

What Is Soft Money In Politics

What Is Soft Money In Politics

Downloaded from everybodystreet.com by Graham & Krueger

UNDERSTANDING SOFT MONEY IN POLITICS

In the complex landscape of political fundraising and campaign finance, few terms carry as much weight—or as much controversy—as **soft money**. To understand modern elections, one must first grasp what soft money in politics means, how it differs from other types of political contributions, and why it has been a focal point for reformers, lawmakers, and watchdog groups. Soft money refers to funds contributed to political parties for "party-building" activities rather than for the direct promotion of a specific candidate. While this definition sounds straightforward, the practical implications have shaken the foundations of campaign finance law.

This article will explore the origins of soft money, how it has been used historically, the key legislation that attempted to regulate it, and its lasting impact on American elections. By the end, you will have a clear understanding of what soft money in politics entails and why it remains a hot-button issue.

THE DEFINITION: WHAT IS SOFT MONEY IN POLITICS?

At its core, **soft money** is a category of political contribution that exists outside the limits and prohibitions of federal campaign finance law. Unlike **hard money**—which is given directly to a candidate's campaign and is strictly regulated in terms of amount, source, and disclosure—soft money is donated to political party committees, such as the Democratic National Committee (DNC) or the Republican National Committee (RNC), for purposes like voter registration, get-out-the-vote drives, issue advocacy, and administrative expenses.

The key distinction is that soft money was not supposed to be used to expressly advocate for the election or defeat of a particular federal candidate. In theory, it funded generic party activities. In practice, however, soft money often blurred the line between party building and candidate promotion, leading to widespread criticism and eventual regulatory changes.

Soft Money vs. Hard Money

To fully appreciate the controversy, you need to see how soft money compares to hard money. Hard money contributions are:

- Subject to strict federal limits (e.g., per-election or per-year caps).
- Banned from corporate and union treasuries (since the Tillman Act of 1907 and later the Taft-Hartley Act).
- Fully disclosed to the Federal Election Commission (FEC).

Soft money, prior to 2002, had no contribution limits and could come from corporations, unions, and wealthy individuals. It was not subject to the same disclosure rules, making it a powerful tool for those seeking to influence elections without the constraints of the law.

THE RISE OF SOFT MONEY IN THE 1990S

The modern era of soft money began in the late 1970s and accelerated throughout the 1990s. After the Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA) of 1971 and its 1974 amendments, political parties discovered they could raise unlimited funds for "party-building" activities. By the 1996 presidential election cycle, both major parties were raising hundreds of millions of dollars in soft money, often from corporations and labor unions that were legally prohibited from contributing hard money.

Critics argued that these unregulated contributions gave wealthy donors and special interests disproportionate influence over legislation and party platforms. The phrase "soft money loophole" entered the public lexicon as journalists reported on how donors could give six- and seven-figure checks to parties and then be rewarded with access to high-ranking officials. The two parties competed aggressively to attract these funds, leading to an escalating arms race of political spending.

Common Uses of Soft Money

Soft money was used in a variety of ways that often walked a fine line between legitimate party activities and indirect candidate support:

1. **Issue advertising** – Parties ran ads supporting or opposing policies (like healthcare reform or tax cuts) that also subtly praised or attacked a candidate. These ads avoided using "magic words" like "vote for" or "defeat" to evade regulation.
2. **Get-out-the-vote (GOTV) drives** – Soft money funded massive voter mobilization efforts that disproportionately benefited the party's candidates.
3. **Building party infrastructure** – Funds paid for staff salaries, polling, data analytics, and headquarters operations—all of which freed up hard money for direct candidate promotion.

THE BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN REFORM ACT (BCRA) OF 2002

In response to growing public concern, Senators John McCain (R-AZ) and Russ Feingold (D-WI) spearheaded the **Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act**, commonly known as the McCain-Feingold Act. This landmark law, passed in 2002, effectively banned soft money contributions to national political parties at the federal level. The law prohibited national party committees from raising or spending any funds that were not subject to federal limits and disclosure.

The BCRA also restricted issue advertising by corporations and unions in the 60 days before a general election and 30 days before a primary. Supporters of the law believed it would curtail the corrupting influence of large, unregulated donations. The Supreme Court upheld the soft-money ban in the 2003 decision *McConnell v. FEC*, though later rulings would chip away at other aspects of the law.

Immediate Effects of the Ban

After the BCRA took effect, the flow of soft money to national parties dried up almost overnight. However, critics immediately noticed that money did not disappear from politics—it simply moved. Wealthy donors began contributing unlimited sums to **independent expenditure-only committees**, commonly known as Super PACs, which were created after the 2010 Supreme Court ruling in *Citizens United v. FEC*. These entities could raise unlimited money from corporations, unions, and individuals, but they could not coordinate with candidates. In many ways, the soft money of the 1990s was replaced by the "hard money" of Super PACs.

SOFT MONEY IN THE POST-BCRA ERA

Although the formal soft money system is gone, the term is still used informally to describe any political money that flows outside traditional channels. Some state and local party committees still raise soft money for state elections, as the BCRA only applies to federal races. Additionally, **dark money**—funds from politically active nonprofits that do not disclose their donors—has become a major concern. In this sense, understanding what soft money in politics was provides essential context for today's debates about transparency and influence.

Loopholes and New Strategies

Campaign finance law is a game of cat and mouse. After the ban, political parties found ways to use so-called "Levin funds" (named after Senator Carl Levin) that allowed state parties to raise limited soft money for voter registration and turnout activities, provided the funds were spent under state rules. Moreover, party leaders began forming super PACs themselves to support their candidates, blurring the lines again. Today, the spirit of soft money lives on in the form of independent expenditures that often dwarf candidate-controlled spending.

WHY SOFT MONEY MATTERS FOR DEMOCRACY

The debate over what is **soft money in politics** is ultimately a debate about equality and representation. Proponents of looser regulations argue that political speech should not be limited by government interference and that wealthy donors have a right to support parties and causes they believe in. Opponents counter that unlimited contributions drown out the voices of ordinary citizens and create a system where policy outcomes favor the wealthy.

Research has shown that donor class preferences often align more closely with corporate interests than with the general public. Soft money, in its original form, allowed a small number of influential actors to shape party platforms. Even after the ban, the rise of Super PACs and dark money entities has perpetuated similar concerns. Understanding the history and mechanics of soft money helps citizens evaluate proposed reforms, such as a constitutional amendment to overturn *Citizens United*, public financing of campaigns, or stricter disclosure requirements.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- **Soft money** refers to unregulated funds given to political parties for party-building, not direct candidate advocacy.
- It was largely banned at the federal level by the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002.
- The ban drove money into Super PACs, which operate independently but often align with party interests.
- Soft money remains a key concept for understanding the evolution of campaign finance and current transparency debates.

CONCLUSION

In summary, what is soft money in politics is more than a simple definition—it is a window into the dynamic and often contentious world of election funding. Initially a legal loophole that allowed enormous sums to flow into party coffers, soft money was both a symptom of a broken system and a catalyst for reform. While the formal soft money system has been outlawed for over two decades, its legacy persists in the shape of modern political

spending, where unlimited contributions continue to raise questions about fairness and accountability. As voters and citizens, staying informed about these mechanisms is crucial to understanding how power operates in a democracy. The story of soft money reminds us that the rules governing elections are never static; they evolve with political strategy, legal interpretation, and public pressure. Ultimately, the health of our democracy depends on how we answer the fundamental question: Who gets to fund the conversations that shape our future?