



Backstage of Political Campaigns – The Mamdani Case Study

By Lev Neymotin, PhD

Preface – The New Coalition of Ideology and Faith

I have watched American politics long enough to know that idealism rarely travels alone. Every campaign is a negotiation between conviction and interest, a transaction disguised as a crusade. In recent years, I have become fascinated—and uneasy—about a new pattern emerging in urban politics: the fusion of radical economic populism with the moral power of religious identity.

Nowhere is this mix more visible than in Zohran Mamdani's ascent in New York City. Mamdani's victory has been praised as the rise of a new progressivism. To me it feels more like the appearance of a new ideological chemistry. Economic populism provides the language of justice; religion supplies the moral energy and the volunteer infrastructure; digital money and nonprofit networks turn belief into logistics. The campaign becomes not only a contest of ideas but a coalition of moral economies—each partner expecting a different return.

This paper looks behind that curtain. It studies how different categories of supporters—institutions, foundations, private donors, and identity networks—interlocked to create one of the most effective populist machines in New York’s recent history. I write as an engineer by training, not a partisan: my goal is to trace the flow of influence, to map where ideology becomes currency, and to ask what this means for civic neutrality in a city built on pluralism.

1 The Framework of Analysis

Before entering the details of contributors and motivations, the method must be clear.

Every campaign can be read through three lenses:

1. **Institutional and business actors** – companies, PACs, consulting firms, and unions that provide capital and strategic services.
2. **Public and non-profit organizations** – foundations and advocacy groups that add legitimacy and outreach capacity.
3. **Private individuals** – ranging from major donors to mass online contributors whose emotional identification gives the campaign social depth.

Each lens reveals a different form of expectation. Institutions seek influence; non-profits seek ideological continuity; individuals seek belonging. By mapping the overlap of these motives we can see how a moral narrative turns into a governing coalition. To organise the analysis I used three tools:

Analytical Tool	Purpose
Motivation Matrix	Categorize donors by dominant incentive: ideological, reputational, or transactional.
Expectation Table	Connect each donor type to probable policy or symbolic rewards.
Influence Density Index	Measure concentration of appointments, grants, and advisory positions within shared networks after victory.

The following sections apply these tools to the Mamdani campaign using verifiable filings, PAC reports, and publicly available donor data.

2 The Political Economy of a Movement

Mamdani’s campaign operated on two currencies: money and moral authority. Large contributions came from progressive PACs and tech philanthropists; the moral capital came from community organisations and faith-based volunteers who translated ideology into neighborhood presence.

Major Institutional Actors

- **Unity & Justice Fund** – linked to civil-rights advocacy; provided organisational muscle and early funding.
- **New Yorkers for Lower Costs PAC** – the principal financial engine; its message of “affordability for all” carried both socialist and business-friendly overtones.
- **Working Families Party PAC** – supplied canvassing infrastructure and ideological branding.
- **OneNYC Business Outreach PAC** – connected corporate donors seeking pragmatic coexistence with an expected progressive administration.

Each of these entities expressed different motives but converged on the same calculation: a Mamdani victory promised access to the next generation of city power.

Philanthropic Foundations

The **Heising-Simons Foundation**, through personal donations by its founders, embodied the secular-progressive flank. Its interest lay in expanding climate, education, and human-rights agendas inside a sympathetic municipal framework. For such donors, policy access—not profit—constitutes the return on investment.

Private and Grass-Roots Donors

At the upper tier stood technology entrepreneurs who view political contributions as both moral alignment and brand management. At the base were thousands of small donors and volunteers—many from immigrant or Muslim backgrounds—who saw in Mamdani’s rhetoric a reflection of social justice and personal dignity. The money was modest, but the enthusiasm converted into door-to-door presence and online amplification.

Together these layers formed what I call **a moral-economic ecosystem**: ideology supplied legitimacy, capital supplied viability, and identity supplied energy.

The resulting movement looked altruistic but functioned with the precision of an investment portfolio.

3 Interplay of Ideology and Self-Interest

When ideology and self-interest coincide, the campaign flourishes; when they diverge, tension appears. Mamdani’s network maintained harmony by allowing each faction to hear its own echo: businesses heard stability, progressives heard equality, faith-based volunteers heard justice. This polyphonic rhetoric made the coalition sound universal while serving multiple expectations.

Category	Primary Motivation	Expected Return
Institutional / PACs	Policy access, regulatory influence	Advisory roles, zoning and funding input
Philanthropic Foundations	Ideological continuity	Visibility, agenda integration
Tech Donors	Reputational alignment, future access	Inclusion in innovation programs
Grass-Roots Supporters	Identity affirmation, local empowerment	Symbolic representation
Faith-Linked Networks	Moral legitimacy, community advocacy	Cultural visibility, voice in appointments

This structure worked because each actor could interpret “justice” in its own language. Yet such elasticity carries a risk: when a word means everything, it soon means nothing. That semantic inflation—justice, dignity, compassion—will be the fault line to watch as this coalition moves from campaigning to governing.

4 Communistic Ideology as Engine

The propulsion of the Mamdani campaign was not moral or religious—it was ideological.

Its discipline, message control, and vocabulary of equality, redistribution, and collective justice drew unmistakably from Marxist and neo-socialist traditions.

Political history offers a clear warning: wherever Marxist experiments have moved from theory to governance, they have tended to produce upheaval—first in the economic order, then in civil society itself. From the Soviet Union and Maoist China to post-colonial Africa, the pattern was strikingly similar: a revolution of ideals giving way to a machinery of control, promising liberation yet delivering scarcity and fear.

5 Early-Warning Frameworks

Another aspect of worry – a religious connection, some of its nuances I felt during the Mamdani’s acceptance speech. History shows that danger rarely comes from a religious belief itself but from its fusion with dogma. When a totalizing political program merges with an uncompromising creed, civic space begins to contract. The twentieth century taught us this through the excesses of Marxist revolutions; the twenty-first reminded us through radical Islamist movements such as al-Qaeda and ISIS—fringe factions whose fanaticism brought devastation to believers and non-believers alike. Both examples reveal the same structural flaw: moral certainty joined to ideological control. For that reason, it is important to watch how new ideological coalitions evolve once they gain authority.

Even a campaign that begins with the language of justice and equality can drift toward orthodoxy if it absorbs the habits of absolute belief. To recognize those shifts early, I designed a set of observation tools—frameworks that convert political behavior into measurable indicators. They are not meant to stigmatize faith or ideology but to detect when conviction starts to suppress pluralism and open debate.

5.1 Rhetoric and Public Messaging

Indicator	Description	Why It Matters
Shift in moral framing	Universal civic language replaced by “our community” language	Marks transition from inclusion to exclusivity
Religious vocabulary in secular offices	Faith terms substitute for “citizens,” “New Yorkers”	Suggests ideological narrowing
Silence after sectarian incidents	Reluctance to condemn polarising rhetoric	Implies political dependency on a single bloc

5.2 Institutional Behaviour

Indicator	Description	Why It Matters
Discretionary-fund clustering	Majority of small grants flow to one community’s nonprofits	Shows informal patronage

Indicator	Description	Why It Matters
Appointment pattern	Over-representation of one faith or advocacy network in middle-management posts	Reflects soft institutional capture
Policy consultation bias	Advisory meetings weighted toward a single bloc	Loss of plural feedback loops

5.3 Social-Behavioural Signals

Indicator	Description	Why It Matters
Community discourse hardens	Public statements define progress as “our people’s gain”	Converts civic goals into sectarian victories
Event segregation	Drop in interfaith or cross-community projects	Early marker of social siloing
Online echo chambers	Digital activism defined along religious lines	Amplifies polarisation beyond proportion

Each of these can be observed in open sources—budgets, press releases, social media. The point is not to criminalize participation but to keep democracy visible to itself.

6 Governance Stress Test

When a new coalition enters power, it inherits a bureaucracy designed for balance. The question is whether that bureaucracy can absorb the new moral energy without being bent by it. To evaluate that resilience, I use a **Staff-Composition Monitoring Framework**, a neutral way to track whether one network begins to dominate public administration.

6.1 Staff Composition Table

Category	Position / Office	Appointee Name	Community / Ideological Background	Known Organisational Links	Competence / Merit (1–5)	Network Flag (Y/N)	Observations
High-Profile	Deputy Mayor	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Chief of Staff	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Budget Director	—	—	—	—	—	—
Mid-Level	Senior Adviser – Community Affairs	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Interfaith Liaison	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Communications Director	—	—	—	—	—	—

Aggregate Metrics

Metric	Threshold	Interpretation
% of appointees from same community network	> 40 % = amber ≥ 50 % = red	Indicates consolidation
% tied to same donor/advocacy group	> 30 %	Signals soft patronage
Cross-community representation	< 25 %	Shows narrowing diversity
Balance Index	Green / Amber / Red	Overall risk rating

This framework can be maintained by journalists or civic observers using only public data. Its virtue is transparency: it translates political gossip into numbers.

6.2 Institutional Resilience

A healthy city administration corrects itself. The checks are well known:

- **Budget transparency** – open dashboards of all community grants;
- **Cross-faith advisory boards** – to prevent insular decision-making;
- **Inter-community youth programs** – because prejudice travels poorly through friendship networks;
- **Prompt responses to inter-group incidents** – language matters more than statistics in cooling tempers.

If these mechanisms stay active, religious mobilization remains an enrichment, not a threat. If they erode, pluralism begins to crack from within—not through laws, but through loyalties.

7 The Structure of Expectation

A campaign that wins on moral energy soon discovers that governing requires arithmetic. Budgets, appointments, and zoning maps are less forgiving than slogans. The Mamdani coalition, built from overlapping circles of progressive activists, business pragmatists, philanthropic donors, and faith-based networks, now faces the test of converting shared enthusiasm into coherent administration.

Each group enters government with its own ledger of expectations. Understanding those expectations is the only way to predict stress points.

Constituency	Primary Motivation	Expected Return
Institutional / PACs	Policy access; regulatory predictability	Advisory seats, zoning or contracting input
Philanthropic Foundations	Ideological visibility; policy alignment	Participation in pilot programs, influence on education or climate policy
Tech & Entrepreneurial Donors	Civic reputation, future access	Inclusion in “smart-city” and digital-governance projects
Grass-roots Volunteers	Emotional identification, recognition	Symbolic representation, community outreach funds
Faith-Linked Networks	Communal visibility, cultural legitimacy	Appointments in diversity, interfaith, or immigrant-affairs offices

A sustainable administration must rotate these expectations like gears in a clock. If one gear seizes—if a particular network monopolizes access or funding—the entire machine begins to grind.

8 Risk Scenarios for New York

8.1 Policy Distortion

When ideology outweighs empiricism, policies drift toward symbolism. Affordable-housing plans may prioritize visible moral gestures over engineering feasibility. Economic populism can translate into budget rigidity that punishes the very small businesses it claims to protect. The safeguard is empirical transparency: publishing cost-benefit analyses and inviting external review.

8.2 Identity Consolidation

If appointments and grants cluster too tightly around one advocacy network, others will interpret inclusion as exclusion. That perception alone can widen communal distance even when no law has changed. The early-warning metrics in Section 5 become vital here: balance indices, diversity dashboards, and independent oversight.

8.3 Civic Polarization

History shows that moral movements often fracture once they face compromise. As factions compete for ideological purity, rhetoric radicalises. Digital media accelerates the process, turning disagreement into betrayal within months. For New York, the challenge will be to prevent national polarisation patterns from replicating inside municipal politics.

8.4 Institutional Fatigue

Civil servants can become risk-averse when every policy is framed as moral redemption. A bureaucracy that fears ideological missteps stops innovating. The cure is procedural normalcy: reaffirming that competence, not virtue signaling, keeps the city running.

9 Reflections – The Fragile Line Between Conviction and Control

When I began this study, I thought I was tracing how belief turns into power. Now I see there was little genuine belief to begin with. What drives modern political movements is not morality but the *appearance* of morality — the language of virtue used to disguise competition for influence. The promise that ethics (in this context, Momdani's pseudo-ethics) can be engineered into government is comforting, but it is a delusion: politics deals in pressure, not purity. The Mamdani movement is a case in point.

Its talk of justice and compassion is not moral insight; it is branding, a vocabulary designed to soothe anxiety and silence dissent. The danger lies not in bad intentions but in self-deception — when leaders begin to mistake their slogans for truth. Once moral language becomes a substitute for argument, the city stops thinking and starts preaching.

The real test for New York's new leadership will not be how persuasively it speaks of fairness, but whether it can keep the machinery of pluralism running — the dull, procedural balance that lets conflicting truths coexist without intimidation. Every era wraps power in its own rhetoric. Ours dresses it in compassion, data, and justice.

Each sounds noble; each becomes corrosive when wielded as proof of moral superiority. For those of us watching from the side lines — engineers, analysts, citizens — the task is to keep asking the questions that moral theatre tries to drown out: *Who benefits? Who decides? Who is quietly left out while we applaud our own virtue?*

If this paper accomplishes anything, let it strip away the illusion that politics based on communistic ideology is a crusade between good and evil. It is, and always has been, an ecosystem of motives. Only by recognizing that fact can a city hope to govern itself with clarity, honesty, and reason, all three above antithetical to the communist ideology engulfing it today. Temporarily.

APPENDIX
Backstage of Mamdani Campaign

Consolidated Support Summary (verified data to date)

#	Name / Entity	Category	Total Contribution (USD)	Possible Motivation	Expectation / Benefit
1	Unity & Justice Fund (super PAC linked to Council on American-Islamic Relations, CAIR)	Institutional / Public	100,000 (25k + 75k)	Ideological alignment; movement power	Access to City Hall on identity / foreign-policy issues
2	New Yorkers for Lower Costs (PAC supporting Mamdani)	Institutional / Public	3,017,623 raised; 2.7 M spent	Coalition vehicle for cost-of-living message	Policy follow-through; coalition influence
3	WFP National PAC – NYS IE Committee	Institutional / Public	17,000 (text IE)	Advance Working Families Party platform	Programmatic alignment; governing leverage
4	OneNYC business outreach PAC	Institutional / Public	≈ 400,000 raised (includes 50 k from Milgram)	Bridge to corporate leaders	Advisory access to business policy
5	Heising-Simons Foundation / Liz Simons	Philanthropic / Institutional (through individual donor)	\$250,000 (personal donation to PAC)	Expand progressive social and climate agenda; align philanthropy with politics	Policy cooperation on climate, education, and equity; enhanced influence in national progressive network
6	Rehan Muneeb-Azhar	Private Individual	> 150,000 (reported)	Ideological solidarity; movement building	Agenda access; issue priority
7	Faheem Zaman	Private Individual	Top donor (amount n/a)	Movement alignment; political entrepreneurship	Message priority; network status
8	Tom Preston-Werner (GitHub co-founder)	Private Individual	20,000 + Top-Three Donor status	Tech-progressive alignment	Affordability agenda; tech-ecosystem inclusion
9	Moiz Ali	Private Individual	Top-Three Donor	Progressive consumer/brand issues	Policy consistency on cost of living
10	Omer Hasan (former AppLovin VP Operations)	Private Individual	≈ 250,000	Tech sector alignment	Access to digital policy / city contracts
11	Mohammad Waqas Javed (former AppLovin Dir. Eng.)	Private Individual	≈ 251,500 +	Tech sector alignment	Influence in innovation / labor policy
12	Idris Mokhtarzada (Rocket Money co-founder)	Private Individual	90,000	Tech donor class for affordability planks	Execution on rent / transit promises

#	Name / Entity	Category	Total Contribution (USD)	Possible Motivation	Expectation / Benefit
13	Haroon Mokhtarzada (Rocket Money co-founder)	Private Individual	Part of 189,000 family total	Same as above	Same
14	Sara Rahnama (academic)	Private Individual	75,000	Foreign-policy alignment / Palestine advocacy	Sympathetic governance on international justice
15	[Spouse of Sara Rahnama]	Private Individual	90,000 (reported)	Family alignment	As above
16	Katrina vanden Heuvel / Mayberry LLC	Private Individual	25,000	Progressive media / policy alignment	Narrative amplification ecosystem
17	Wendy vanden Heuvel	Private Individual	25,000	Same family / ideological network	As above
18	Tariq Afaq Ahmed (Silicon Valley angel)	Private Individual	25,000	Amplify Muslim / South-Asian donor presence	Representation in policy appointments
19	Mohammed Davoodi	Private Individual	2,100 (max direct gift)	Values alignment	Symbolic access; event role
20	Andrew Milgram (Marblegate CEO)	Private Individual	50,000 to OneNYC PAC	Business hedging / relationship building	Advisory council influence
21	Kevin Ryan (AlleyCorp)	Private Individual	Not stated (OneNYC adviser)	Civic-business bridge	Policy input on business innovation
22	Tech employee cluster – Google	Private Group	40,500 (≈ 260 employees)	Workforce affordability / progressive culture	Housing & transit benefits for tech sector
23	Tech employee cluster – Meta	Private Group	10,500 (approx.)	Same	Same
24	Tech employee cluster – Amazon	Private Group	9,000 (approx.)	Same	Same
25	Out-of-state donor network	Private Aggregate	> 1 M (aggregate est.)	National progressive ideology	Model expansion / influence beyond NYC
26	Small-donor base (NYC residents)	Private Aggregate	≈ 4 M (total cycle)	Grass-roots cost-of-living concerns	Rent freeze / free transit / social programs
27	Foreign-address donors (~170 gifts)	Foreign Individual / Mixed	≈ 13,000	Ideological solidarity from abroad	Symbolic support / reputation; non-monetary benefit

◆ Aggregate Insight Snapshot

Category	Approx. Verified Funding	Share of Total Funds	Primary Motives (by weight)
Institutional / Public PACs & Orgs	≈ 3.5 – 3.7 M (Unity & Justice Fund + PACs)	~45 % of known total	Ideology (≈ 50 %), Strategic Access (≈ 40 %), Reputation (≈ 10 %)
Private Individuals & Groups	≈ 4.0 M (campaign + PAC donors ≥ 5 k)	~50 % of known total	Ideology (≈ 40 %), Personal Influence (≈ 35 %), Business Advancement (≈ 25 %)
Foreign / Other	≈ 13 k	< 1 %	Symbolic alignment; non-monetary interest

◆ Interpretive Notes

1. **Central dynamic:** campaign resources stemmed from a hybrid of *ideological enthusiasm* and *transactional expectation*.
2. **Tech-sector donors** dominate among large individual givers; their self-interest aligns with affordability and innovation agendas.
3. **Philanthropic and advocacy PACs** (e.g., Unity & Justice Fund, WFP PAC) provided ideological coherence and legitimacy.
4. **Corporate / hedge fund donors** (Milgram, OneNYC circle) contributed hedged investments—maintaining access regardless of outcome.
5. **Grass-roots donors** formed the moral cover and voter-level legitimacy, but collectively contributed amounts similar to top-tier backers.
6. **Foreign donations** are negligible in size but symbolically important for international ideological solidarity.

Backstage of Political Campaigns — Summary of Findings (Mamdani Case Study)

Category	Primary Motives	Expected Benefits / Outcomes
Institutional / Business / PACs	• Secure influence over future municipal policy and appointments. • Shape city priorities (housing, transit, contracts, zoning). • Align with ideological signals attractive to their base or members.	• Preferential access to decision-making circles. • Regulatory or funding advantages for affiliated sectors. • Public image of progressive partnership without direct governance risk.
Public / Non-Profit Foundations	• Advance social or ideological missions (equity, justice, identity politics). • Reinforce donor visibility within activist ecosystems. • Maintain relevance through association with successful movements.	• Legitimacy for advocacy platforms. • Influence on program design and city grants. • Strengthened fundraising position via “policy proximity.”
Private Individuals (High-Value Donors)	• Blend of ideology and self-interest: personal access, reputation, career positioning. • Desire to shape narrative around cost-of-living and global justice issues. • Pursuit of symbolic power or belonging in progressive elite networks.	• Access to candidate / administration. • Recognition within social-political circles. • Indirect leverage on business, academic, or philanthropic interests.

Category	Primary Motives	Expected Benefits / Outcomes
Private Individuals (Mass Donors)	• Economic self-interest (housing, transit, healthcare). • Emotional identification with progressive rhetoric. • Hope for tangible local improvements.	• Policy benefits: rent relief, transit subsidies, healthcare access. • Psychological reward of participation in “change.”
Tech-Sector Contributors (cluster across levels)	• Align corporate citizenship with urban affordability agenda. • Maintain public legitimacy amid anti-tech sentiment. • Build bridges with reformist governance.	• Favorable regulatory tone toward tech/start-up ecosystem. • Workforce-friendly housing and transit measures. • Inclusion in smart-city contracts and innovation programs.
Business / Financial Donors (OneNYC network)	• Maintain relevance under probable new administration. • Pre-empt adversarial policy by early cooperation. • Preserve market stability.	• Access to advisory bodies. • Mitigated regulatory risk. • “Insider” reputation under new political order.
Philanthropic Families (Simons, vanden Heuvel, etc.)	• Merge philanthropic missions with political narrative. • Convert moral capital into policy influence. • Expand ideological legacy.	• Direct consultation on education, climate, or equity initiatives. • Enhanced visibility of family foundations.
Foreign / Diaspora Supporters	• Ideological solidarity; symbolic identification with the candidate’s message. • Emotional participation in global progressive movement.	• None material; reputational satisfaction; emotional return.
Aggregate Structural Pattern	<i>Across all categories:</i> ideology functions as moral cover; the true engine is expectation—financial, reputational, or strategic.	<i>Result:</i> campaigns evolve into ecosystems of mutually reinforced interests rather than altruistic civic ventures.

Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR)

Founded: 1994, Washington, D.C.

Structure: A U.S. 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization with a national office and numerous state-level chapters.

Mission (self-stated):

“To enhance understanding of Islam, protect civil rights, promote justice, and empower American Muslims.”

(Source: cair.com)

Activities:

- Legal assistance and advocacy for Muslims facing discrimination or hate crimes.
- Media and public-relations campaigns about Islam and Muslim life in America.
- Lobbying on issues related to civil rights, immigration, and U.S. foreign policy toward Muslim-majority countries.
- Political-education and voter-registration drives through affiliated 501(c)(4) or PAC entities.

Funding:

- Donations from individuals and community organizations; not government-funded.
- Some state chapters have separate nonprofit registrations.

Criticism / Controversy:

- Some Jewish, Christian, and secular groups accuse CAIR of tolerating or excusing Islamist rhetoric, and the UAE listed it as a “terror organization” in 2014 (a designation widely disputed in the U.S.).
- CAIR denies any extremist ties and describes itself as a mainstream civil-rights organization comparable to the NAACP or the ACLU for Muslims.

Political role:

- Officially, CAIR (as a 501(c)(3)) cannot donate to or directly coordinate with campaigns.
- A related **super PAC**, the *Unity and Justice Fund*, can legally spend independently to support or oppose candidates, and that entity has appeared in filings connected with the 2025 NYC mayoral race.

WFP National PAC – NYS IE Committee

Full name:

Working Families Party National Political Action Committee – New York State Independent Expenditure Committee

◆ What it is

- It is the **independent-expenditure (IE)** arm of the **Working Families Party (WFP)**, registered with both the **Federal Election Commission** and the **New York State Board of Elections**.
- It operates as a **PAC**, meaning it can raise and spend money to support or oppose political candidates—but **cannot coordinate directly** with the campaigns it supports.
- The “IE Committee” portion of the name signals that these expenditures are **independent**—for example, funding texting drives, digital ads, or canvassing efforts that promote a candidate’s platform but are executed without the campaign’s direct input.

◆ About the Working Families Party (WFP)

- Founded in **New York State in 1998** as a **progressive political party** aiming to advance social-democratic and labor-movement goals.
- Over time it expanded into multiple states, operating both as a **fusion party** (endorsing Democrats on the WFP ballot line in NY) and as a **national advocacy network**.
- Typical priorities: workers’ rights, affordable housing, universal healthcare, criminal-justice reform, climate policy, and wealth-tax proposals.
- Prominent endorsed figures include **Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, Jamaal Bowman, Cynthia Nixon, and Zohran Mamdani**.

◆ Role in Mamdani’s campaign

- The **WFP National PAC – NYS IE Committee** filed **independent expenditures** with the NYC Campaign Finance Board during the 2025 mayoral race, such as a **\$17,000 texting and outreach program** promoting Mamdani’s candidacy.
- Motivation: support a candidate representing WFP’s ideological and policy platform.
- Expectation: ensure that, if elected, the candidate governs consistently with WFP priorities and strengthens the party’s influence within city politics.

◆ Legal & structural summary

Feature	Description
Entity type	Political Action Committee (Independent Expenditure Committee)
Affiliation	Working Families Party National Organization
Jurisdiction	Registered in New York State; files with both state and city campaign-finance authorities
Permitted activity	Raise and spend unlimited funds to promote or oppose candidates, provided there's no coordination with those candidates
Funding sources	Donations from individuals, labor unions, and allied progressive organizations
Goal in 2025 NYC race	Support progressive alignment and voter mobilization for Mamdani-style platform

In short:

The WFP National PAC – NYS IE Committee is the **Working Families Party's independent-spending vehicle in New York**, used to fund outreach and advertising for candidates like Mamdani who represent the party's progressive, pro-labor agenda.

OneNYC business outreach PAC

- OneNYC is a *political independent-expenditure committee* (IE-PAC) formed to support Zohran Mamdani's candidacy for New York City mayor. [New York City Campaign Finance Board+2OneNYC+2](#)
- It is described on its website as: "an independent expenditure committee formed by business leaders, policymakers and previous government officials committed to supporting principled, effective leadership and robust, data-driven policies that make living and doing business in New York City affordable for all." [OneNYC+1](#)
- It launched publicly in September 2025 via a press release titled "*OneNYC Launches in Support of Zohran Mamdani*". [New York City Campaign Finance Board](#)
- The PAC is also aligned with related 501(c)(3) and 501(c)(4) structures under the "OneNYC" brand for research and policy development. [New York City Campaign Finance Board+1](#)

What OneNYC does

- It **raises funds** from business leaders, executives, and investors to support the campaign infrastructure, public-messaging, outreach, and coalition-building around Mamdani's platform. For example: the PAC "has raised nearly \$400,000" from business-sector donors. [Business Insider](#)
- It serves as a **bridge** between the business community and the progressive/populist campaign of Mamdani, attempting to reassure CEOs and major employers that they have a role in the future if he wins. [Reuters+1](#)
- It organizes or intends to organize a **Business Advisory Council**, bringing together business leaders who will engage with the campaign's economic agenda, attend roundtables/meetings, and provide input on policy implementation. [Business Insider+1](#)
- It communicates and markets its mission in terms of **affordability for all, business growth, job creation, economic competitiveness**, and **making New York City attractive for living and doing business**. [OneNYC+1](#)

How OneNYC fits into your “Backstage of Political Campaigns” analysis

- It is a **key example** of the “Institutional / Business” category of campaign support: i.e. companies, business leaders, investor networks aligning with a candidate — not simply by default, but proactively via a dedicated PAC.
- It illustrates many of your hypothesized drivers:
 - **Business/Professional Advancement:** Business leaders join because they expect influence, access, or at minimum amenable policy if a candidate they support wins.
 - **Money/Wealth:** The donors are investing (via the PAC) in the expectation of preserving or enhancing business-environment conditions in NYC.
 - **Personal Ambition / Network Advantage:** For some donors, this may serve as an avenue for status, networking with the next mayor’s inner circle, or shaping policy that affects their sector.
 - **Ideological Cover:** The public messaging emphasizes “affordability for all” and “strong city economy,” which helps frame a business-backed PAC as socially conscious rather than purely transactional.
- OneNYC should be included as a **named Institutional supporter**, with known total raised (≈\$400k) and key mover (Yasser Salem, former McKinsey/Investment executive).
- **Name/Title:** OneNYC (Independent Expenditure Committee supporting Zohran Mamdani)
- **Total Contribution:** ≈ \$400,000+ (raised from business donors) [Business Insider+1](#)
- **Possible Motivation:** Business leaders hedging their stakes; building a cooperative bridge with a potentially successful candidate; aligning business interests with a rising political figure.
- **Expectation:** Advisory access, policy input in a Mamdani administration, favorable economic/regulatory environment under new leadership.