (National Institute for Money in State Politics)
- transparencydata.org (Sunlight Foundation)
- Guidestar.org
Policy Disconnects

The graph illustrates the trend of Policy Disconnects over time. The x-axis represents the years from 1979 to 2009, labeled as 'Election', while the y-axis shows the CFscore ranging from -0.5 to 0.5. Three lines are depicted, each representing different trends in policy disconnects. The red line shows a consistent positive trend, the black line indicates a declining trend with fluctuations, and the blue line displays a more gradual decline. The graph suggests a pattern of growing policy disconnects over the specified period.