

# **Truth in Advertising**

## **What the 2006 Campaigns Tell Us**

November 9, 2006

By Robert L. Borosage, Eric Lotke and Robert Gerson

## **Truth in Advertising: What 2006 Campaigns Tell Us**

*By Robert L. Borosage, Eric Lotke and Robert Gerson*

*November 9, 2006*

---

The 2006 elections produced an historic sea change, as Democrats, despite the impediments of gerrymandered districts, incumbency, money, machinery and mobilization capacity, took control of the House and the Senate. Democrats have gained 29 seats and counting in the House and six in the Senate. Stunningly, incumbent Democrats lost not one seat. Democrats also made gains in the states. They picked up 275 seats in state legislatures, taking control of nine new chambers and winning six new governors' offices. Democrats now control a majority of statehouses, and both legislative bodies in 23 states, with Republicans controlling 10 states and 16 split. Democrats won in every region, but the bulk of the gains were in the Northeast and Midwest. This was a sweeping repudiation of one party rule in Washington, with Republicans suffering down ballot as well.

### How Did Candidates Frame the Election?

To decipher the results, CAF sponsored an election night poll to probe what voters thought when they cast their votes. In addition, we followed 11 contested races to see how the candidates chose to present themselves, what issues they emphasized, and how they distinguished themselves from their opponents. We reviewed stump speeches, web sites and newspaper coverage, but the primary focus was on paid television ads which are still the major way candidates in House and Senate races communicate an image to voters. Paid media ads reflect the broad messages that candidates and their professional pollsters and campaign consultants think can attract supporters and/or detract from opponents.

We selected 11 landmark campaigns in races of national significance. Geographically diverse and located in battleground states, they featured strong candidates in competitive races. We examined five campaigns for the U.S. House of Representatives, four for the U.S. Senate and two governors. Obviously we need to be cautious about drawing general conclusions from a limited sample. Because we chose battleground states, no race from the South was represented in the sample. Politics is still local and many races featured local twists. TV ads that reach a general population are different from the tailored appeals of mail and phone calls, which can and do feature more ideological appeals to closely targeted voters. Yet even with those caveats in mind, the sample demonstrates some clear themes about this election and the candidates' read of the mood of the overall electorate.

## The Races Followed

	State (District)	Republican	Democrat
<b>House</b>	New Mex. (01) Ohio (15) Iowa (01) Florida (22) Penn. (06)	<b>Heather Wilson</b> <b>Deborah Pryce</b> Mike Whalen <b>Claw Shaw</b> <b>Jim Gerlach</b>	Patricia Madrid Mary Jo Kilroy Bruce Braley Ron Klein Lois Murphy
<b>Senate</b>	Ohio Penn. Missouri Minn.	<b>Mike DeWine</b> <b>Rick Santorum</b> <b>Jim Talent</b> Mark Kennedy	Sherrod Brown Bob Casey Claire McCaskill Amy Klobuchar
<b>Gov.</b>	Ohio Colorado	Ken Blackwell Bob Beauprez	Ted Strickland Bill Ritter

**Incumbents in bold.**

## What We Found

### A Populist Temper

In the races we studied, the largest sums of campaign advertising were spent on economic ads that featured remarkably populist messages. Ads from candidates of both parties showed people working harder and not getting ahead. Campaign ads featured drugs people couldn't afford, college priced out of reach, and fuel prices breaking family budgets. Corruption was linked to this middle class squeeze. The cost of corruption – candidates voting the interests of corporate lobbies and donors rather than working families – attracted the most combined ad money. While working families struggled, big business and corporate elites were portrayed as making out like bandits. Corporate lobbies regularly appeared as a villain in ads by candidates from both parties, whether driving up the price of oil, polluting the Everglades, or fouling up health care. It can be safely said that more money was spent on ads depicting Big Oil and Big Pharma as threats than on ads warning of Osama bin Laden.

## Expenditures by Issue: Totals for 11 Races

	<b>Democrat TV ad spending</b>	<b>Republican TV ad spending</b>
Campaign Contributions/Corruption	\$19,854,007	\$16,037,972
Jobs/Wages/Economy	\$24,954,167	\$8,580,423
Taxes <sup>1</sup>	\$14,305,763	\$18,689,507
Iraq/National Security/Veterans	\$16,149,734	\$15,624,874
Senior Issues (Social Security/Medicare)	\$14,669,241	\$10,474,427
Energy/Environment	\$10,611,985	\$3,903,522
Education (K-12 and Higher)	\$9,259,910	\$1,384,802
Crime	\$3,359,305	\$5,472,338
Moral Values <sup>2</sup>	\$773,784	\$2,364,216

### A Conservatism That Dare Not Speak Its Name

In these races, campaign ads suggest that movement conservatives have little faith that their views can attract majority support. No television ads in these benchmark races showed candidates bragging about being conservative or proudly wearing the conservative label. That the more unrepentant conservatives like Rick Santorum and Ken Blackwell did not fare well, suggests that this caution was justified. Democrats consistently associated Republicans with voting with President Bush; Republicans consistently sought to demonstrate their independence.

### War and Terror

Since 9/11, Republicans have prospered as the war party. Karl Rove opened the year by summoning Republicans to run on terror and taxes. Taxes remained central to their campaigns, but the fiasco in Iraq forced Republicans to duck and cover. Candidates in both parties realized that the war was increasingly unpopular and driving opinion.

In these 11 races, \$32.5 million was spent talking about Iraq. No Republican in these races affirmed that the war was keeping us safe. No ads championed pre-emptive war. In the first months of the campaign, most Iraq ads were about supporting the troops or the veterans, with candidates from both parties claiming they were the ones who voted for superior body armor – a matter on which there was no ideological disagreement. In attacking Democrats on security,

---

<sup>1</sup> Includes ads about raising or lowering taxes, and tax incentives for businesses

<sup>2</sup> Includes abortion, gay marriage and stem cell research.

Republicans preferred to focus on the USA PATRIOT Act and warrantless wiretapping than on the war itself. As the race went on, Democrats grew bolder, increasingly attacking their opponents for standing with George Bush in his failed policy. Some ads were even more direct. For example, Democratic challenger, a Patricia Madrid of New Mexico, running against former Air Force officer Heather Wilson, spent \$126,000 on an ad declaring that the war has made us “less safe.” Democrats began the campaign season displaying the caution of a Hillary Clinton and ended up sounding more like Ned Lamont.

### **Government: A Solution, Not A Problem**

In Ronald Reagan’s first inaugural address, he famously declared, “Government is not the solution to our problem; government is the problem.” Since that time, conservatives have talked about shrinking government, keeping government off your back, and even shrinking it to the size it can be drowned in the bathtub. But that’s not how they ran on the air in this election. Candidates in these benchmark races did not echo that theme in their ad buys.

Instead, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce spent an estimated \$10 million nationally on ads praising Republican incumbents for delivering the new Medicare prescription drug benefit.<sup>1</sup> Republican candidates in the races we studied spent \$3 million touting their success in delivering the benefit.

Despite all the bad press for earmarked appropriations and the Abramoff scandals, bringing home the bacon was a popular theme. New Mexico Republican Heather Wilson spent \$83,000 bragging that she kept an army base open to “keep good jobs here in New Mexico” – not to keep us safe.<sup>2</sup> Conservative stalwart, Pennsylvania Republican Rick Santorum, spent \$160,000 bragging that he kept an air force base open.<sup>3</sup>

### **Moral Values Devalued**

Moral values and differences on social issues were invoked in stump speeches and discussed in debates, but they did not receive significant mass media television advertising. Of the 212 total advertisements by Republicans or Republican committees in the races we studied, only two ads even mentioned abortion. Gay marriage was mentioned in nine ads, though typically as a single entry in a list of concerns, never as the exclusive focus of an entire advertisement. Stem cell research received more attention – particularly in the heated Missouri race with a separate ballot initiative and the famous ad featuring Michael J. Fox. The more unapologetic right-wing moralizers—Ken Blackwell and Rick Santorum – had little appeal to voters. Again, conservative incumbents shied away from making broad appeals to voters on the basis of a right wing social issue agenda.

### **Tax Cuts Uber Alles**

Wary about the conservative themes of morality and security, taxes were about the only thing remaining in the conservative arsenal, and Republican incumbents barraged their opponents with it. In these races, Republicans spent \$18 million on ads bragging about delivering tax cuts and warning that their Democratic opponents would raise taxes.

But the argument had limits. First, the presentation wasn't highly ideological – as in, it's *your* money; *you* should keep it. The emphasis was less on tax cuts than the threat that Democrats would raise taxes. The National Republican Campaign Committee's (NRCC) ad for Mike Whalen in Iowa simply scrolled the taxes and dollar savings down the screen while the narrator listed the potential victims if Democrats raised taxes—"Married couples could pay \$2,726 more," "Single moms could pay \$1,062 more," and so forth.<sup>4</sup> Ironically, the emphasis on struggling families echoed the Democratic economic populist themes.

Even on this subject, some candidates strayed from the ideological foundation. In the Colorado governor race, Republican Bob Beauprez ran an ad saying "I don't think we'd mind so much giving government a dollar if we got close to a dollar's value back in return."<sup>5</sup> That's a plea for better management, not smaller government.

Democrats felt they had to respond to the charges that they would raise taxes. Most emphasized their support for middle class tax cuts. Some – like Sherrod Brown and Amy Klobuchar—used the response to reinforce their populist message. "Did you get that big tax break [Republican] Mike DeWine's been bragging about? There may be a reason why," the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee (DSCC) asked voters in the Ohio Senate race.<sup>6</sup> Amy Klobuchar even put a figure on it. Running for Senate in Minnesota she planned to "roll back Bush tax cuts for people making over \$336,000 a year ... and cut taxes for the middle class."<sup>7</sup>

### **Jobs and The Economy**

Republicans in campaign ads generally talked about jobs as a corollary to tax cuts. The Bush tax cuts created jobs, they contended, or more frequently, Democrats will raise taxes and destroy jobs. "The choice?" asked Ken Blackwell in his quest to become governor of Ohio: "Ted Strickland and job killing taxes? Or Ken Blackwell's commitment to cutting taxes to create jobs?"<sup>8</sup> The right answer is clear from the lighting on screen, though nobody offers to prove the assertion. It's just offered as an economic fact, like a correlation between lower prices and higher sales.

Democrats, on the other hand, focused on jobs and the economy. At \$25 million in advertisements these was the single biggest subject of their attention, and they sounded like economic populists. They highlighted a working class falling behind while millionaires and corporate elites race ahead. The \$14 million spent in Democratic ads in these races referred to the minimum wage or talked about jobs going overseas. As *The Wall Street Journal* reported, "trade concerns have emerged as a central issue in many of this year's races," and "Republicans are finding it more painful politically to defend" existing policies.<sup>9</sup>

### **Energy**

Alternative energy emerged as a positive bipartisan theme during this election – one of the rare exceptions to relentlessly negative ads. Candidates of both parties spent \$14.5 million in these races to promise a new energy policy, with increased emphasis on energy independence and cleaner homegrown alternatives. Democrat Bill Ritter, the new governor of Colorado, opened his campaign after Labor Day with an energy promise. Standing before a field of windmills he declared, "My economic policy protects our air and water, and creates jobs and a new energy economy."<sup>10</sup> In a similar spirit, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce ran a series of ads showing

windmills and grain processing plants, and explaining the need to explore “alternative fuels” and “keep jobs at home.”<sup>11</sup>

Candidates in both parties clearly understood that the public wants action on energy, and made promises. Both parties were happy to claim the issue as their own, even if neither had actually delivered much on it.

## **Conclusion**

In these races, the focus on struggling families and inordinately powerful corporate interests helped frame the election against incumbents. Republicans sought to respond by showing how they had used their offices to deliver for their constituents and charging that their Democratic opponent would make things worse by raising taxes. They often countered Democratic attacks on the costs of corruption with very personal attacks on their opponents. On security, Republicans, for the most part, chose not to defend the war directly, but to indict their opponent for being soft on giving the president the power to do what he must on terror. In every contested Senatorial race, other than Conrad Burns, Republicans called for Rumsfeld’s resignation or a new course in Iraq.

## **Race-by-Race Analysis: U.S. Senate**

### **Ohio Senate:**

#### **Democratic Challenger Sherrod Brown v. Incumbent Republican Mike DeWine**

The race between Democratic challenger Sherrod Brown and Republican incumbent Mike DeWine was perhaps the signature race of the cycle, a pitched battle in a weathervane state. Staggered by the loss of manufacturing jobs and the resulting pressures on middle class families, Ohio voters were overwhelmingly concerned about jobs and the economy.<sup>12</sup> The war in Iraq was also a direct concern, with small Ohio communities suffering from the sacrifice of sons and daughters lost there. Republican scandals – at both state and national levels, from Governor Taft to Rep. Bob Ney, weighed heavily on up and down the Republican ticket.

Republican incumbent Mike DeWine was a relative moderate, one of the “Gang of 14” who sought to mediate the battle over filibustering Supreme Court nominees. He won the endorsement of the *Columbus Dispatch* for his record on bipartisanship and cooperation.<sup>13</sup>

On the other hand, Democratic challenger Sherrod Brown ran as a grassroots populist and social liberal. He condemned NAFTA and bragged that his father was a country doctor who cared for everybody, regardless of their ability to pay.

Brown built his campaign around populist economics. His signature campaign ad showed him in front of a factory with hard-hatted Americans.<sup>14</sup> “They work hard,” Brown declared. “They love their country. They play by the rules. But the cars, steel and appliances they used to make are now being made overseas where workers are paid 3 or 4 dollars a day.” He indicted DeWine for supporting trade agreements such as NAFTA “that cost us these jobs.” He promised to oppose any further trade accords, and make our global strategy work for working people.

The hardhat ad ran on September 8, the opening of the fall campaign, and at \$699,000 it was the biggest of Brown's early ad buys. A few days later, the DSCC picked it up and spent another \$143,000 to show it more than 300 additional times.<sup>15</sup> The DSCC echoed the themes in their own \$1.3 million ad against trade deals and Washington elites who have "betrayed the middle class."

Altogether, the Brown and Democrats spent \$6.6 million railing against corporate trade policies in the Ohio Senate race. In a \$1.3 million ad titled "Change is Coming," the DSCC charged that Republicans like Mike DeWine had "betrayed our families and betrayed the middle class."<sup>16</sup> Brown answered DeWine's attack on him over taxes directly, but he also had his own take on taxes – railing at tax breaks for the wealthy and corporations. Out of the total 37 ads run by Brown or the party behind him, 26 were about jobs or the economy; another 10 were about ending tax breaks for billionaires and major corporations. That means that 97 percent of times T.V. viewers saw a Democratic ad during this race, it was about the struggles and betrayals of the middle class.

In the debates, Mike DeWine appeared as the moderate he has been throughout his career. But his television ads ran a different direction. DeWine's ads did not brag about a pension reform bill he helped to pass, his opposition to drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, or the treatment he made available for the mentally ill.<sup>17</sup>

Rather, DeWine largely followed Karl Rove's playbook, with the bulk of his ad funds spent on negative ads assailing his opponent on taxes and terror. DeWine ran two television ads during the month of July. The first \$590,000 buy boasted of his role in helping first responders "be prepared for terrorist threats."<sup>18</sup> The second \$1.1 million ad attacked Brown for being weak on security, but not, tellingly, on the war. "Brown voted to slash national intelligence programs. He voted against strengthening criminal laws for terrorist attacks. He voted against the PATRIOT Act, which gives law enforcement the tools to fight terrorists. Brown even voted against the death penalty for terrorists who killed passengers on trains and subways." The ad concluded: "Sherrod Brown. Weakening America's security. Out of touch with Ohio values."<sup>19</sup>

During the crucial stretch of the election between Labor Day and the middle of October, when most minds were being made up, DeWine and the national Republicans ran 10 different ads. Six of them were about national security – typically accusing Brown of being weak on defense or failing to support the troops. The biggest buy, at \$926,000 by the National Republican Senate Committee, tried to use Brown's populism against him. "Sherrod Brown says he marches for workers, but if your work is protecting our country, Sherrod Brown doesn't march for you. Sherrod Brown voted against advanced body armor for our troops, against up-armored humvees, against better housing for military families."<sup>20</sup>

The other four ads at that time were about taxes – typically bragging that DeWine lowered them, threatening that Brown would raise them, or both.<sup>21</sup> The economy was seen only as a subordinate clause connecting tax increases with job losses, or vice versa. "Brown voted for a broad-based energy tax which would have cost Ohio over 20,000 jobs."<sup>22</sup>

During this time, the race changed from neck-and-neck to a clear Brown lead. On October 15, the *New York Times* reported that the national GOP was withdrawing support from the DeWine race, expecting that he would lose and not wanting to waste additional resources.<sup>23</sup>

The GOP estimated correctly. DeWine was defeated soundly. His campaign followed Rove’s advice more closely than many we reviewed, but that advice didn’t save him from Brown’s populist appeal.

**Summary chart of ad expenditures**

	Brown	Dem. Party	Other	DeWine	Rep. Party	Other
Jobs/Economy	\$3,572,060	\$2,404,513	\$0	\$737,463	\$0	\$219,897
Taxes	\$2,495,080	\$2,837,442	\$0	\$1,540,588	\$3,390,529	\$0
Iraq	\$1,086,841	\$1,908,721	1 primary*	\$2,846,639	\$3,571,129	1 primary*
Individual total	\$5,794,293	\$9,234,936		\$7,114,575	\$7,297,086	\$1,128,174
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>\$15,029,229</b>			<b>\$15,539,835</b>	

\*Primary advertisement; no financial information available.

\*\*A single ad may address more than one issue, so its cost will appear in more than one row. However, the cost appears only once in the total. Thus, the sum of expenditures by subject may appear to exceed the total.

**Minnesota Senate**

**Democrat Amy Klobuchar v. Republican Mark Kennedy**

Minnesota is a battleground state, given to political mavericks. Its voters have elected the populist Paul Wellstone to Senate and the idiosyncratic Jesse Ventura as governor. In the last two presidential cycles, it virtually split its vote. The 2006 Senate race was to replace retiring Democrat Mark Dayton. In the beginning of the year, this was considered a major pickup opportunity for Republicans.

Republican Mark Kennedy represents the 6<sup>th</sup> District of Minnesota in the U.S. House of Representatives. In his ads, Kennedy introduced himself as an ordinary but independent nice guy. His early ads showed him with his family teasing about him about his tired old shirts,<sup>24</sup> or by a pond talking about his willingness to cross party lines, “because when good ideas cross party lines, we should too.”<sup>25</sup>

When the campaign got going, however, he pulled out his baseball bat. He hired as a political consultant the same Scott Howell who orchestrated the infamous “Swift Boat” ad campaign against John Kerry during the 2004 presidential race.<sup>26</sup> His ads turned to guns and drugs, and the major theme was a Republican classic: painting Amy Klobuchar as weak on crime. Since Klobuchar had served as the District Attorney in Minneapolis, the tactic was clearly designed to turn her crime-fighting credential from a positive asset into a negative drag. “Fifty-two percent of first degree drug felons were given lighter sentences,” accuses a \$347,022 Kennedy ad with a classic film-noir mood.<sup>27</sup> “Klobuchar promised to keep gun criminals off our streets. Then she kept handing out plea bargains.”

Klobuchar responded by bringing victims to her side. One ad featured a victim of identify theft thanking her because she “made sure that the perpetrators went to jail,” and a victim of murder expressing appreciation because she “saw to it that those gang members were put away.”<sup>28</sup> Then she shifted her prosecutorial eye on a different enemy. She didn’t only take on “scam artists, child abusers and murderers.” She even put a judge in prison when he broke the law. A member of her own party. “But it didn’t matter because this guy had to go to jail.”<sup>29</sup>

With her credentials established, Klobuchar made the case for her promotion. In one ad, she explained her sense of the skewed economy. “These days no matter how hard you work, the price of gas, college and health care is getting out of reach. Washington’s been tilting the playing field against the middle class for the past six years. I think it’s got to stop.”<sup>30</sup> In other ads, she explained how she’ll get it done, with an emphasis on tax code favoritism. “[S]he’ll stop the \$70 billion a year offshore tax scam for billionaires and the giveaways to big oil and drug companies.”<sup>31</sup> She’ll require Medicare to negotiate lower prices for prescription drugs. With the steely eye of a prosecutor she declares, “The drug companies don’t want to do it, but I do.”<sup>32</sup>

**Summary chart of ad expenditures**

	Klobuchar	Dem. Party	Other	Kennedy	Rep. Party	Other
Medicare/Health	\$1,572,453	\$0	\$0	\$1,001,134	\$0	\$0
Taxes	\$1,829,713	\$0	\$0	\$273,825	\$0	\$0
Campaign\$/Corruption	\$914,350	\$0	1 primary*	\$364,793	\$0	\$0
Crime	\$337,137	\$0	\$0	\$748,647	\$0	\$0
Individual total	\$2,984,928	\$0	1 primary*	\$2,250,136	\$0	\$0
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>\$2,984,928</b>			<b>\$2,250,136</b>	

\* Primary advertisement; no financial information available.

\*\* A single ad may address more than one issue, so its cost will appear in more than one row. However, the cost appears only once in the total. Thus, the sum of expenditures by subject may appear to exceed the total.

**Missouri Senate:**

**Democrat Challenger Claire McCaskill v. Republican Incumbent Jim Talent**

Jim Talent was in the first wave of the Republican revolution in the early 1990s. He served eight years in the U.S. House of Representatives, and then moved to the Senate in 2002, winning a very close race against Democrat Jean Carnahan, who had been appointed to her husband’s seat after he died in a plane crash.

Talent’s voting record makes him a loyal Republican, though he positioned himself as independent from the start of the campaign. In a tone-setting July ad he explained, “Most people don’t care if you’re red or blue, Republican or Democrat. They don’t use words like partisan or obstructionist. They care about getting things done, knowing the difference between knowing what’s right and what’s wrong.”<sup>33</sup> By August he had become philosophical about it. “They called politicians centuries ago ‘statesman,’” he declared, with the dictionary definition behind him on the screen. “And the true meaning of the word statesman is not just someone that knows how to make government work, but knows how to represent the people while he makes government work.”<sup>34</sup>

Talent’s ads didn’t show him campaigning against the government in the spirit of Ronald Reagan, Newt Gingrich or Grover Norquist. In a four part series of ads that ran through September and October for a total cost in excess of \$350,000, Jim Talent showed himself as a senator who used government to get things done.<sup>35</sup> He appeared on a park bench, relaxed after a hard day’s work. “People ask me what I’ve been working on in the Senate,” he said. He then ticked off some of the items: Building new roads and bridges, supporting our troops, bringing

prescription drugs to seniors and people in rural areas, funding new research in sickle cell. The list changed in each ad but the message was clear. Activist government was serving the people. He then closed the ad with a call for more. “Oops,” he exclaimed, checking his watch. “Gotta get back to work.”

The flip-side of Talent’s positive ads on good things he’d done was a spate of nasty, personal attack ads. He claimed that McCaskill’s husband, a successful real estate developer, has “a tax shelter in Bermuda” that the family used to avoid paying taxes.<sup>36</sup> Talent spent more than \$2 million on ads charging McCaskill with dodging taxes and with using her husband’s fortune to “buy an election and build her mansion.”<sup>37</sup> His ads regularly pointed out the conflict between her husband’s financial interests in the nursing home industry and her responsibility to regulate the industry as state auditor.

Fighting on her own turf, Democratic challenger, Claire McCaskill, presented herself as a commonsense problem-solver, a fourth generation Missourian, and a tough state auditor who protected taxpayers. She ran an ad in August telling voters that “Dad worked in a small mill in Southwest Missouri.”<sup>38</sup>

And she pushed back on the allegations of corruption and conflict of interest. “Claire’s father died in a nursing home,” declared McCaskill’s mother in an October ad.<sup>39</sup> “That’s why Claire’s worked so hard as auditor to clean them up.” Nursing home care and conflicts of interest ran in the background of the entire campaign, but McCaskill’s major offensive thrust was a challenge to Talent’s claim that he’d been serving the people of the Missouri.

In a \$600,000 ad that reviewed images of Talent on the same park bench, McCaskill gave her own opinion about what he had been working on. “He’s voted for billions in tax breaks for the oil and gas companies. He’s pushed for a drug plan that’s meant billions for the drug companies. And he’s been collecting checks from oil and gas. From pharmaceuticals.”<sup>40</sup> The ad made it clear that Democrats didn’t want Jim Talent to “get back to work,” as he said in his own ad. He’d been captured by corporate interests that work against voters’ interests.

More specific ads showed Shera, a single mother with two jobs who had to quit school when Medicaid cuts drove up her health care costs;<sup>41</sup> Charlie who explained that \$86 to fill up his pickup truck “is the difference between getting by and getting left behind;”<sup>42</sup> and Josh who returned from Iraq with “a busted ankle and post-traumatic stress,” but “[i]t was six months before I could see a doctor.”<sup>43</sup>

McCaskill painted Talent as an insider who had been captured by corporate lobbies and abandoned the people. “What kind of person takes \$280,000 from oil companies then gives them \$14 billion dollars? Votes 19 times to cut Medicaid while taxpayers fund his personal health insurance? Votes 11 times against increasing the minimum wage but takes six Congressional pay raises?”<sup>44</sup> One of her last ads of the season, a \$253,000 buy on November 2, simply shows images of hard working people in middle America. One woman sits in a rocking chair; a man in overalls rests on a park bench; a child rides a bike. A piano plays and no words are spoken, just a few rolling across the screen. “We want leadership on our side. We want change.”<sup>45</sup>

Neither candidate devoted great attention to Iraq. Talent simply listed “working to support our troops” as one item he got done in ads like the one that had him sitting on the park bench until he

checked his watch. McCaskill tended to list Iraq as one of the things for which “accountability” was needed in Washington, and on which Talent had failed.<sup>46</sup>

In one of the most recognizable ads of the season, McCaskill presented the actor Michael J. Fox, shaking with Parkinson’s, pleading for research on behalf of “Americans like me.”<sup>47</sup> At \$257,000 it was a modest buy but it put Talent on the defensive. The following week he spent \$151,000 explaining that he supports medical research and boasting of funding he’s provided for sickle cell. “What I oppose is the cloning of human embryos. This is a personal decision for me based on faith and moral conviction.”<sup>48</sup> The Fox ad—and the controversy around it—generated millions in unpaid media. This was one of the rare times in the 2006 election cycle when moral values moved front and center.

### Summary chart of ad expenditures

	McCaskill	Dem. Party	Other	Talent	Rep. Party	Other
Health	\$2,400,629	\$1,124,507	\$0	\$1,597,156	\$0	\$967,576
Campaign\$/Corruption	\$1,021,501	\$1,169,588	1 primary*	\$2,629,069	\$1,326,149	\$0
Taxes	\$688,230	\$2,394,234	\$0	\$1,040,403	\$599,226	\$0
Jobs/Economy	\$660,941	\$2,584,731	\$0	\$857,744	\$0	\$524,472
Iraq	\$1,127,970	\$0	\$25,489	\$1,550,154	\$599,226	2 primary*
Individual total	\$5,217,549	\$6,287,958	\$25,489	\$4,495,370	\$4,823,585	\$2,041,047
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>\$11,530,996</b>			<b>\$11,360,002</b>	

\* Primary advertisement; no financial information available.

\*\* A single ad may address more than one issue, so its cost will appear in more than one row. However, the cost appears only once in the total. Thus, the sum of expenditures by subject may appear to exceed the total.

### Pennsylvania Senate Democrat Bob Casey v. Republican Incumbent Rick Santorum

Pennsylvania is a crucial swing presidential state and the race for Pennsylvania Senate was one of the most expensive in the nation, with incumbent Republican Rick Santorum enjoying a significant funding advantage from the start.<sup>49</sup>

Both Santorum and the challenger, Democrat Bob Casey, were relatively well known. Santorum had established himself as a leader of movement conservatives. First elected to Congress in the 1994 Republican revolution, he was renowned for his opposition to government spending, and his drive to restore moral order. Casey, the son of a popular former governor, had run successfully statewide to become state treasurer. His opposition to abortion was well known, even before the campaign began.

Santorum didn’t back away from his conservatism in the election, but he seemed to understand the limits of that appeal. Campaigning at the Pittsburgh Zoo, he bragged about the \$500,000 federal money he secured for the new polar bear exhibit.<sup>50</sup> He ran television ads boasting about defeating Pentagon plans to close the 911<sup>th</sup> Airlift Wing stationed at the Pittsburgh Airport. “Hundreds of jobs were saved,” the ad declared.<sup>51</sup> At \$1.4 million, one of his biggest ad buys of the campaign showed his willingness to “fight” to make sure Pennsylvania gets “our fair share of highway funds.”<sup>52</sup> He ran for reelection emphasizing he was a politician who brought home the bacon.

Ironically for one of the generals of Tom Delay's notorious K Street project, a main theme in Santorum campaign ads was the corruption of money in politics. Santorum outspent Casey on the air during the crucial month of September by \$5.3 million compared to \$3.4 million. Santorum spent more money than anything else – fully \$2.3 million – charging Casey with being compromised by his special interests donors. In comparison, he spent less than \$600,000 on national security or the war in Iraq.

The ad that drew the most attention during the campaign was a \$1 million spot that showed alleged Casey campaign contributors smoking cigars in dimly lit prison cells, while the announcer intoned how much each had allegedly given to the Casey campaign.<sup>53</sup> The ad stirred controversy for factual problems<sup>54</sup> but the message was clear: Political giving and prison terms were peas in a pod. One of the Republican Party's leading fund-raisers and leading social conservatives chose to emphasize the real corruption of modern America: money in politics. Casey countered with ads claiming Santorum's charges to be false, while attacking Santorum for voting against raising the minimum age while raising his own salary, voting to send jobs abroad, seeking to privatize Social Security.

The cost of corporate favors emerged from Casey's side of the field as well. Starting in the early spring, the independent Lantern Project ran ads claiming that "Oil companies are making record profits and we're paying more, but Rick Santorum recently voted to give oil companies an additional \$2 billion in new tax breaks." The Lantern Project dogged Santorum throughout the campaign with similar 15 second spots on prescription drugs, minimum wage, student loans, overtime pay and lobbyist visits. Each spot indicated the Santorum was on the take, and that regular folk were being left behind.

Meanwhile Casey ran his own ads presenting himself as the champion of the little guy, who would protect them from the corporate interests that dominate Washington. One of Casey's biggest ad buys of the fall showed him in front of the U.S. Capitol voicing the popular sentiment that "America's headed in the wrong direction."<sup>55</sup> In serious tones, he explained the cause of the misdirection: "Senators selling out to the drug companies, the oil companies and the insurance industry." Attacks on trade accords that send jobs abroad was a central part of this litany.

Altogether, the air wars of the Casey-Santorum campaign paint a picture of a government controlled by money and pushing against American families. The bacon Santorum brought home wasn't enough to swing the balance. Pennsylvania voters pushed back against big business and its influence in government.

"These tax cuts upon tax cuts for multi-millionaires just don't make any sense. Or giving corporations tax breaks for sending jobs overseas. We need to reduce the deficit, lower interest rates, and invest in people again. We can do a lot better in Washington, and we will. I'm Bob Casey, and I approve this message."<sup>56</sup>

### Summary chart of ad expenditures

	Casey	Dem. Party	Other	Santorum	Rep. Party	Other
Jobs/Economy	\$7,507,465	\$1,287,723	\$61,161	\$853,897	\$0	\$1,299,618
Campaign\$/Corruption	\$3,710,205	\$1,287,723	\$62,303	\$2,290,295	\$354,842	\$0
Iraq	\$35,301	\$1,287,723	\$0	\$590,963	\$0	1 primary*
Bacon	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,163,705	\$0	\$0
Individual total	\$8,649,152	\$2,445,988	\$139,862	\$9,985,683	\$364,483	\$3,325,727
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>\$11,235,002</b>			<b>\$13,675,893</b>	

\* Primary advertisement; no financial information available.

\*\* A single ad may address more than one issue, so its cost will appear in more than one row. However, the cost appears only once in the total. Thus, the sum of expenditures by subject may appear to exceed the total.

### Race-by-Race Analysis: U.S. House of Representatives

#### Ohio House District 15:

#### Democratic Challenger Mary Jo Kilroy v. Republican Incumbent Deborah Pryce

Republican Deborah Pryce was no doubt surprised to find herself in a pitched battle for re-election though she seems likely to survive. The fourth highest ranking member of the House Republican caucus, Pryce had been re-elected seven times to her seat. Her district, centered in Columbus, supported George Bush in 2004.

Outside expenditures helped define the race. In April, MoveOn.org ran a series of ads painting Pryce as “caught red-handed.” The ads showed her accepting industry campaign contributions and protecting oil company profits, drug company prices, and defense contractors who overcharge. Meanwhile, soldiers lacked body armor, seniors paid too much for drugs, and we all “pay at the pump.”<sup>57</sup> The cost of corruption was a particularly resonant ad in a state where the Republican Party was swimming in scandal.

Pryce’s own campaign focused on taxes. Her ads indicted her opponent, Mary Jo Kilroy for raising taxes as a local official and opposing Bush’s massive federal tax cuts. “For Congress, the difference on taxes is clear,” declared Pryce’s \$100,000 Labor Day ad,<sup>58</sup> defining the tone of her campaign, detailing a list of local taxes that she charged Kilroy had voted to raise and federal taxes that Pryce helped to cut.

As a challenger, Kilroy presented herself as a fiscally responsible manager, and used that as a counter to the Pryce attacks on taxes. “Mary Jo Kilroy balanced 14 of 14 budgets” during her time as county commissioner, she declared in her Labor Day ad that started the day after Pryce’s anti-tax attacks.<sup>59</sup> The ad boasts that Kilroy’s county was ranked one of the five best managed counties in the country, and that her budgets balanced every year while Bush and Pryce ran up record deficits. The next few ads bragged about increased local funding for health care and veterans’ benefits, making it clear what she was doing with taxpayer money.<sup>60</sup>

Kilroy further explained in a broadly reported interview, “What I find offensive is to just put everything on a gigantic federal credit card for somebody else to take care of,” she told the

*Columbus Dispatch*. "That's just tax cuts because you think you're going to score political points for it."<sup>61</sup>

At the close of the campaign, with the outcome very much in doubt, Pryce changed tack. She wanted voters to know how she delivered. An ad broadcast on October 20 showed an Ohioan thanking Pryce because she "got me the medication I need." Another Ohioan said Pryce "saved our farm" and another said she "helped children get all the health care they need."<sup>62</sup> On October 26 she ran an add bragging how she secured federal funds to expand the local airport and "won critical funding to make Columbus Children's Hospital a national leader."<sup>63</sup>

**Summary chart of ad expenditure**

	Kilroy	Dem. Party	Other	Pryce	Rep. Party	Other
Iraq/veterans	\$995,257	\$368,311	\$124,141	\$333,050	\$339,400	\$0
Taxes/Budgets	\$850,178	\$0	\$0	\$864,413	\$1,340,108	\$0
Campaign\$/Corruption	3 primary*	\$231,631	\$156,754	\$228,478	\$0	\$0
Individual total	\$1,271,425	\$1,262,916	\$501,134	\$2,158,888	\$1,679,508	\$216,411
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>\$3,035,475</b>			<b>\$4,054,807</b>	

\* Primary advertisement; no financial information available.

\*\* A single ad may address more than one issue, so its cost will appear in more than one row. However, the cost appears only once in the total. Thus, the sum of expenditures by subject may appear to exceed the total.

**Florida, House District 22:**

**Democratic Challenger Ron Klein v. Republican Incumbent Clay Shaw**

Representative Clay Shaw had been elected 13 times in 22<sup>nd</sup> House District of Florida, a district with one of the nation's highest percentage of elderly voters. The district supported John Kerry in the 2004 presidential election and, from the beginning, Democrats made it clear that they would challenge Shaw. His Democratic challenger Ron Klein was a state legislator and a partner in a law firm that, among other things, lobbies the Florida legislature.

Shaw presented himself as friend of the environment<sup>64</sup> and highlighted his alleged difference with President Bush over privatizing Social Security.<sup>65</sup> His attack on his challenger echoed the populist themes of both his opponent and of Democratic challengers across the country. Clay Shaw and the Republican Party spent \$4.4 million painting Klein as lobbyist who puts corporate money over the public good. "[Ron Klein] is a paid lobbyist [who] used his political position to make [his] lobbying law firm rich."<sup>66</sup>

"Big Sugar," declares the announcer in one of Clay Shaw's leading attack ads,<sup>67</sup> "Pumping pollution into the everglades and pumping campaign money into Tallahassee's politicians like Ron Klein." On the air, Clay Shaw spent more time and money attacking his challenger for accepting corporate contributions as a state legislator than any other issue. This 23-year-incumbent barely paused to brag about providing prescription drug coverage for seniors in a district with one of the highest concentration of Medicare recipients in the country. Instead, he spent the bulk of his ad budget criticizing his challenger for accepting corporate money and appeasing corporate interests in return. "Ron Klein can't change Washington. He's already part of the problem."<sup>68</sup>

Ron Klein’s campaign featured the same themes. He presented himself as a man of the people who never personally lobbied the state legislature (although his law firm did).<sup>69</sup> His own charges against Shaw mirrored Shaw’s charges against him. He charged Shaw with being in the pocket of pharmaceutical manufacturers and the insurance industry.<sup>70</sup> “Congress banned Medicare from negotiating lower drug prices, and gave pharmaceutical giants a windfall,” declares a \$160,000 attack ad that highlights Shaw’s role in passing the new prescription drug benefit. “Wonder why? Shaw has taken nearly a million dollars in big drug and insurance donations.”<sup>71</sup>

Two weeks later, a \$699,000 attack, one of the biggest buys of the campaign, pointed out: “As he was writing a bill to give them [drug companies] billions in new profits, Shaw bought drug company stock for himself. Once the law was signed, Shaw sold his stock, putting profits in his own pocket. So here’s how this drug deal went down. Shaw took care of the drug companies, and he took care of himself.”<sup>72</sup>

The exchange of conflict-of-interest populist attacks dominated the campaign. Both sides launched mirror-image attacks that the other had sold out to industry. Independent candidate Neil Evangelista captured the sentiment in their three-way debate. "You've seen all their ads," he said. “Mr. Klein is right about Mr. Shaw, and Mr. Shaw is right about Mr. Klein. I'm none of the above.”<sup>73</sup>

Neither major party candidate proposed a solution but they both accepted the same frame: Private corporate interests have too much power, and don’t represent the public good. Voters should reject politicians who pocket corporate campaign contributions and vote in favor of corporate interests. A more fundamentally progressive theme cannot be stated.

**Summary chart of ad expenditures**

	Klein	Dem. Party	Other	Shaw	Rep. Party	Other
Campaign\$/Corruption	\$408,405	\$1,745,928	\$0	\$2,198,166	\$2,204,473	\$0
Energy/Environment	\$539,725	\$897,475	\$0	\$459,379	\$0	\$0
Individual total	\$2,831,058	\$2,786,605	2 primary*	\$2,544,481	\$3,426,692	\$136,157
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>\$5,617,663</b>			<b>\$6,107,330</b>	

\* Primary advertisement; no financial information available.

\*\* A single ad may address more than one issue, so its cost will appear in more than one row. However, the cost appears only once in the total. Thus, the sum of expenditures by subject may appear to exceed the total.

**New Mexico House District 01:  
Democratic Challenger Patricia Madrid v. Republican Incumbent Heather Wilson**

Incumbent Republican Heather Wilson has been elected four times to the U.S. Congress, and has been a leading target of Democrats each time. This year, the contest for 1st House District in New Mexico was particularly prominent, attracting attention from AFSCME and the NEA (for Madrid) as well as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Realtors (for Wilson).

The incumbent Heather Wilson presented herself as an effective legislator who can deliver the goods. Her own \$94,000 ad bragged that she had saved the military base in Kirtland, and 23,000 jobs with it.<sup>74</sup> The Chamber of Commerce spent \$82,000 praising her for delivering the prescription drug benefit. She also presented herself as independent of George Bush and the Republican right. She spent \$192,000 on an ad highlighting her differences with Bush over stem cell research. “I voted to override his veto because it was the right thing to do,” she declared.<sup>75</sup> The ad ended with the slogan used throughout her campaign. “Independent. Honest. Effective.”

But more of her money was spent on negative attacks. Wilson assailed her opponent, Patricia Madrid for being soft on corruption. “Attorney General Patricia Madrid ignored the corruption in Santa Fe for years,” contends a Wilson ad early in the summer.<sup>76</sup> She said Madrid was soft on a public corruption scandal involving state treasurers Robert Vigil and Michael Montoya and cash money allegedly changing hands in bathroom stalls.<sup>77</sup> Wilson and the NRCC spent a total of \$1.7 million hammering Madrid on these scandals, about as much as they spent on taxes, health care and the economy *combined*.

Patricia Madrid returned the attacks in kind. “And Heather Wilson? She took \$46,000 from indicted Republican leader Tom Delay, then voted to make it harder to investigate him.” On screen are photos of Heather Wilson and Tom Delay, both smiling.<sup>78</sup> She and the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee (DCCC) spent a total of \$1.9 million accusing Wilson of selling out the public interest for personal gain. “Heather Wilson took almost \$400,000 from the oil and gas industry while voting to give them \$2.6 billion in subsidies,” Madrid declared in a \$136,000 buy.<sup>79</sup>

This issue of money in politics dominated the campaign. Of the 48 ads shown on television, 26 of them addressed personal corruption or the taint of money in politics.

<p><b>DCCC: “Same Lane”</b></p> <p><i>327 screenings for \$127,773 starting September 19, 2006.</i></p> <p>“They just keep driving in the same lane. George Bush and Heather Wilson. Wilson’s taken \$416,000 in contributions from Big Oil and Gas, energy special interests who give millions to Bush. And Wilson voted for the Bush energy plan. Billions in tax breaks for the oil and gas industry, while they’re already making record profits. Heather Wilson and George Bush. They get their way, and New Mexico gets left behind.”</p>	<p><b>Wilson: “Corruption Cards II”</b></p> <p><i>506 screenings for \$157,773 starting September 20, 2006 (following “Corruption Cards,” with 613 screenings for \$214,894 on September 5).</i></p> <p>“Troubling Questions. A casino owner wanted less competition, and Patricia Madrid got over \$100,000 in cash. But there’s more. A contract to build a private prison was in jeopardy until Patricia Madrid intervened to save the \$13 million deal. Just 18 days later, Madrid got ten grand from the people who got the contract. Madrid’s friends got the contract. Madrid got her cash.”</p>
---	--

The attacks went back and forth. Madrid and the Democrats said Wilson sold out to the pharmaceutical industry with a prescription drug plan that didn't let Medicare negotiate for lower prices. Wilson and the Republicans said Madrid gave a sweetheart plea deal to a party member indicted in a kickback scheme. The candidates saturated the airwaves with messages of public corruption and self-dealing.

The only other issue to break through was Madrid's unusually strong criticism of the war in Iraq. Madrid first raised the issue with an ad framed as a challenge to Wilson's slogan of honesty and independence. "[S]he never questioned Bush on the war" Madrid accused in a \$184,000 ad aired in August. "Heather Wilson even missed a vote on setting a timetable for withdrawal so she could attend a fundraiser with George Bush."<sup>80</sup>

Three weeks later Madrid suggested that the war had backfired. The Iraq war and Wilson's failures on the House Armed Services Committee had actually *increased* the terrorist threat. "Heather Wilson: Lying for George Bush. Leaving America *less safe*."<sup>81</sup>

By late October, the DCCC had joined in the call. In one of its strongest ads of the season it recited the history of problems with intelligence and Iraq, and answered whether America needs to stay the course. "No, we don't."<sup>82</sup> A few days later another DCCC spot advised, "It's time to make a change."

Wilson responded with accusations not about the war, but about warrantless wiretapping. She spent \$583,000 in the second half of October with ads on national security.<sup>83</sup> "A terrorist plot may be unfolding. Should the government intercept the call or wait until the paperwork is filed? Heather Wilson says act immediately. Lives may be at stake. Liberal Patricia Madrid says no. Apply for a court warrant, even if valuable time is lost."<sup>84</sup> Neither Heather Wilson nor the NRCC actually defended the war in Iraq.

### Summary chart of ad expenditures

	Madrid	Dem. Party	Other	Wilson	Rep. Party	Other
Campaign/Corruption	\$1,385,035	\$543,467	\$86,354	\$1,161,966	\$729,537	\$0
Iraq	\$1,119,256	\$679,136	\$0	\$967,914	\$0	\$0
Individual total	\$1,758,964	\$1,222,603	\$322,892	\$3,191,382	\$1,001,941	\$622,777
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>\$3,304,459</b>			<b>\$4,816,100</b>	

\*\* A single ad may address more than one issue, so its cost will appear in more than one row. However, the cost appears only once in the total. Thus, the sum of expenditures by subject may appear to exceed the total.

### Iowa House District 01: Democratic Bruce Braley v. Republican Mike Whalen

In the 1<sup>st</sup> District of Iowa, the retirement of the Republican incumbent opened a contested race for the open seat.<sup>85</sup> In a district of rolling cornfields and light industry on the bluffs above the Mississippi River, business interests made this district a top priority. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce and other business groups poured money into the campaign of the Republican

candidate Mike Whalen, a restaurateur businessman. Meanwhile, organized labor fueled the campaign of Democratic candidate Bruce Braley, trial lawyer with a history of volunteering in the non-profit sector.

Republican Mike Whalen presented himself as a businessman who knew how to create jobs and meet a payroll. He turned a small restaurant into a multi-million dollar, multi-state chain. He could get things done. One ad said he spent “a lifetime creating jobs and opportunities for Iowa families.”<sup>86</sup> Another ad promised to put that experience to work. “As your Congressman, I’ll get up every morning thinking about how we can grow the economy and protect America for you and your kids. That’s why I’m asking you to hire Mike.”<sup>87</sup>

At the same time, he attacked Braley as a “greedy trial lawyer”<sup>88</sup> whose lawsuits slowed the wheels of production. Braley “co-authored a book on how to sue doctors” while “[H]ealthcare costs soar and Iowa can’t get the doctors we need,”<sup>89</sup> Whalen declared in a \$94,000 ad around Labor Day. By the end of the campaign he even had it down to a rhyme. “Bruce Braley: The spirit of ‘Can Sue.’ Mike Whalen: The spirit of ‘Can Do.’”<sup>90</sup>

But Braley turned Whalen’s own professional experience against him. “Whalen opposes raising the minimum wage,” he accused in a tone-setting ad just before Labor Day.<sup>91</sup> “Wonder why? Millionaire Whalen pays some of his employees just the minimum wage.” Jobs and wages, especially the minimum wage, appeared regularly in Braley’s advertisements. His ads compared Congressional salaries with their own regular pay raises to the stalled minimum. “Thirty years ago I made \$2.30 an hour bussing tables like these to put myself through college,” he said standing in a diner. “It’s disgraceful that today’s minimum wage pays people only \$5.15 and hour.”<sup>92</sup>

He defended his profession as a lawyer who fought “to hold corporations accountable to their employees,”<sup>93</sup> and returned his attention back to working people. At \$98,000, one of his biggest ad buys announced that 20,000 manufacturing jobs left Iowa under George Bush. The ads said Braley “supports rolling back unfair trade deals like NAFTA and CAFTA because they cost us jobs in Iowa.” The ad even accused Whalen of moving his own company out of Iowa to get tax breaks.<sup>94</sup>

The DCCC didn’t join him on trade but it chimed in with its own \$203,000 advertisement against big business and on behalf of working people. “Bush gave billions in tax breaks to oil companies while they made record profits.” Bruce Braley will “crack down on tax giveaways to oil companies.”<sup>95</sup>

“I won’t take a pay raise in Congress until the minimum wage is \$7.25. You can take that to the bank.”<sup>96</sup>

### Summary chart of ad expenditures

	Braley	Dem. Party	Other	Whalen	Rep. Party	Other
Jobs/Economy	\$466,943	\$854,030	\$0	\$501,424	\$0	\$0
Iraq	\$51,322	\$552,596	\$0	\$254,243	\$830,251	\$118,400
Individual total	\$518,265	\$1,641,646	\$14,042	\$733,105	\$1,795,124	\$118,400
Campaign\$/Corruption	2 primary*	\$0	\$0			
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>\$2,173,953</b>			<b>\$2,646,629</b>	

\*\* A single ad may address more than one issue, so its cost will appear in more than one row.

However, the cost appears only once in the total. Thus, the sum of expenditures by subject may appear to exceed the total.

### Pennsylvania House District 06: Democratic Lois Murphy v. Republican Jim Gerlach

Pennsylvania’s 6th Congressional District is located in affluent suburbs west of Philadelphia, where television time is expensive to buy. It is a classic swing district in a swing state. Gerlach won his elections by narrow margins but Kerry took the district in 2004. This election is something of a rematch. The same Lois Murphy failed to unseat the same Jim Gerlach in 2004 by a margin of 6,731 votes.

During his two terms in office, Gerlach has done little to distinguish himself. He voted relatively reliably with the Republican Party, although he did vote to override the President’s veto of stem cell research. The local newspaper *Morning Call* endorsed Gerlach over Murphy two years ago but changed its endorsement this time “after watching the incumbent's performance in office.”<sup>97</sup>

Lois Murphy’s web page described her as a wife, mother and attorney who represents small businesses, nonprofits and families. Earlier in her career she was associate counsel at the National Abortion Rights Action League, and later served on the board of NARAL Pro-Choice Pennsylvania.

Perhaps it was the NARAL connection that fueled the negativity, but this campaign was remarkable for its anti-liberal hostility. In some ways it echoed the Gerlach win in 2004, fueled in part by an ad suggesting that Murphy supported the Taliban, kidnaps and rapes.<sup>98</sup>

Over the summer, Republicans saturated the conservative parts of the district with a direct-mail blitz claiming that "San Francisco liberals have a plan for Berks county" – high taxes and "far-left values."<sup>99</sup> That was just the warm-up. In October, the NRCC spent \$722,000 claiming that Lois would “roll back the tax cuts” and create “the largest tax increase in America’s history.”<sup>100</sup> They followed it with \$1.9 million in ads accusing “Liberal Lois Murphy”<sup>101</sup> of being endorsed by “radical groups”<sup>102</sup> who don’t “share our values”<sup>103</sup> and advocate “cutting the defense budget by \$130 billion.”<sup>104</sup> On Halloween, with the race still far too close to call, the NRCC spent \$1.5 million broadcasting a single ad more than 3,500 times. “Lois Murphy is extreme. Look at the company she keeps, a who’s who of liberal causes.” On the screen flashed the names of MoveOn and Council for a Livable World, and the banner, “Too Extreme.”

Before Halloween Gerlach spent only \$50,000 of his own money on the air, mostly on a local land use issue, and he virtually disappeared behind the national Republicans. But in the closing days of the campaign he found half a million dollars to run an ad that to echoed the “liberal” label with specific accusations. “Do you recognize this liberal? Here are some hints. She supports amnesty for 11 million illegal aliens. She supports giving illegals special perks like lower college tuition rates and full Social Security. She supports illegal aliens going two years without paying any federal taxes. Yet this very same liberal supports raising your taxes and cutting your Social Security benefits. Now you have a clear picture of Lois Murphy.”<sup>105</sup>

We’ll never find out how Lois Murphy might have responded to those criticisms. She did reasonably well in fundraising but she couldn’t keep up, especially in that final week. Her only major ad, from early October, matter-of-factly discussed good government, wasteful spending and the need for change.<sup>106</sup> The DCCC backed her up with ads tying Gerlach to President Bush and the failed occupation of Iraq.<sup>107</sup> It ran its own million dollar ad on Halloween night that cited the National Intelligence Estimate to prove that “the war has made us less safe.”<sup>108</sup> But it wasn’t enough. The Republican financial advantage, the inherent advantage of incumbency, and district lines redrawn in 2001 to favor Republicans<sup>109</sup> were simply too much.

### Summary chart of ad expenditures

	Murphy	Dem. Party	Other	Gerlach	Rep. Party	Other
Taxes/Budget	\$866,426	\$2,184,903	\$0	\$271,573	\$3,676,513	\$0
Iraq	\$594,327	\$2,782,700	\$0	\$283,763	\$1,860,741	\$0
Campaign\$/Corruption	\$594,327	\$0	\$0	\$43,489	\$0	\$0
Individual total	\$1,460,753	\$3,504,205	\$0	\$592,476	\$5,537,254	\$438,582
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>\$4,964,958</b>			<b>\$6,568,312</b>	

\*\* A single ad may address more than one issue, so its cost will appear in more than one row. However, the cost appears only once in the total. Thus, the sum of expenditures by subject may appear to exceed the total.

### Race-by-Race Analysis: Governors

#### Ohio Governor

#### Democrat Ted Strickland v. Republican Ken Blackwell

Ohio is a heartland state with all the troubles of modern America. Its manufacturing base has been hit by overseas competition and its agricultural base is straining to sustain the family farmer. Ohio was also the swing state whose final late tally gave the presidency to George Bush in 2004.

Rare among Republicans in 2006, Ohio Secretary of State Ken Blackwell centered his primary campaign for governor with a direct appeal to conservative moral values. In a contested primary, nearly all of his ads were about gay marriage and abortion. “As governor, I will not back down from the values we share,” he declared in one of his biggest ad buys of the primary season.<sup>110</sup>

He tacked back towards the center for the general election, and ran mostly on taxes. In August, he spent \$663,000 on one ad that listed taxes as systematically as a W-4 form. “In Congress, Taxin’ Ted [Strickland] voted 31 times to increase taxes on gasoline, family income, even Social

Security. Fifty-two times he opposed a tax cut on married couples, families with children and even medical savings.”<sup>111</sup> He followed it with a \$635,000 buy in which he admits that “Taxin’ Ted” voted four times to reduce taxes. “But he doesn’t tell you about his 83 other votes for higher taxes.”<sup>112</sup>

But he never completely abandoned morals. In September Blackwell ran an ad attacking “liberal judges” for prohibiting prayer in school and removing “Under God” from the Pledge of Allegiance.<sup>113</sup> His campaign continued to characterize Strickland as an “ultraliberal ideologue.”<sup>114</sup> To prove it, Blackwell spokesman Carlo LoParo said Strickland was supported by "radical and liberal advocacy groups" such as NARAL, the Service Employees International Union and People for the American Way.<sup>115</sup> Blackwell himself told the *Columbus Dispatch* in October that gay marriage and abortion kept business from locating in Ohio.<sup>116</sup>

Independent expenditure campaigns reinforced the themes. At \$473,000 the biggest single “values” buy was for an ad by a group called Common Sense Ohio, which attacked Strickland for opposing “Under God” in the Pledge while supporting abortion and gay marriage.<sup>117</sup> In September, the Republican Governor’s Association spent \$356,000 on an ad indicting Strickland on gay marriage.<sup>118</sup>

In contrast, Ted Strickland presented himself as a problem solver and uniter. His ads focused on schools and jobs, and promised to “create the jobs of the future by making sure we have the most highly trained workforce possible.”<sup>119</sup> He ran a single \$638,000 ad that pointed out the connection between campaign contributions and the local no-bid contract scandals in Ohio, concluding that “it’s time for a change.”<sup>120</sup> But generally his ads focused good things that he had done as a legislator. He spent \$983,000 touting his role in passing the Family and Medical Leave Act<sup>121</sup> and \$765,000 bragging that he had helped save the Wheeling-Pittsburgh Steel plant.<sup>122</sup> Ted Strickland opposed NAFTA, and people who watched television learned it about it through his advertising.

His general appeal was a populist one. “We’ve got a state where college is becoming increasingly unaffordable. Where jobs are leaving. Where more and more of our citizens find themselves without adequate healthcare coverage,” Strickland laments in a \$418,000 ad called *Look Forward*.<sup>123</sup> The ad promises to use government resources to solve those problems, and to “expand the use of renewable and alternative energies.” It is positive, forward-looking and recognizes the role that the public sector plays in promoting the public good.

The results of this race speak for themselves. Blackwell’s base-hugging strategy didn’t overcome the scandals that stained Republican candidates in this state. Strickland’s focus on kitchen-table issues and government as a positive force contributed to a landslide.

### Summary chart of ad expenditures

	Strickland	Dem. Party	Other	Blackwell	Rep. Party	Other
Education	\$3,254,889	\$0	\$409,223	\$552,228	\$0	\$0
Jobs/Economy	\$2,963,730	\$0	\$10,202	\$2,052,317	\$0	\$368,385
Health	\$1,945,706	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Taxes	\$1,089,801	\$0	\$0	\$3,310,285	\$0	\$980,803
Moral Values	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,006,022	\$356,791	\$473,383

Individual total	\$6,518,296	\$0	\$409,223	\$5,005,940	\$356,791	\$2,172,099
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>\$6,927,519</b>			<b>\$7,534,830</b>	

\*\* A single ad may address more than one issue, so its cost will appear in more than one row. However, the cost appears only once in the total. Thus, the sum of expenditures by subject may appear to exceed the total.

## **Colorado Governor Democrat Bill Ritter v. Republican Bob Beauprez**

Colorado is a state in transition. Dominated by conservative Republicans for years, it has recently witnessed a Democratic resurgence. Liberal majorities populate its major metropolises, while smaller towns are centers of right-wing energy. The conservative group Focus on the Family has its headquarters in Colorado Springs, the state’s second largest city. The state’s economy needs to reconcile a modern high tech sector with and old agricultural and mining interests. Immigration is a hot button issue.

This year is one of transition in the Colorado governor’s mansion. Republican Bill Owens was required to step down after two terms. Competing to take his place were two men who already hold public office. Republican Bob Beauprez retired from the U.S. House of Representatives after serving one term as the first representative of its new 7th district. Democrat Bill Ritter was the district attorney of Denver, Colorado’s biggest city.

In this election, Democrat Bill Ritter presented himself as a champion of alternative energy, the candidate of sunshine. He opened his campaign after Labor Day with a \$327,000 ad buy on energy, one of his biggest of the campaign.<sup>124</sup> Before beautiful scenery in wide open spaces, Ritter talked about wind farms and wheat fields. He said Colorado University research could lead America towards energy independence. “My economic plan protects our air and water, and creates jobs and a new energy economy.”

The following week, a \$283,000 Ritter ad talked about investment. A smiling Ritter promised to balance the budget while innovating and investing wisely in education, health care and energy. A guitar strummed behind scenes of children and windmills.

Republican Bob Beauprez ran as a tough man, serious and stern. Experience “taught me to sit straight in the saddle and have a tight grip on the reins,” he declared in a \$68,000 ad.<sup>125</sup> He focused on the challenge posed by crime and illegal immigration. Half his ads featured immigration, and never in a positive light. “I believe we ought to require proof of citizenship prior to voting,” he declared in his post-Labor Day campaign opening.<sup>126</sup>

A week after Labor Day, roughly the time Ritter ran his ads on investment, a new Beauprez ad warned, “I believe we ought to stop releasing illegal aliens who commit violent crimes back into our communities to commit crimes again.”<sup>127</sup> Illegal aliens committing violent crimes were a mainstay of his campaign, blurring the line between immigrants and criminals. He spent nearly \$1.2 million on ads connecting Bill Ritter to such individuals, since as District Attorney Ritter had presided over many of those releases. (One such ad got Beauprez in trouble because it used confidential information in a felony case that was legally available only to law enforcement.)<sup>128</sup>

Ritter’s victory suggests the rise of a more positive American spirit, tired of running in fear. Ritter’s Colorado was energetic and hopeful, and that’s where the electorate chose to head.

**Summary chart of ad expenditures**

	Ritter	Dem. Party	Other	Beauprez	Rep. Party	Other
Education	\$940,605	\$0	\$143,398	\$33,001	\$0	\$0
Energy/Environment	\$617,679	\$0	\$0	\$73,812	\$0	\$0
Health	\$553,495	\$0	\$263,573	\$0	\$0	\$0
Immigration/Crime	\$199,045	\$0	\$0	\$963,219	\$0	\$530,918
Individual total	\$2,005,234	\$0	\$962,356	\$1,630,493	\$0	\$530,918
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>\$2,967,590</b>			<b>\$2,161,411</b>	

\*\* A single ad may address more than one issue, so its cost will appear in more than one row. However, the cost appears only once in the total. Thus, the sum of expenditures by subject may appear to exceed the total.

## ENDNOTES

---

- <sup>1</sup> Liz Sidoti. "U.S. Chamber of Commerce Alters Medicare Ads After Democrats Complain." *The Associated Press*. 1 August 2006. Geoff Davis (KY); Jim Talent (MO); Mark Kennedy (MN); John Kline (MN); Collin Peterson (MN)- Democrat; Jon Kyl (AZ); JD Hayworth (AZ); Mike DeWine (OH); Deborah Pryce (OH); Rick Santorum (PA); Don Sherwood (PA); Curt Weldon (PA); Jim Matheson (UT)- Democrat; Thelma Drake (VA); Jon Porter (NV); Rob Simmons (CT); Heather Wilson (NM).
- <sup>2</sup> Heather Wilson. "Kirtland." *Heather Wilson for Congress*. 5 October 2006. 243 screenings for \$93,820. Source: TNS Media Intelligence/Campaign Media Analysis Group. [Henceforth: TNSMI-CMAG]
- <sup>3</sup> Rick Santorum. "Champion." *Santorum 2006*. 21 September 2006. 138 screenings for \$160,014. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>4</sup> "More Taxes." *National Republican Congressional Committee*. 23 October 2006. 391 screenings for \$174,006. Source: TNS Media Intelligence/Campaign Media Analysis Group.
- <sup>5</sup> Bob Beauprez. "Table." *Beauprez for Governor Committee*. 13 September 2006. 67 screenings for \$21,062. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>6</sup> "Taxes." *Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee*. 23 September 2006. 95 screenings for \$91,288. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>7</sup> Amy Klobuchar. "Deficit." *Klobuchar for Minnesota Committee*. 8 September 2006. 442 screenings for \$539,326. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>8</sup> Ken Blackwell. "Taxin' Ted." *Ohioans for Blackwell*. 27 August 2006. 1,139 screenings for \$662,681. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>9</sup> Greg Hitt. "Protectionist Stance Is Gaining Clout, Democrats Benefit by Fighting Free Trade, and Next Congress Could Face Changing Tide." *Wall Street Journal*. 6 November 2006.
- <sup>10</sup> Bill Ritter. "New Energy Economy." *Bill Ritter for Congress*. 6 September 2006. 421 screenings for \$330,233. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>11</sup> "Energy Future." *US Chamber of Commerce*. 29 August 2006 (Talent). 30 August 2006 (DeWine, Santorum, Wilson, Pryce). Mike DeWine: 167 screenings for \$116,368. Rick Santorum: 136 screenings for \$79,760, Jim Talent: 220 screenings for \$275,415, Heather Wilson: 43 screenings for \$17,884, Deborah Pryce: 39 screenings \$28,312. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>12</sup> Jon M. Broder and Megan Thee. "Alarm Bells for G.O.P. in Poll Results in Ohio." *The New York Times*. 18 October 2006. 46% of registered voters ranked economy and jobs as their number one concern; next was health care at 17% and terrorism at 15%.
- <sup>13</sup> "For U.S. Senate: DeWine Displays Cooperation, Common Sense Necessary to Get Essential Work Done." *Columbus Dispatch*. 15 October 2006.
- <sup>14</sup> Sherrod Brown. "The Standard." *Friends of Sherrod Brown*. 8-9 September 2006. 999 screenings for \$699,226. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>15</sup> "The Standard." *Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee*. 11 September 2006. 332 screenings for \$142,851. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>16</sup> "Change is Coming." *Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee*. 1-3 September 2006; 1,775 screenings for \$1,310,956. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>17</sup> See e.g. "Senator's Record Reflects Compromise, Not Crusading." *Columbus Dispatch*. 3 September 2006. Michael Douglas. "Mike DeWine In Full: What Sherrod Brown Won't Tell You." *Akron Beacon Journal (Ohio)*. 24 September 2006.
- <sup>18</sup> Mike DeWine. "First Responders." *Mike DeWine for U.S. Senate*. 9 July 2006. 1,086 screenings for \$590,028. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>19</sup> Mike DeWine. "Weakening Security." *Mike DeWine for U.S. Senate*. 14 July 2006. 2,223 screenings for \$1,096,663. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>20</sup> "Defend our Security." *National Republican Senatorial Committee*. 28 September 2006. 1,457 screenings for \$926,394. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>21</sup> In the worksheet, from Disappointed to Pam. September is pink; October is blue.
- <sup>22</sup> Mike DeWine. "Polar Opposites." *Mike DeWine for U.S. Senate*. 19 September 2006. 682 screenings for \$448,469. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>23</sup> Adam Nagourney. "In Final Weeks, G.O.P. Focuses on Best Bets." *New York Times*. 16 October 2006.
- <sup>24</sup> Mark Kennedy. "About Mark." *Mark Kennedy 06*. Screening and Money Data Unavailable. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>25</sup> Mark Kennedy. "Crossing Party Lines." *Mark Kennedy 06*. Screening and Money Data Unavailable. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.

- 
- <sup>26</sup> Jay Weiner. "From 'Dull' Accountant to Determined Candidate." *Minneapolis Star Tribune*. 1 October 2006.
- <sup>27</sup> Mark Kennedy. "Broken Promises." *Mark Kennedy 06*. 15 September 2006. 258 screenings for \$347,022. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>28</sup> Mary Klobuchar. "Ashamed." *Klobuchar for Minnesota Committee*. 27 September 2006. 337 screenings for \$337,137. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>29</sup> Mary Klobuchar. "My Job." *Klobuchar for Minnesota Committee*. Screening and Money Data Unavailable. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>30</sup> Mary Klobuchar. "Fairness." *Klobuchar for Minnesota Committee*. 31 August 2006. 302 screenings for \$331,617. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>31</sup> Mary Klobuchar. "Follow the Money." *Klobuchar for Minnesota Committee*. 21 August 2006. Screening and Money Data Unavailable. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>32</sup> Mary Klobuchar. "Good idea." *Klobuchar for Minnesota Committee*. 18 September 2006. 248 screenings for \$257,599. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>33</sup> Jim Talent. "Matters." *Talent for Senate*. 20 July 2006. Screening and Money Data Unavailable. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>34</sup> Jim Talent. "Statesman." *Talent for Senate*. 15 August 2006. 214 screenings for \$59,721. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>35</sup> Jim Talent. "Working On." *Talent for Senate*. 5 September 2006. 185 screenings for \$153,883. Source: TNSMI-CMAG. Jim Talent. "Working On 2." *Talent for Senate*. 5 September 2006. 109 screenings for \$38,484. Source: TNSMI-CMAG. Jim Talent. "Working On 3." *Talent for Senate*. 19 October 2006. 124 screenings for \$40,608. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>36</sup> Jim Talent. "Bermuda." 24 October 2006. 190 screenings for \$281,306. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>37</sup> "Her Mansion." *Republican National Committee*. 30 October 2006. 661 screenings for \$592,763. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>38</sup> Claire McCaskill. "Mom." 8 August. Source: TNSMI-CMAG. Cost and screening information unavailable.
- <sup>39</sup> Claire McCaskill. "It's Personal." 20 October 2006. 109 screenings for \$39,256. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>40</sup> "Working." *Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee*. 19 September 2006. 755 screenings for \$618,325. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>41</sup> Claire McCaskill. "Shera." *McCaskill for Missouri*. 20 September 2006. 113 screenings for \$94,629. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>42</sup> Claire McCaskill. "Charlie." *McCaskill for Missouri*. 13 September 2006. 408 screenings for \$280,024. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>43</sup> Claire McCaskill. "Josh." *McCaskill for Missouri*. 13 September 2006. 470 screenings for \$228,062. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>44</sup> Claire McCaskill. "What Kind of Person." *McCaskill for Missouri*. 6 October 2006. 583 screenings for \$408,206. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>45</sup> Claire McCaskill. "Believes." *McCaskill for Missouri*. 2 November 2006. 225 screenings for \$252,735. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>46</sup> Claire McCaskill. "Meth Revised." *McCaskill for Missouri*. 23 October 2006. 252 screenings for \$175,629. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>47</sup> Claire McCaskill. "Like Me." *McCaskill for Missouri*. 21 October 2006. 195 screenings for \$257,186. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>48</sup> Jim Talent. "No Human Cloning." *Talent for Senate*. 25 October 2006. 188 screenings for \$150,930. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>49</sup> Center for Responsive Politics.
- <sup>50</sup> Charles Hurt. "Santorum Goes Full Circle: Seen as a Symbol of a System He Vowed to Topple." *The Washington Times*. 22 August 2006.
- <sup>51</sup> Rick Santorum. "Champion." *Santorum 2006*. 21 September 2006. 138 screenings for \$160,014. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>52</sup> Rick Santorum. "Keeps Up the Fight." *Santorum 2006*. 29 September 2006. 1,158 screenings for \$1,309,808. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>53</sup> Rick Santorum. "Corner Bar 1." *Santorum 2006*. 12 September 2006. 1,123 screenings for \$1,000,907. Source: TNSMI-CMAG. Rick Santorum. "Corner Bar 2." *Santorum 2006*. September 2006. 12 screenings for \$3,031. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>54</sup> Eg. Catherine Lucey. "Casey's Plan: Play It Safe; But His Cautious Strategy Could Boost Santorum." *Philadelphia Daily News*. 9 October 2006

- 
- <sup>55</sup> “Casey Capitol.” *Pennsylvania Democratic Party*. 11 October 2006. 390 screenings for \$1,287,723. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>56</sup> Bob Casey. “Turned Around.” *Bob Casey for Pennsylvania Committee*. 28 June 2006. 474 screenings for \$393,579. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>57</sup> *MoveON*. “Red-Handed.”
- <sup>58</sup> Deborah Pryce. “Taxes.” *Pryce for Congress*. 6-9 September 2006. 133 screenings for \$104,367. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>59</sup> Mary Jo Kilroy. “Key Difference.” *Kilroy for Congress*. 7-9 September 2006. 145 screenings for \$76,747. Source: TNSMI-CMAG. Mary Jo Kilroy. “Key Difference, revised.” 12 September 2006. 254 screenings for \$136,436. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>60</sup> Key difference revised. DCCC forgetting families. Kilroy veterans benefits. Not sure which!
- <sup>61</sup> Jack Torry and James Nash. “Kilroy and Pryce Pitch Centrist Messages.” *The Columbus Dispatch*. 17 September 2006.
- <sup>62</sup> Deborah Pryce. “Thanks.” *Pryce for Congress*. 20 October 2006. 93 screenings for \$89,299. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>63</sup> Deborah Pryce. “Fighting for You” *Pryce for Congress*. 26 October 2006. 137 screenings for \$143,953. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>64</sup> Clay Shaw. “Honor.” *Friends of Clay Shaw*. 23 July 2006. 291 screenings for \$150,407. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>65</sup> Clay Shaw. “Independent.” *Friends of Clay Shaw*. 9 August 2006. 203 screenings for \$123,351. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>66</sup> Clay Shaw. “Double Life.” 19 September 2006. 96 screenings for \$70,096. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>67</sup> Clay Shaw. “Big Sugar.” *Friends of Clay Shaw*. 23 August 2006. 187 screenings for \$131,122. Source: TNSMI-CMAG. Maybe list sweet deal and some others.
- <sup>68</sup> Clay Shaw. “Big Sugar.” *Friends of Clay Shaw*. 23 August 2006. 187 screenings for \$131,122. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>69</sup> George Bennett. “Shaw, Klein Clash on Iraq, Social Security, Taxes.” *Palm Beach Post*. 6 October 2006.
- <sup>70</sup> “Deal.” *Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee*. 21-23 September 2006. 299 screenings for \$159,741. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>71</sup> “Deal.” *Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee*. 21 September 2006. 299 screenings for \$159,741. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>72</sup> “Drug Deal.” *Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee*. 6-7 October 2006. 734 screenings for \$688,712. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>73</sup> Michael Mayo. “Voter Discontent Goes Beyond Foley Scandal.” *Fort Lauderdale Sun-Sentinel*. 15 October 2006.
- <sup>74</sup> Heather Wilson. “Kirtland.” *Heather Wilson for Congress*. 5 October 2006. 243 screenings for \$93,820. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>75</sup> Heather Wilson. “Stem Cells.” *Heather Wilson for Congress*. 22 September 2006. 616 screenings for \$190,684. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>76</sup> Heather Wilson. “Corruption Stunt.” *Heather Wilson for Congress*. 14 July 2006. 298 screenings for \$108,232. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>77</sup> Kate Nash. “Jury to Begin Weighing Testimony.” *The Albuquerque Tribune*. 14 May 2006.
- <sup>78</sup> Patricia Madrid. “Ethical.” *Madrid for Congress*. 19 July 2006. 237 screenings for \$104,819. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>79</sup> Patricia Madrid. “Pay the Price.” *Madrid for Congress*. 8 August 2006. 378 screenings for \$135,797. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>80</sup> Patricia Madrid. “Bush War.” *Madrid for Congress*. 23 August 2006. 487 screenings for \$184,453. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>81</sup> Patricia Madrid. “Less Safe.” *Madrid for Congress*. 28 September 2006. 303 screenings for \$125,962. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>82</sup> “Stay the course.” *Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee*. 25 October 2006. 382 screenings for \$184,405. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>83</sup> Heather Wilson. “Wrong on Security.” *Heather Wilson for Congress*. 17 October 2006. Heather Wilson. “National Security.” *Heather Wilson for Congress*. 25 October 2006. 915 screenings for \$401,858. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>84</sup> Heather Wilson. “Wrong on Security.” *Heather Wilson for Congress*. 17 October 2006. 566 screenings \$236,586. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>85</sup> Jim Nussle left Congress to run for governor.

- 
- <sup>86</sup> Mike Whalen. "Doing." *Whalen for Congress*. 12 October 2006. 14 screenings for \$3,496. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>87</sup> Mike Whalen. "Hire Mike." *Whalen for Congress*. 9 October 2006. 343 screenings for \$116,429. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>88</sup> "Greedy Trial Lawyer." *National Republican Congressional Committee*. 20 September 2006. 540 screenings for \$260,137. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>89</sup> Mike Whalen. "Twisting the Facts." *Whalen for Congress*. 6 September 2006. 293 screenings for \$93,655. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>90</sup> Mike Whalen. "Can See." *Whalen for Congress*. 26 October 2006. 313 screenings for \$107,840. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>91</sup> "Minimum Wage." *Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee*. 437 screenings for \$176,909. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>92</sup> Bruce Braley. "Bank." *Braley for Congress*. 4 October 2006. 188 screenings for \$46,879. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>93</sup> Bruce Braley. "Whalen Denouncement." *Braley for Congress*. 8 September 2006. 74 screenings for \$27,402. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>94</sup> Bruce Braley. "Trade Deals." *Braley for Congress*. 16 October 2006. 389 screenings for \$188,136. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>95</sup> "Better Choice." *Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee*. 490 screenings for \$203,044. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>96</sup> Bruce Braley. "Bank." *Braley for Congress*. 4 October 2006. 188 screenings for \$46,879. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>97</sup> "General Election 2006; Reform-minded Lois Murphy has the Edge in 6th Congressional District." *Morning Call*. 19 October 2006.
- <sup>98</sup> The Philadelphia Inquirer. October 20, 2006. HEADLINE: Murphy in another rough Sixth District race. Nancy Petersen
- <sup>99</sup> McClatchy-Tribune News Service. July 13, 2006 Thursday. HEADLINE: In the 6th, the battle is in Berks: The socially conservative county has become an early field of contention for incumbent U.S. Rep. Jim Gerlach and challenger Lois Murphy. BYLINE: Nancy Petersen, The Philadelphia Inquirer.
- <sup>100</sup> "More Taxes." *National Republican Congressional Committee*. 23 October 2006. 390 screenings for \$174,006. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>101</sup> "Dirty Secret." *National Republican Congressional Committee*. 24 October 2006. 517 screenings for \$1,494,682. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>102</sup> "MoveOn Values." *National Republican Congressional Committee*. 10 October 2006. 340 screenings for \$945,001. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>103</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>104</sup> "Wrong Friends." *National Republican Congressional Committee*. 17 October 2006. 344 screenings for \$915,740. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>105</sup> Jim Gerlach. "Clear Picture." 31 October 2006. 93 screenings for \$265,224. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>106</sup> Lois Murphy. "Washington." *Lois Murphy for Congress*. 5 October 2006. 359 screenings for \$866,426. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>107</sup> "Behind Bush." *Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee*. 17 October 2006. 295 screenings for \$869,071. "Handout." *DCCC*. 24 October 2006. 275 screenings for \$822,735. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>108</sup> "Iraq." *Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee*. 31 October 2006. 347 screenings for \$1,090,894. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>109</sup> Morning Call. October 19, 2006 Thursday. HEADLINE: General Election 2006; Reform-minded Lois Murphy has the edge in 6th Congressional District.
- <sup>110</sup> Ken Blackwell. "Values." *Ohioans for Blackwell*. 26 April 2006. 553 screenings for \$306,406. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>111</sup> Ken Blackwell. "Taxin' Ted." *Ohioans for Blackwell*. 27 August 2006. 1,139 screenings for \$662,681. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>112</sup> Ken Blackwell. "Taxin' Ted revised." *Ohioans for Blackwell*. 13 September 2006. 946 screenings for \$636,694. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>113</sup> Ken Blackwell. "Pledge." *Ohioans for Blackwell*. 13 September 2006. 158 screenings for \$114,280. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>114</sup> Jonathan Riskind. "Strickland Doesn't Always Fit 'Liberal' Label." *The Columbus Dispatch*. 2 September 2006.

- 
- <sup>115</sup> Jonathan Riskind. "Strickland Doesn't Always Fit 'Liberal' Label." *The Columbus Dispatch*. 2 September 2006.
- <sup>116</sup> Joe Hallett. "Blackwell Plans to Focus Campaign on Tax Cuts, 'Values,' Issues." *The Columbus Dispatch*. 11 October 2006.
- <sup>117</sup> Ken Blackwell. "ComSenVote." 16 August 2006. 411 screenings for \$473,383. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>118</sup> "Disappointed." *Republican Governors Association*. 29-30 September 2006. 594 screenings for \$356,791. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>119</sup> Ted Strickland. "Positive Plan." *Strickland for Governor*. 30 September 2006. 757 screenings for \$527,525. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>120</sup> Ted Strickland. "Noe." *Strickland for Governor*. 13-14 October 2006. 1,134 screenings for \$675,346. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>121</sup> Ted Strickland. "Children First." *Strickland for Governor*. 9 September 2006. 963 screenings for \$552,508. Source: TNSMI-CMAG. Ted Strickland. "Turnaround." *Strickland for Governor*. 14 September 2006. 8 screenings for \$7,186. Source: TNSMI-CMAG. Ted Strickland. "Turnaround 2." *Strickland for Governor*. 15 September 2006. 669 screenings for \$422,537. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>122</sup> Ted Strickland. "What It Takes." *Strickland for Governor*. 16 August 2006. 462 screenings for \$335,207. Source: TNSMI-CMAG. Ted Strickland. "Turnaround." *Strickland for Governor*. 14 September 2006. 8 screenings for \$7,186. Source: TNSMI-CMAG. Ted Strickland. "Turnaround 2." *Strickland for Governor*. 15 September 2006. 669 screenings for \$422,537. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>123</sup> Ted Strickland. "Look Forward." *Strickland for Governor*. 22 September 2006. 658 screenings for \$418,111. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>124</sup> Bill Ritter. "New Energy Economy." *Bill Ritter for Congress*. 6 September 2006. 421 screenings for \$330,233. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>125</sup> Bob Beauprez. "That Smell." *Beauprez for Governor Committee*. 18 October 2006. 316 screenings for \$260,073. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>126</sup> Bob Beauprez. "Citizenship." *Beauprez for Governor Committee*. 13 September 2006. 117 screenings for \$34,940. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>127</sup> Bob Beauprez. "Criminals." *Beauprez for Governor Committee*. 14 September 2006. 67 screenings for \$9,002. Source: TNSMI-CMAG.
- <sup>128</sup> Bob Beauprez. "Case File." *Beauprez for Governor Committee*. 29 September 2006. 417 screenings for \$315,353. Source: TNSMI-CMAG. Stuart Steers, Alan Gathright and Marilyn Robinson. "FBI Joins Investigation In Guv Race: Beauprez, Staff Expect to be Queried on Database Access." *Rocky Mountain News*. 19 October 2006.