**HOW CANDIDATES MANAGE THEIR CAMPAIGNS**

Candidates will usually construct a small committee of assistants to take on the various tasks in gaining public support and whatnot. Furthermore, candidates and their assistants will work with political parties and political action committees (which are essentially interest groups that donate heavily in money or some electoral thing of value).

These teams consist of experts from many fields, for instance, finance, PR, polling, advertising, or social media.

**FUNDRAISING**

Funds are (A) able to come from a number of sources, (B) must be reported by a candidate or a treasurer acting on behalf of the candidate to a state authority and/or the FEC, and (C) play a major role in a candidate's campaigns.

Sources include:

* Political action committees (hereby referred to as PACs): temporary and sometimes permanent groups often engage in fundraising as a part of their electioneering activities.
  + A “527” organization is an organization that is able to raise unlimited funds for the purpose of influencing government or legislation.
* Political parties: if there is a clear favorite during the election process (i.e. during primaries and nearing towards the general election), political parties usually support their candidates. This usually means incumbent candidates, as the party is sure in their popularity and ability to win again. Political parties also give support through their connections to others, emailing and advertising infrastructure, etc.
  + Overwhelmingly, candidates receive support from political parties, PACs and other entities that are not themselves for campaign financing.
* Individual donations.
  + These derive from fundraising events directed at local communities and whatnot.

**FUNDRAISING REGULATION 1**

Campaigns were first regulated by the Federal Election Campaign Act of ‘71, hereby known as FECA. FECA, in response to growing expenditures by politicians, implemented transparency and mandatory reporting requirements for campaigners.

FECA would later be amended to add things such as:

* individual donor limits
* party and interest group limits
* PAC donor limits (a PAC is legally an org with at least gift persons, donating to at least five candidates and registering with the FEC).
  + PACs are further subdivided into categories based on funding ability:

1. Connected PACs are PACs stemming from labor unions, companies, etc. that are separate and funded by individuals and not the parent, and that are limited in their ability to get and send money.
2. Nonconnected PACs are ones that are independent of any body and can raise money from anywhere, provided they disclose and register.
3. Leadership PACs are started by formerly or currently elected officials, and cannot be used to fund the founder’s campaign but can be used to fund others’ campaigns.
4. Super PACs are large and powerful PACs that were set free by Citizens United v. FEC’s shooting down many restrictions on individual and organizational donations. The one thing is, these groups cannot directly donate to candidates, whereas the other three are able to.
5. Under no circumstances may any PAC (A) coordinate formally with candidates, (B) fail to register or violate any still standing campaign donation rules.

* *overall campaign limits on how much a candidate can draw from their own wealth for the purpose of donating (later ruled unconstitutional by the case Buckley v. Valeo of ‘75).*
* establishing the Federal Election Commission, which was charged with enforcing the laws and maintaining endpoints on which information could be accessed by the public.
* requiring that all candidates register with the FEC and allow the FEC to take their information and release it.

These 1970s regulations however, do not apply to the following:

* donors to parties (who may run ads or otherwise provide aux support for the candidate)
* donors to interest groups, who may serve the same function.
* most forms of soft money (money that does not go directly to a candidate but still supports a campaign).

**FUNDRAISING REGULATION 2**

After the passage of the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act, hereby known as the BCR Act of ‘02, many old loopholes were closed, which included:

* modifying hard money (directly to candidate) limits.
* prohibiting any transfer of soft money for the purpose of or direct execution of electioneering within 60 days of a gen. election and 30 for primaries.
* enforcing disclosures on political ads (where the ad would have to be signed off on by a voice recording of the candidate, stating explicitly and clearly that the candidate is endorsing this message.

These would come under fire, in Citizens United v. FEC of ‘10:

* After the passage of the BCR Act, no organization could be involved in electioneering via communications infrastructure such as TV or radio 30/60 days before an election.
* Some group had made a political video and intended to air it, but were barred from doing so legally by the BCR Act.
* The part of the law responsible for this barring was argued to have violated AM1 and the right to free speech.
* Counterargs included previous district court cases, the impact of money on elections, etc.
* In the end, the court ruled that:
  + independent broadcasts that are not coordinated with the candidate cannot be stopped at any point of an election cycle
  + such independent broadcasts and thus actions carried out by other parties without coordination with candidates are protected political speech and not campaign speech.
  + politically charged talk, even if not for a certain candidate, is still subject to the BCR Act
  + certain provisions limiting use of money by individuals and other orgs such as corps were also unconstitutional. This money, *dark money*, is not subject to rules regarding transparency; and even though disclosure of origin is necessary, disclosure of who funded the ad was not.

**OBTAINING PR**

1. A candidate officially files and records themselves as running.
2. Candidates usually draw distinct lines from their opponents. This is the result of people voting off of very little info and thus needing clear lines and boundaries to make decisions. After drawing the lines, candidates then flame the living fuck out of other candidates by searching through archives and whatnot for dirt on their opponents. These messages are transmitted through many means.
3. Candidates are also welcome to debate, which can be beneficial or detrimental to their campaigns.
4. Candidates usually use tracking polls and ask pollsters to keep track of the population as a tool of maintaining good PR.
5. Candidates setting up social media accounts and posting their curated content on there (i.e. interviews, tours of local communities).
   1. This can also include advertisements
   2. The use of social media and the digital age has allowed for selecting a certain demographic to advertise to; gone were the days of crafting messages for everyone on one platform. The extreme of this, dark ads, is the practice of targeting certain demographics or psychographics and manipulating their emotions.
6. Candidates are sometimes covered by news media outlets, and are also sometimes given ads on these news/comms outlets. When the candidate is covered and benefits, it is almost entirely free, but since the candidate can’t control what is being said, the news could also screw over prospective officials. The use of emotions, shooting at opponents, clear distinction and quick and snappy production are commonplace amongst political candidate derived advertisements.

**2016 CAMPAIGN**

Due to an immense amount of deviations, unusual and unorthodox conduct and plain bullshit, the book has included the 2016 general elections for Presidents as a part of the chapter.

Some remarks:

1. The 2016 general election saw the greatest amount of money spent on advertising and PR.
2. The 2016 general election saw an unprecedented amount of candidates, at over 20, all of which attacked the other with an unprecedented viciousness.
3. Trump was accused of sexually assaulting women when a hot mic recording was released of him that evidenced such activity.
4. Clinton won 48% of the national vote, Trump 46%, and the remainder 6% split amongst third party candidates, but due to very thin margins in certain battleground states, Trump managed to win the EC.
5. There is some evidence to suggest that Russians and other foreign powers were involved in tampering with the election.
6. There was a large spike of voting restrictions around this time, such as voter ID laws and limits on early voting.