

ADVANCED PLACEMENT UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

Free Response Questions

Unit 5: Political Participation

SCOTUS – Unit 5

These appeals present constitutional challenges to the key provisions of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (Act), and related provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, all as amended in 1974...

The Court of Appeals, in sustaining the legislation in large part against various constitutional challenges, viewed it as "by far the most comprehensive reform legislation [ever] passed by Congress concerning the election of the President, Vice-President, and members of Congress..."

In this Court, appellants argue that the Court of Appeals failed to give this legislation the critical scrutiny demanded under accepted First Amendment and equal protection principles...

In sum, the provisions of the Act that impose a \$1,000 limitation on contributions to a single candidate, a \$5,000 limitation on contributions by a political committee to a single candidate, and a \$25,000 limitation on total contributions by an individual during any calendar year, are constitutionally valid. These limitations, along with the disclosure provisions, constitute the Act's primary weapons against the reality or appearance of improper influence stemming from the dependence of candidates on large campaign contributions. The contribution ceilings thus serve the basic governmental interest in safeguarding the integrity of the electoral process without directly impinging upon the rights of individual citizens and candidates to engage in political debate and discussion. By contrast, the First Amendment requires the invalidation of the Act's independent expenditure ceiling, its limitation on a candidate's expenditures from his own personal funds, and its ceilings on over-all campaign expenditures. These provisions place substantial and direct restrictions on the ability of candidates, citizens, and associations to engage in protected political expression, restrictions that the First Amendment cannot tolerate.

Excerpted from Buckley v. Valeo (1976)

Based on the information above, respond to the following questions.

- A. Identify a common constitutional principle used to make a ruling in both Citizens United v. FEC (2010) and Buckley v. Valeo (1976).
- B. Explain how the facts of Citizens United v. FEC (2010) and the facts of Buckley v. Valeo (1976) led to a similar holding in both cases.
- C. Describe an action that members of the public who disagree with the holding in Citizens United v. FEC (2010) could take to limit its impact.

A series of horizontal lines for writing.

QUANTITATIVE – UNIT 5

Americans' Willingness to Vote for Presidential Candidates from Certain Groups

Between now and the 2016/2020 political conventions, there will be discussion about the qualifications of presidential candidates – their education, age, religion, race and so on. If your party nominated a generally well-qualified person from president who happened to be _____, would you vote for that person? % Yes, would vote for

	2015 %	2019 %	Change (pct. pts.)
Black	92	96	+4
Catholic	93	95	+2
Hispanic	91	95	+4
A woman	92	94	+2
Jewish	91	93	+2
An evangelical Christian	73	80	+7
Gay or lesbian	74	76	+2
Under the age of 40	---	71	----
Muslim	60	66	+6
Over the age of 70	---	63	----
An atheist	58	60	+2
A socialist	47	47	0

Source: Gallup, May 2019

Use the chart above to answer the following questions.

- A. Identify the qualification of president that has grown more acceptable since 2015.
- B. Using the data, describe a likely Democratic or Republican candidate for president.
- C. Explain how the data in the chart might be used by a candidate running for president.
- D. Explain how the data in the chart could affect voter turnout in presidential elections.
