Overall Figures for Races in AL, AR, GA, IL, KY, LA, MI, MS, NC, NM, NV, OH, OR, WA, & WV
January 1 – December 31, 2004

Figure 1. Spending on Supreme Court Campaign Ads, by Sponsor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Number of Ads</th>
<th>Number of Airings</th>
<th>Cost of Airtime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>26,248</td>
<td>$12,439,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10,440</td>
<td>$7,393,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5,561</td>
<td>$4,590,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>180</strong></td>
<td><strong>42,249</strong></td>
<td><strong>$24,423,252</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 2. Group and Party Spending

![Bar chart showing Group and Party Spending costs for Democrats + Trial Lawyer and Republicans + Business.]

Figure 3. Winners v. Losers

![Bar chart showing cost distribution for Winners and Losers, with categories for Party, Group, and Candidate.]
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Figure 2. Tone of Ads, by Sponsor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PROMOTE</th>
<th>ATTACK</th>
<th>CONTRAST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>22051</td>
<td>1087</td>
<td>3110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>3929</td>
<td>5450</td>
<td>1061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party</td>
<td>1355</td>
<td>3003</td>
<td>1203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CANDIDATE

- PROMOTE 84%
- ATTACK 4%
- CONTRAST 12%

GROUP

- PROMOTE 38%
- ATTACK 52%
- CONTRAST 10%

PARTY

- PROMOTE 24%
- ATTACK 54%
- CONTRAST 22%
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Figure 3. Theme of Ads, by Sponsor
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- Traditional Judicial: Candidate 32%, Group 8%, Party 14%, Role of Judges 9%, Civil Rights 7%, Criminal Justice 5%, Special Interests 2%, Not Applicable 0%
- Civil Justice: Candidate 0%
- Criminal Justice: Candidate 0%
- Special Interests: Candidate 0%
- Judicial Decisions: Candidate 0%
- Family/Conserv. Values: Candidate 0%
- Civil Rights: Candidate 0%
- Role of Judges: Candidate 0%
- Attack (no theme): Candidate 0%
- Not Applicable: Candidate 0%
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GROUP

- CIVIL JUSTICE: 25%
- CRIMINAL JUSTICE: 21%
- FAMILY/CONSERV V. VALUES: 18%
- JUDICIAL DECISIONS: 15%
- SPECIAL INTERESTS: 14%
- ROLE OF JUDGES: 5%
- CIVIL RIGHTS: 1%
- ATTACK (no theme): 0%

PARTY

- CIVIL JUSTICE: 22%
- CRIMINAL JUSTICE: 25%
- SPECIAL INTERESTS: 17%
- JUDICIAL DECISIONS: 25%
- FAMILY/CONSERV V. VALUES: 4%
- TRADITIONAL JUDICIAL: 5%
- ROLE OF JUDGES: 2%