

D. Bruce La Pierre

*Campaign Contribution Limits: Pandering to Public Fears
About “Big Money” and Protecting Incumbents*

52 Admin. L. Rev. 687 (2000)

Abstract by Rosy Lor

The author begins with a discussion of *Buckley v. Valeo*, and argues that the Supreme Court’s upholding of limits on federal campaign contributions, which were not based on any showing of harm, gave Congress substantial power to limit speech and association. The article discusses the Supreme Court’s development of the “real harm” standard in the regulation of commercial speech and how Shrink Missouri Government PAC (SMG) employed these cases to attack Missouri’s law on limits on campaign contributions. The article then examines the background of the Eighth Circuit case *Shrink Missouri Government PAC v. Adams* and provides arguments against Missouri’s justifications for limiting campaign contributions, particularly the notion that the public inherently perceives corruption when candidates receive an unlimited amount of contributions. Finally, the article analyzes and critiques the Supreme Court’s reversal of *Shrink Missouri Government* and concludes that the Court subordinated the First Amendment to the “predilections of the legislature.”