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Proposal?

Dirty money. Dirty stinky money. Smells like corruption. When you think of a bribe You probably imagine a criminal in a trench coat who is paying off a policeman or something similar. However, today in America there is no secrecy surrounding bribes, and they are done in the wide open. Figures like the Koch brothers have their hands in every pot, using their wealth to control every aspect of our political system from the media, to campaigning, and even having partial control over the decisions made in congress. While there are many components to creating this kind of power, a large part of this stems from our current campaign finance system, specifically the existence of Super PAC’s (Political Action Commitees). There are no caps on the amount of money individuals or corporations can donate to these Super PAC’s. Though these organizations are not supposed to communicate or cooperate with the campaign directly, many play fast and loose with this rule, and the enforcement of it is quite underwhelming. This allows large corporations to donate unlimited amounts of money to campaigns (though technically indirectly), giving these companies power over whose campaign is successful. Politicians have an incentive to treat these special interest groups very well, and this shapes how our policy is formed here in the United States. Politics play favorites towards the industries that give them the most money, because that is how the American democratic system has been built. The Citizens United court ruling should be overturned in order to give corporations and special interest groups less power in our political system.

The status quo of our political system is corruption. Establishment politics are tainted by the influence of many private entities, making it less and less for the people at large. The reason for this is due to these companies and people in power over who wins and who loses elections, in large part because of our current campaign finance policy. The power that large industries and corporations wield is far and wide, many industries receive a staggering amount of special treatment just because the right people donated to the right candidate.

Millions and millions of dollars are poured into Super PAC’s for many different politicians. Some of these campaigns are successful and others are not, but regardless it inherently corrupts our political system, taking power out of the hands of the individual and putting it in the hands of those that already wield the most power. Allowing corporations and individuals to donate unlimited amounts of money allows for self-governance among the ultra-wealthy and the private sector.

Among the ten largest weapons manufacturers in the world, seven of them are from the United States. There is a lot of money to be made, so weapons manufacturing companies want to ensure that we continue to fight wars. To do this, many will donate large sums of money to Super PAC’s in order to elect candidates that will be more militaristic. Every election cycle, all of the largest arms manufacturers donate several million dollars to their candidate of choice. Being war happy is a good way to get your campaign funded, and so many establishment candidates, as a result, have been very pro-military. From George W. Bush, to Barack Obama, and even to Hilary Clinton, this militaristic approach to foreign policy only grows worse, and as it becomes the norm the public thinks about it less and less.

Some may say that this is not a direct form of corruption. On the contrary, the incentive to act in one way or another is determined directly by how it may affect one’s campaign finance. To solve this Super PAC’s must be altered greatly or eliminated entirely. Should we alter these committees, there are several changes that must be incurred. The first change is to limit the amount of spending that any individual can donate to the Super PAC. For normal donations, politicians are allowed to receive 2700 dollars per election cycle from an individual. If they take one donation in the primaries and one in the general election, they take a maximum of 5700. Super PAC’s should be able to take slightly more than direct donations, as they are not directly tied to one specific candidate, but limits must be in place because of their inherently corrupt qualities. The limit should be no greater than six thousand dollars, allowing companies and individuals to finance campaigns to a certain extent, but not so much that it outweighs the direct donations. This will incentivize more of these direct donations, allowing more people to have a voice in our political system.

In order to put these limits in place it is likely that we will have to overturn the Citezens United court ruling, the one that allows limitless individual and corporate spending towards political action committees.

How does this solution solve the problem

Eradicating the existence of limitless superpacs will help uncorrupt our politics because private entities will no longer have the power to choose who wins and loses elections, giving politicians no incentive to prioritize industries over the good of the American people.
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*Heather’s notes: Love the illustrative intro. I know you’ll fine-tune this as you go along, but make sure to clearly define what the Citizen’s United court ruling is somewhere in your intro before you get to the thesis statement, and how it plays into the culture of political corruption that you observe! There are probably some great examples you can cite about how Super PAC money seems to have made a clear difference in how specific issues were legislated to drive this home in a tangible way. Last thing: you can probably be slightly more specific about what it means to put caps on Super PACs (e.g. how much money is too much, etc.) ☺*

What are we if not manifestations of each other’s conscious minds? Does observation qualify reality or is there an underlying objective reality? Will this distinction ever matter? It seems that it will be impossible to answer these questions until we can properly model the human mind (a task so gargantuan it may never be done).
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