

Obama's victory changed nothing: "it's the money stupid"

 blogs.lse.ac.uk/polis/2008/11/13/obamas-victory-changed-nothing-its-the-money-stupid/

2008-11-13

I have written [elsewhere](#) about how Obama's campaign was radically different. In terms of tactics, methods, participation, new media and race it seemed to signal a shift. But one cold [fact](#) reminds us that nothing has changed about US politics. In fact it has got 'worse'. The [evidence](#) is that money still decides elections from the top to the bottom of the democratic structure.

[In 90% of races in 2008 the person who spent the most money won.](#) According to Opensecrets.org:

"Continuing a trend seen election cycle after election cycle, the biggest spender was victorious in 397 of 426 decided House races and 30 of 32 settled Senate races. On Election Day 2006, top spenders won 94 percent of House races and 73 percent of Senate races. In 2004, 98 percent of House seats went to the biggest spender, as did 88 percent of Senate seats."

Of course, this could simply reflect the fact that the best candidate, or the most popular person will raise more funds.

But it could also reflect the ability of lobby groups to swing campaigns.

At the very least it shows how reliant US democracy is upon expensive campaigning methods.

.

- Copyright © 2014 London School of Economics and Political Science