

November 20, 1980

THE ROLE OF CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS IN THE 1980 U.S. SENATE ELECTIONS

INTRODUCTION

There were twenty-four Democrat-held and ten Republican-held seats at stake in the 1980 Senate elections. Two Democrats, Stevenson and Ribicoff, as well as three Republicans, Schweiker, Bellmon and Young, had retired. One Republican senator, Javits, was defeated in a primary while three Democrats, Gravel, Stone, and Stewart, were also primary losers. This left six Republican incumbents and nineteen Democrat incumbents running in the general election.

The Republicans won twenty-two of the thirty-four races, including seven of the nine races for open seats caused by primary defeat or retirement, and retained all ten of the seats held by Republicans before the elections. All Republican incumbents won their races, while only ten of the nineteen Democrat incumbents won re-election.

There will be sixteen new Republicans and two new Democrats in the new Senate, which will consist of fifty-three Republicans, forty-six Democrats, and one Independent.

It is interesting to note that when the new Senate convenes in January, fifty-four of the 100 senators (thirty-five Republicans and nineteen Democrats) will be serving their first terms, and only twenty-five senators (fifteen Democrats, nine Republicans and one Independent) will have been elected before 1970.

This short paper, consisting primarily of statistical tables, presents some analyses of the 1980 Senate Elections. Tables E and F, which contain some preliminary statistics about campaign finances, might be of special interest. Since the elections, much has been written about the connection between election victory and campaign contributions. There have been charges that the

Republican landslide was simply "bought." Specifically, the electoral defeats of four of the most prominent Democrat liberals, Senators Bayh, Culver, Church and McGovern, have provoked many arguments. Yet, in three of the four races, excepting only the Culver vs. Grassley contest, the Democrat incumbent raised more in campaign contributions than his Republican challenger. And, this paper shows that in only eight of the eighteen races won by narrow margins (54 percent or less) did the winner receive more in campaign contributions than his opponent.

For two reasons, this paper does not deal with the controversial issue of independent expenditures by political action committees. First, no complete and up-to-date statistics are available as yet. Secondly, the question whether independent expenditures help or hinder candidates is based largely on speculation and is probably unresolvable. Equally unresolvable is the charge that in-kind contributions by labor unions -- contributions that are not required to be reported under the Federal Election Campaign Act -- are significant elements in the campaigns of liberal Democrats. That question is not dealt with here. Additionally, the much-discussed "power of incumbency," that is, the significant advantages that incumbents have in running for re-election, is not treated in this paper.

THE TREND TO THE WEST AND THE SOUTH

Highlights of Tables A, B, and C of the Appendix

In the last three Senate elections, the Republicans have done a much better job of protecting their incumbents than the Democrats. Twenty-four Democrat incumbents, but only seven Republican incumbents, have been defeated for re-election in the last three elections.

From Table B, it can be seen that the ability of the Democratic Party to control both Senate seats in individual states has declined continually since 1974. In that year, a plurality of states had two Democrat senators while today a plurality of states are split with one Democrat senator and one Republican senator. Additionally, the Republicans now hold both Senate seats in more states than the Democrats.

From Table C, it can be seen that the new Republican majority in the Senate has been constructed from states in the West and the South. In 1974, the West was split evenly between the two parties. Today, the Republicans hold a commanding 24-14 margin. The most remarkable Republican gains have been in the South where, it seems, the old "Solid South" has now been completely destroyed. In 1974, the Democratic Party still held both Senate seats in six states. Today, only two southern states (Arkansas and Louisiana) have two Democrat senators.

THE MARGINS OF VICTORY IN THE 1980 SENATE ELECTIONS (Table D)

Of the eighteen races where the margin of victory was narrow (54 percent or less), the Republicans were victorious in fifteen. Of the eleven Democrat incumbents who were involved in narrow races, eight were defeated. Of the sixteen Republican winners in narrow races, six collected more votes in their races than Reagan did in those states. Of the sixteen races where the margin of victory was wide (55 percent or greater), incumbents won eleven.

SENATE CAMPAIGN FINANCES -- SOME PRELIMINARY OBSERVATIONS

Tables E and F show the gross campaign receipts of all the major candidates for the Senate in the 1980 elections. These tables are based on each candidate's final pre-election report (October 23) to the Federal Election Commission. But that final report covers receipts only through October 15. So it must be noted that these statistics are very preliminary. The final totals will not be available from the FEC until the beginning of December. Additionally, since the receipts are gross unaudited receipts, the totals for some candidates might be inflated. Nevertheless, some highlights:

In twenty-one of the thirty-four races, the eventual winner received the most in contributions.

In only eight of the eighteen close races did the winner receive the most in contributions.

Twenty-six of the sixty-eight major candidates received more than \$1 million in contributions.

Thirteen of these twenty-six were incumbents.

Only six of these incumbents were winners.

Only fourteen of the twenty-six millionaires were winners.

Four of the five receiving more than \$2 million in contributions were Democrats.

Of the twenty-six candidates receiving more than \$1 million in contributions:

- eight were Republican winners
- seven were Democrat winners
- three were Republican losers
- eight were Democrat losers

Of the twenty-six candidates receiving more than \$1 million in contributions:

sixteen were involved in close races
five of the remaining 10 were incumbents

In seven of the thirty-four races, both candidates received more than \$1 million in contributions.

THE NEW REPUBLICAN SENATE AND THE FUTURE SENATE ELECTIONS

Table G shows a remarkable fact about the new Senate: twelve of twenty chairmen of Senate committees are from the West; nine of the chairman of the fifteen major committees are from the West.

Table H shows which senators will be up for re-election in the 1982 and 1984 elections.

Thomas R. Ascik
Policy Analyst

Table A

After the Senate Elections of:	<u>New Senators</u>		<u>Incumbents Defeated</u>					<u>Change of Seats</u>	
	D	R	<u>Primary</u>		<u>General</u>		Ind	D to R	R to D
			D	R	D	R			
1974	9	2	1	1	0	2	-	1	5
1976	10	8	0	0	5	3	1	7	8
1978	9	11	2	1	5	2	-	8	5
1980	2	16	3	1	9	0	-	12	0

Table B

After the Senate Elections of:	Senate Lineup	Number of States with 2 Dem. Senators	Number of States with 2 Rep. Senators	Number of States with 1 Dem. & 1 Rep.	Other
1974	D-60 R-38 Ind-2	21	8	19	N.Y.-1 Rep.-1 Ind. Va.-1 Rep.-1 Ind.
1976	D-61 R-38 Ind-1	19	7	23	Va.-1 Rep.-1 Ind.
1978	D-58 R-41 Ind-1	16	7	26	Va.-1 Rep.-1 Ind.
1980	R-53 D-46 Ind-1	11	14	24	Va.-1 Rep-1 Ind

Table C

After the Senate Elections of:	19* Western States			10* Southern States									
	The number of states with:			Total from West			The number of states with:			Total from South			
	<u>2D</u>	<u>2R</u>	<u>ID-IR</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>R</u>	<u>2D</u>	<u>2R</u>	<u>ID-IR</u>	<u>IR-1</u>	<u>Ind</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>R</u>	<u>I</u>
1974	5	5	9	19	19	6	1	2	1	1	14	5	1
1976	5	6	8	18	20	6	0	3	1	1	15	4	1
1978	4	5	10	18	20	5	0	4	1	1	14	5	1
1980	3	8	8	14	24	2	1	6	1	1	10	9	1

*Alaska, Hawaii, and the seventeen states west of the line formed by the eastern boundaries of Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, Nebraska, South Dakota, and North Dakota

*Florida, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas, Tennessee, South Carolina, North Carolina, Virginia

Table D

1980 Senate Races According to the Narrowness of the Victories

*Incumbent

<u>State</u>	<u>Winner</u>	<u>Winning</u> <u>%</u>	<u>Votes for</u> <u>Winner</u>	<u>Loser</u>	<u>Votes for</u> <u>Reagan</u>
<u>54% or less (18)</u>					
Wash.	Gorton(R)	54	832,752	*Magnuson	763,631
Ind.	Quayle(R)	54	1,164,678	*Bayh	1,231,295
Iowa	Grassley(R)	54	684,701	*Culver	676,556
Ok.	Nickles(R)	53	573,339	Coats	683,807
Ore.	*Packwood(R)	52	578,046	Kulongski	555,859
Mo.	*Eagleton(D)	52	1,057,467	McNary	1,055,355
N.H.	Rudman(R)	52	195,053	*Durkin	221,771
Ala.	Denton(R)	51	638,944	Folsom	640,621
Colo.	*Hart(D)	51	585,776	Buchanon	650,749
Fla.	Hawkins(R)	51	1,732,828	Gunter	1,937,269
Pa.	Specter(R)	51	2,238,516	Flaherty	2,251,058
Vt.	*Leahy(D)	51	103,185	Ledbetter	93,443
Wis.	Kasten(R)	51	1,101,669	*Nelson	1,089,750
Ga.	Mattingly(R)	51	788,757	*Talmadge	870,483 (Carter)
Ari.	*Goldwater(R)	50	426,171	Schulz	523,124
Ida.	Symms(R)	50	218,793	*Church	290,087
N.C.	East(R)	50	891,373	*Morgan	913,949
N.Y.	D'Amato(R)	45	2,627,458	Holtzman	2,790,498
<u>55% or more (16)</u>					
La.	*Long(D)	unopposed			796,240
Haw.	*Inouye(D)	78	224,485	Brown	135,879 (Carter)
Utah	*Garn(R)	74	433,943	Berman	435,839
S.C.	*Hollings(D)	72	595,210	Mays	445,414
Ohio	*Glenn(D)	71	2,731,377	Betts	2,202,212
N.D.	Andrews(R)	71	189,170	Johanneson	173,825
Md.	*Matthias(R)	66	811,925	Conroy	706,327 (Carter)
Ky.	*Ford(D)	65	719,679	Foust	625,820
Kan.	*Dole(R)	64	595,194	Simpson	562,848
Ark.	*Bumpers(D)	59	473,132	Clark	402,946
Cal.	*Cranston(D)	59	4,638,488	Gann	4,447,266
Nev.	*Laxalt(R)	58	143,781	Gojack	154,570
S.D.	Abdnor(R)	58	190,726	*McGovern	198,102
Conn.	Dodd(D)	57	765,126	Buckley	672,648
Ill.	Dixon(D)	56	2,494,254	O'Neal	2,342,450
Alas.	Murkowski(R)	55	65,924	Gruening	66,874

<u>State</u>	<u>Candidate</u>	<u>Total Receipts</u>
Washington	Slade Gorton(R) Warren Magnuson(D)	608,667 1,271,012
Wisconsin	Robert Kasten(R) Gaylord Nelson(D)	373,439 733,474

Table F

Senators with receipts over \$1 million (26)

*incumbent

Packwood(R)*	Ore.	\$2,783,071	winner
McGovern(D)*	S.D.	2,695,438	loser
Cranston(D)*	Cal.	2,675,975	winner
Bayh(D)*	Ind.	2,223,006	loser
Dixon(D)	Ill.	2,129,180	winner
Long(D)*	La.	1,974,412	winner unopposed
Talmadge(D)*	Ga.	1,925,863	loser
Quayle(R)	Ind.	1,874,063	winner
Javits(R)*	N.Y.	1,674,888	loser
Holtzman(D)	N.Y.	1,661,929	loser
Church(D)*	Ida.	1,644,271	loser
Grassley(R)	Iowa	1,635,276	winner
Symms(R)	Ida.	1,528,911	winner
Schulz(D)	Ari.	1,389,443	loser
Culver(D)*	Iowa	1,385,477	loser
Abdnor(R)	S.D.	1,383,448	winner
Buckley(R)	Conn.	1,362,996	loser
Magnuson(D)*	Wash.	1,271,012	loser
Gunter(D)	Fla.	1,245,174	loser
D'Amato(R)	N.Y.	1,244,757	winner
Glenn(D)*	Ohio	1,148,947	winner
O'Neal(R)	Ill.	1,145,843	loser
Eagleton(D)*	Mo.	1,142,854	winner
Dodd(D)	Conn.	1,111,109	winner
Specter(R)	Pa.	1,039,826	winner
Dole(R)*	Kan.	1,033,628	winner

Table G

Probable Committee Chairman in the Next Senate

Agriculture - Helms
Appropriations - Hatfield
Armed Services - Tower
Banking - Garn
Budget - Domenici
Commerce - Packwood
Energy - McClure
Environment and Public Works - Stafford
Finance - Dole
Foreign Affairs - Percy
Government Affairs - Roth
Judiciary - Thurmond
Labor and Human Resources - Hatch
Rules - ?
Veterans - Simpson

Select Committee on: Ethics - Schmitt
Indian Affairs - Cohen
Intelligence - Goldwater
Small Business - Hayakawa
Aging - Heinz

1982 Senate Elections

Democrats (20)

DeConcini
 Chiles
 Matsunaga
 Mitchell
 Kennedy
 Riegle
 Stennis
 Melcher
 Zorinsky
 Cannon
 Williams
 Moynihan
 Burdick
 Metzenbaum
 Sasser
 Bentsen
 Jackson
 Byrd (W.Va.)
 Proxmire
 Sarbanes

Byrd (Va.)

Republicans (12)

Hayakawa
 Weiker
 Roth
 Lugar
 Danforth
 Durenberger
 Schmitt
 Heinz
 Chafee
 Hatch
 Stafford
 Wallop

1984 Senate Elections

Democrats (14)

Heflin
 Pryor
 Biden
 Nunn
 Huddleston
 Johnston
 Tsongas
 Levin
 Baucus
 Exon
 Bradley
 Boren
 Pell
 Randolph

Republicans (19)

Stevens
 Armstrong
 McClure
 Percy
 Jepsen
 Kassebaum
 Cohen
 Boschwitz
 Cochran
 Humphrey
 Domenici
 Helms
 Hatfield
 Thurmond
 Pressler
 Baker
 Tower
 Warner
 Simpson