

ever, there is some inevitable distortion of the data. For example, there are a number of cases in Washington, DC, where there are downtown zip codes with high numbers of people of color as residents that are also generous sources of campaign contributions. This is most likely not because people of color are giving the campaign contributions, but rather because a large number of lobbyists and other professionals either reside or, more likely, have offices in the same zip codes, and skew the picture. Indeed, contributions by zip code may generally be skewed by people who list their place of work rather than their home address on contributions.

In addition, contributions associated with zip codes with no Census information on race/ethnicity are not included in this study, since we cannot determine what the racial/ethnic makeup of the neighborhood is. There are a number of reasons why this situation may occur. For example, a zip code may be taken up entirely by the headquarters of a company, or may be the location of an airport or an Army base. The amount of campaign contributions coming from these zip codes is not enormous when compared to the total contributed, but neither is it insignificant—less than eight percent of the 2000 and 2002 contributions analyzed in this study. It can be assumed that, were it possible to determine the racial/ethnic makeup of the donors of this sum, that the pattern of giving, of non-Hispanic white donors dominating, would be similar to that demonstrated in this report.

In rare cases where there are negative campaign contribution amounts—which are attributable to refunded contributions—these contributions are added to totals.

###

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I: CONTRIBUTIONS BY STATE

FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS, RACE, ETHNICITY, AND INCOME BY STATE

Individual Federal Contributions (\$200+)
2000 & 2002 Election Cycles Combined

State	Total federal contributions	Amount per capita (population 18 and over)	% from predominantly non-Hispanic white zip codes	% from zip codes predominantly people of color	% from wealthy zip codes	% from zip codes with high levels of poverty
California	\$273,093,840	\$11.09	84.6%	15.4%	65.6%	8.3%
New York	\$205,682,579	\$14.40	93.6%	6.4%	77.5%	2.3%
Texas	\$152,074,175	\$10.17	77.2%	22.8%	42.7%	6.0%
Florida	\$112,127,585	\$9.09	83.4%	16.6%	36.6%	4.7%
New Jersey	\$92,272,171	\$14.58	89.1%	10.9%	73.5%	1.8%
Illinois	\$91,217,094	\$9.94	93.5%	6.5%	69.0%	2.3%
Virginia	\$77,657,924	\$14.54	93.6%	6.4%	60.2%	2.1%
Pennsylvania	\$75,721,689	\$8.09	96.3%	3.7%	42.8%	5.5%
Ohio	\$59,606,043	\$7.04	93.3%	6.7%	35.5%	9.9%
Massachusetts	\$55,439,428	\$11.43	97.4%	2.6%	72.3%	3.0%
Michigan	\$53,855,493	\$7.33	91.7%	8.3%	44.7%	7.3%
Maryland	\$51,434,748	\$13.05	83.7%	16.3%	67.8%	7.5%
District of Columbia	\$51,194,290	\$112.01	72.3%	27.7%	50.5%	8.0%
Georgia	\$51,047,116	\$8.48	86.5%	13.5%	38.7%	8.4%
Connecticut	\$43,988,986	\$17.16	94.5%	5.5%	79.5%	1.3%
Missouri	\$40,837,394	\$9.80	94.4%	5.6%	43.9%	6.8%
Tennessee	\$37,371,919	\$8.72	93.9%	6.1%	36.5%	7.1%
Washington	\$36,601,350	\$8.36	94.7%	5.3%	34.9%	3.8%
North Carolina	\$36,126,900	\$5.94	91.7%	8.3%	27.9%	4.4%
Colorado	\$33,857,011	\$10.58	97.8%	2.2%	35.6%	1.5%
Minnesota	\$33,718,308	\$9.28	99.3%	0.7%	36.9%	1.4%
Indiana	\$27,796,791	\$6.17	92.8%	7.2%	23.4%	6.2%
Kentucky	\$27,637,699	\$9.06	97.0%	3.0%	11.0%	12.5%
Arizona	\$24,247,177	\$6.44	93.9%	6.1%	36.9%	7.1%
Alabama	\$23,519,739	\$7.08	88.2%	11.8%	20.4%	15.0%
Louisiana	\$22,159,666	\$6.82	73.4%	26.6%	1.6%	36.4%
Nevada	\$17,753,393	\$11.97	96.7%	3.3%	12.8%	2.6%
South Carolina	\$16,417,759	\$5.47	87.0%	13.0%	3.8%	7.9%
Wisconsin	\$14,902,481	\$3.73	98.3%	1.7%	17.4%	2.7%
Iowa	\$14,661,691	\$6.69	99.7%	0.3%	5.0%	6.0%
Oklahoma	\$14,221,583	\$5.56	96.3%	3.7%	3.4%	10.9%

COLOR OF MONEY: 2003

State	Total federal contributions	Amount per capita (population 18 and over)	% from predominantly non-Hispanic white zip codes	% from zip codes predominantly people of color	% from wealthy zip codes	% from zip codes with high levels of poverty
Arkansas	\$13,756,739	\$6.90	90.6%	9.4%	6.5%	11.6%
Oregon	\$13,635,872	\$5.30	100.0%	0.0%	15.4%	9.9%
Kansas	\$12,920,118	\$6.54	99.2%	0.8%	45.7%	6.0%
New Mexico	\$10,751,566	\$8.22	68.2%	31.8%	7.9%	10.5%
Nebraska	\$10,082,982	\$8.00	99.9%	0.1%	7.4%	4.8%
New Hampshire	\$9,499,613	\$10.26	100.0%	0.0%	28.6%	0.8%
Mississippi	\$9,133,945	\$4.42	76.9%	23.1%	3.1%	33.7%
Utah	\$8,655,457	\$5.72	99.6%	0.4%	23.2%	0.3%
Delaware	\$7,551,229	\$12.82	97.4%	2.6%	63.9%	1.6%
Maine	\$7,488,340	\$7.70	100.0%	0.0%	16.9%	0.9%
Rhode Island	\$6,458,985	\$8.07	99.2%	0.8%	22.6%	9.2%
West Virginia	\$6,336,394	\$4.51	100.0%	0.0%	13.9%	17.6%
South Dakota	\$6,216,089	\$11.26	99.5%	0.5%	5.6%	2.2%
Wyoming	\$4,171,055	\$11.44	100.0%	0.0%	10.1%	2.0%
Montana	\$3,959,270	\$5.89	99.4%	0.6%	5.3%	0.9%
Hawaii	\$3,738,711	\$4.08	6.6%	93.4%	23.5%	0.3%
Idaho	\$3,545,655	\$3.84	100.0%	0.0%	5.1%	0.6%
Alaska	\$3,133,938	\$7.21	96.0%	4.0%	19.4%	0.2%
Vermont	\$2,682,478	\$5.82	100.0%	0.0%	17.3%	0.0%
North Dakota	\$2,297,010	\$4.78	99.6%	0.4%	0.1%	0.7%

*While it may appear that a large amount of campaign money comes from people of color in Hawaii, it must be noted that the state ranks 47th among all 50 states and the District of Columbia in terms of federal contributions, contributing just .0019% of total federal contributions examined in this report. In addition, the state is unusual in that it contains a majority minority population—75% of the population is people of color (66% is Pacific American).