



THE MONEY BEHIND THE MARRIAGE AMENDMENTS

By
SUE O'CONNELL

JAN. 27, 2006

This publication was made possible by grants from:

The JEHT Foundation, *Democratizing the Electoral Process*
Carnegie Corporation of New York, *Strengthening U.S. Democracy Program*
Ford Foundation, *Program on Governance and Civil Society*
Joyce Foundation, *Program on Money and Politics*
Rockefeller Brothers Fund, *Program on Democratic Practice*

The statements made and the views expressed are solely the responsibility of the Institute.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Overview	3
Methodology	5
A Rush to Amend.....	6
A Network Forms.....	8
About the Arlington Group	9
The Forces Against	13
Top Contributors Across the 13 States.....	16
Where the Money Went	19
Looking down the Road	21
In Search of New Strategies	21
The Arlington Group's Continuing Interests	22
State-By State Summaries	
Arkansas.....	28
Georgia.....	30
Kentucky	31
Louisiana.....	33
Michigan	35
Mississippi	39
Missouri	40
Montana	42
North Dakota	43
Ohio	44
Oklahoma.....	47
Oregon	49
Utah.....	53
Appendix A: Arlington Group Members, February 2005	55
About the Institute.....	56

OVERVIEW

The spate of 2004 ballot measures that banned same-sex marriages in fully one-fourth of the states generated more than \$13 million in campaign contributions. Slightly more than half of the money came from just three groups of contributors: organizations and individuals supporting gay and lesbian rights; conservative Christian organizations, such as Focus on the Family and the Family Research Council; and organized religion.

Together, contributors in those groups poured nearly \$7.2 million into the marriage debate in 13 different states: Arkansas, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon and Utah. Four of the states with amendments on the ballot were considered to be among the 20 or so battleground states in the presidential contest — Arkansas, Michigan, Ohio and Oregon.¹

Supporters of the measures raised slightly more than opponents — \$6.8 million compared with \$6.6 million. However, the election results were entirely one-sided. The constitutional amendments passed in every state, some by margins of 3:1.

An analysis of the campaign-finance reports filed by the ballot measure committees shows:

- Groups and individuals supporting gay and lesbian rights gave the largest chunk of cash: slightly more than \$3 million. The national Human Rights Campaign gave about one-third of this total, or nearly \$1.1 million, as it contributed to ballot committees in five states. The National Gay and Lesbian Task Force gave another \$789,360, in six states. The remainder came primarily from state-based groups or others supporting gay and lesbian rights.
- Contributors affiliated with conservative Christian organizations gave \$2.2 million. Nearly \$2 million of this amount, or 89 percent, came from members of the so-called “Arlington Group,” a coalition with close ties to the Bush White House and made up of conservative groups that have, in some instances, taken credit for the broad sweep of same-sex marriage measures in 2004. Member organizations of the Arlington Group or organizations with ties to them were active on numerous fronts, by:
 - forming campaign committees to support the measures in 11 of the 13 states.
 - giving money to ballot committees supporting the measures in 11 of the 13 states.
 - undertaking advertising campaigns targeting congressional candidates on the marriage issue in at least six of the states

¹ “Same Sex Marriage Measures on the 2004 Ballot,” *National Conference of State Legislatures*, Nov. 17, 2004 [on-line]; available from <http://www.ncsl.org/programs/legman/statevote/marriage-mea.htm>; Internet; accessed Nov. 21, 2005.

with ballot measures on the issue: Arkansas, Louisiana, North Dakota, Michigan, Ohio and Oklahoma.²

- Churches — including ministers and other employees, as well as fellowship groups and church-related businesses — gave \$1.9 million in nine states.
 - Fully \$1 million of this amount came from seven Roman Catholic dioceses in Michigan. Their contributions to a committee supporting the same-sex marriage ban represented 36 percent of the total contributions raised by the marriage amendment committees in Michigan.
 - Church-related contributors gave 39 percent of the total raised in Arkansas, but much lower percentages in the other states in which they gave.
 - Slightly less than \$12,000 of the nearly \$2 million in church-related contributions went to committees opposed to the marriage amendments — amounting to less than 1 percent of the giving by churches.

While gay- and lesbian-rights contributors topped the list as a single group, contributions to pro-amendment committees from churches and conservative Christian groups together totaled more — \$4.1 million, or about 35 percent more than the amount given by gay- and lesbian-rights supporters.

The most costly battleground proved to be Oregon, where Measure 36 drew nearly \$5.4 million in contributions. Opponents of the ban raised just under \$3 million, or 55 percent of the total, while supporters raised \$2.4 million.

The vote in Oregon was the closest among all states, with 57 percent of Oregon voters approving passage and 43 percent opposing the initiative.

Elsewhere, voters passed the constitutional amendments with much more decisive margins of victory following campaigns marked by heavy rhetoric, calls from the pulpit to rally support, and a suggestion that the measures were part of a politically motivated effort to turn out conservative “values” voters in support of President Bush.

Some of the amendments drew heavy financial support, while ballot battles in other states were relatively inexpensive, as the table on the following page shows.

² “Focus on the Family Action Takes on Swing-State Senators Over FMA,” *Focus on the Family Action* [on-line]; available from <http://www.focusaction.org/activities/a0000010.cfm>; Internet; accessed Dec. 8, 2005, and David D. Kirkpatrick, “The 2004 Campaign: Gays; Marriage Between Gays Becomes Issue in Campaigns,” *The New York Times*, Oct. 30, 2004, sec. A, p. 16.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO SAME-SEX MARRIAGE AMENDMENTS BY STATE, 2004

STATE	CONTRIBUTIONS			VOTES	
	FOR	AGAINST	TOTAL	% FOR*	% AGAINST*
Oregon	\$2,434,454	\$2,933,998	\$5,368,452	57%	43%
Michigan	\$1,930,429	\$854,212	\$2,784,641	59%	41%
Ohio	\$1,202,761	\$942,421	\$2,145,182	62%	38%
Utah	\$506,922	\$780,740	\$1,287,662	66%	34%
Kentucky	\$201,132	\$522,864	\$723,996	75%	25%
Missouri	\$29,612	\$488,189	\$517,801	71%	29%
Arkansas	\$334,731	\$2,952	\$337,683	75%	25%
Georgia	\$92,765	\$0	\$92,765	76%	24%
Louisiana	\$43,117	\$23,547	\$66,664	78%	22%
Montana	\$10,870	\$51,498	\$62,368	67%	33%
Oklahoma	\$21,644	\$11,616	\$33,260	76%	24%
Mississippi	\$7,215	\$0	\$7,215	86%	14%
North Dakota	\$0	\$8,974	\$8,974	73%	27%
TOTAL	\$6,815,652	\$6,621,011	\$13,436,663		

*Sources: National Gay and Lesbian Task Force and The Marriage Amendment Project

Most of the money came from organizations, rather than the average citizen on the street.

Individual contributors gave about \$4.1 million, or about 31 percent of the funds. But some individuals gave heavily, accounting for a significant portion of the funds. Twenty-one individuals gave \$10,000 or more, for contributions totaling slightly more than \$1 million, representing about one-fourth of the money given by individual contributors.

The ballot committees reported another \$1.1 million in unitemized contributions — donations in amounts that fell below a particular state's threshold for reporting the names and other identifying information of the contributors. Many of these contributions came from individuals giving small amounts or money collected at fund-raising events.

METHODOLOGY

For this analysis, the Institute collected the campaign-finance reports that ballot measure committees filed with the state disclosure agency in their respective states. The committees' contributions and expenditures were entered into a database for analysis.

Institute staff use the employer and occupation information provided on disclosure reports to assign an occupation code to contributors. When that information is not provided, staff members conduct additional research to determine a contributor's economic interest, where possible. The occupation codes are based on the Standard Industrial Classification system used by the federal government.

A RUSH TO AMEND

Before 2004, only six states had placed a definition of marriage as the union of a man and a woman in their state constitutions, although 33 states had defined marriage as such in their state laws.³

But two pivotal events occurred in 2003 that added fuel to an ongoing debate over the definition of marriage:

- In June, the U.S. Supreme Court struck down a Texas law that criminalized homosexual sex, citing the right to privacy.
- In November, the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court struck down that state's law prohibiting same-sex marriages.

Those two court rulings helped revive a flagging effort to amend the U.S. Constitution to include a definition of marriage. A federal amendment had been introduced in 2002 and again in 2003, but had languished in Congress.

Congress had already passed the Defense of Marriage Act in 1998, defining marriage in law. But same-sex marriage opponents had remained concerned that judicial rulings could void that law. Supporters contended that only a federal constitutional amendment would ensure that no federal or state court ruling could impose a different standard.

The court rulings in 2003 gave new impetus to the drive to constitutionally define marriage. President Bush came out in support of a federal amendment in February 2004.⁴ The effort gained even more momentum after a series of highly publicized same-sex marriages in the winter and spring of 2004, not only in Massachusetts, but also in New York, Oregon, New Mexico and California.

In July 2004, the latest version of the Federal Marriage Amendment came up for a procedural vote in the U.S. Senate, to determine whether it should go on to a full vote. However, supporters failed to obtain the 60 votes needed to move the measure forward. Even had the amendment come to a vote and secured the required two-thirds approval of each house, it still would have needed the approval of three-fourths of the state legislatures. Supporters acknowledged that the constitutional ratification process would be lengthy, and not necessarily successful.

But things move faster at the state level. And in 2004, same-sex marriage opponents turned their attention to the states, with efforts to amend state constitutions while the federal amendment remained in limbo. Those efforts helped place the issue on the ballot in 13 states.

In Mississippi, Missouri, Montana and Oregon, the ballot measures simply defined marriage as the union of a man and woman. Measures in the remaining states — Arkansas, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma and Utah — also prohibited recognition of

³ "Same Sex Marriage Measures on the 2004 Ballot," *National Conference of State Legislatures*, Nov. 17, 2004 [on-line]; available from <http://www.ncsl.org/programs/legman/statevote/marriage-mea.htm>; Internet; accessed Nov. 21, 2005.

⁴ Susan Page and Richard Benedetto, "Bush Backs Gay-Marriage Ban," *USA Today*, Feb. 25, 2004, p. 1.

civil unions. And the Oklahoma measure made it a misdemeanor crime to issue marriage licenses to same-sex couples.⁵

In some states, lawmakers placed the measures on the ballot via legislation. In others, same-sex marriage opponents used the initiative process. Whatever the route taken, the debate in all states was bitter.

Supporters painted the measures — both at the federal and state levels — as necessary to preserve moral values and circumvent judges who wanted to legislate from the bench. Opponents decried them as discriminatory. And many political observers questioned whether the measures were simply a way for conservative groups to mobilize their voters in what was expected to be a close presidential election and in states where U.S. Senate and House seats were up for grabs. Four of the amendments were on the ballot in states considered key to the presidential election: Arkansas, Michigan, Ohio and Oregon.⁶

Democratic Congressman William Jefferson of Louisiana criticized President Bush's call for a national constitutional amendment in February 2004, contending the president was merely trying to draw conservative voters to the polls. "Elections are all about turnout," he said. "This is about energizing people when you don't have answers on other big issues, like health care and the economy."⁷

And indeed, leaders of conservative Christian groups found the developments around the country to be the catalyst they needed to not only move forward on the marriage issue, but also to motivate voters.

James Dobson, head of the evangelical Christian organization Focus on the Family, said the issue of gay marriage was one of the most influential factors in the outcome of the 2004 election. In a piece published on the Focus on the Family Action Web site, Dobson wrote: "I am among those who believe the President would not have won re-election if it had not been for the power of this issue to drive conservative voters to the polls."⁸

⁵ "Same Sex Marriage Measures on the 2004 Ballot," *National Conference of State Legislatures*, Nov. 17, 2004 [on-line]; available from <http://www.ncsl.org/programs/legman/statevote/marriage-mea.htm>; Internet; accessed Nov. 21, 2005.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Bill Walsh, "Bush takes hard line on gay marriage; rivals say move is a political stunt," *Times Picayune*, Feb. 25, 2004, p. 1.

⁸ Dr. James Dobson, "Looking Back, Looking Ahead," *Focus on the Family Action* [on-line]; available from <http://www.focusaction.org/articles/a0000050.cfm>; Internet; accessed Dec. 30, 2005.

A NETWORK FORMS

On the ground in the 13 states, efforts to promote and defeat the measures were led and supported by a variety of people active in their churches, involved in human rights groups or conservative causes, or simply impassioned by the topic.

But a few news stories during those months showed another force was at work, as well.

In September 2003, the *Boston Globe* reported the formation of the Arlington Group, “a coalition of evangelical Christian and other conservative organizations.”⁹ The group was called together by the Rev. Donald Wildmon of Mississippi; Wildmon is chairman of the American Family Association, which runs a network of more than 200 Christian radio stations and affiliate groups.¹⁰

The *Globe* article said leaders of the groups began meeting in July 2003 to address the threat they saw in the U.S. Supreme Court ruling and the possibility the Massachusetts high court may invalidate that state’s ban on gay marriage. Wildmon said religious conservatives mobilized too slowly after the 1973 Supreme Court ruling that legalized abortion and needed to act sooner on same-sex marriages “because the danger is now.”

Subsequent news articles in publications such as *The New York Times*, *The Washington Post*, *USA Today* and *Time* magazine frequently quoted members of the Arlington Group on the issue of same-sex marriage, but made only passing reference to the existence of the group. Those quoted were instead usually linked to the organization with which they were directly tied, including James Dobson of Focus on the Family, Tony Perkins of the Family Research Council, Richard Land of the Southern Baptist Convention and conservative activist Gary Bauer.

By early to mid-2004, articles in regional newspapers also made mention of the group’s existence, but with little explanation of who was involved:

- A Feb. 24 article in *The Times Picayune* of New Orleans mentioned that the Arlington Group was pressing its case for a national amendment with President Bush and his top adviser, Karl Rove.
- A *Washington Post* article reprinted in the *Milwaukee Journal-Sentinel* on March 9 said leaders of the Arlington Group had jointly hired or loaned several full-time staff members to work on the gay-marriage issue.
- The Rev. William Owens, a member of the group, wrote a piece for the Memphis *Commercial Appeal* on June 20, saying the executive board of the Arlington Group had attended a meeting of the Coalition of African-American Pastors to speak to them about supporting the Federal Marriage Amendment.
- A news brief in the *Dayton Daily News* on July 12 noted that Ohio Secretary of State J. Kenneth Blackwell was the only non-senator to speak at a meeting of the U.S. Senate Republican Conference, where he

⁹ Mary Leonard, “Gay Marriage Stirs Conservatives Again,” *Boston Globe*, Sept. 28, 2003, p. 1.

¹⁰ Ibid.

discussed the need for a federal constitutional amendment defining marriage. Blackwell's name is on lists of Arlington Group members.¹¹

- And on July 14, the *Omaha World-Herald* reported that at the request of the Arlington Group, several churches urged their congregations to call their U.S. senators to support the proposed federal marriage amendment.

ABOUT THE ARLINGTON GROUP

The Arlington Group is made up of the leaders of numerous conservative religious and social groups. Reports from various time periods list anywhere from 20 members (in early 2004)¹² to more than 60 (in 2005).¹³ A list on the Ohio section of the American Policy Roundtable Web site and a 2005 letter to presidential adviser Karl Rove each contain the same list of 47 names. (See Appendix A on P. 55.)

An October 2003 press release on the Web site of Americans United to Preserve Marriage, an organization headed by Gary Bauer, made mention of a group of "two dozen conservative and religious groups" that pledged to use "their bully pulpits, media outlets and other grass-roots resources to rouse national and political support for traditional marriage."¹⁴ The news release quotes seven people whose names appear on lists of Arlington Group members, but never identifies the coalition by that name.

The Origins of the Arlington Group

The Arlington Group's formation and purpose are described in detail in a December 2004 column written by Arlington Group member Paul Weyrich of the Free Congress Research and Education Foundation and published on the Web site of Renew America, a group headed by Reagan appointee and conservative commentator Alan Keyes.

Weyrich's column says that several months earlier, the Rev. Wildmon of the American Family Association began contacting leaders of religious groups, suggesting that they begin to work together on "daunting social problems."¹⁵

"He correctly said," Weyrich wrote, "that if we all went our separate ways we would not amount to much. However, if we could all sing off the same sheet of music, we could be a significant force."

¹¹ "Arlington Group Members," *American Policy Roundtable* [on-line]; available from http://www.ohioroundtable.org/untangling/arlington_Group.html; Internet; accessed Nov. 21, 2005. A Jan. 17, 2006, phone call to the Ohio Secretary of State's Office to confirm Blackwell's participation in the Arlington Group was referred to the office for Blackwell's current gubernatorial campaign; a campaign staffer said Blackwell participates in the group and has received phone calls from the Arlington Group.

¹² "Statement from 'Arlington Group' on Today's Marriage Ruling in Massachusetts," *Family Research Council*, Feb. 4, 2004 [on-line]; available from <http://www.frc.org/get.cfm?l=PRO4B04>; Internet; accessed Dec. 6, 2005.

¹³ Russell Shorto, "What's Their Real Problem with Gay Marriage? It's the Gay Part," *The New York Times*, June 19, 2005, sec. 6, p. 34.

¹⁴ "Groups Pledge to Protect Marriage," *Americans United to Preserve Marriage*, Oct. 3, 2003 [on-line]; available from http://www.americansformarriage.org/press_release_article.php?id=10030301; Internet; accessed Dec. 7, 2005.

¹⁵ Paul Weyrich, "The Arlington Group," *Renew America*, Dec. 3, 2004 [on-line]; available from <http://www.renewamerica.us/columns/weyrich/041203>; Internet; accessed Nov. 21, 2005.

Weyrich said the group of religious and conservative leaders first met at a condominium in the Washington, D.C., suburb of Arlington, Va. That location led to the permanent name for the ongoing coalition — the Arlington Group. Its meetings, he said, “are not secret but they are off the record.”

“Early on,” he wrote, “the group agreed to work on the marriage issue. Indeed the effort to put marriage on the ballot in eleven States emanated from the Arlington Group. And the resources to go full-tilt in Ohio were raised from participants in the group.”

In fact, campaign contributions from member groups of the coalition went most heavily to Ohio, totaling \$1.18 million, nearly all of the money given to support Ohio’s amendment and 59 percent of the \$1.99 million in contributions given by organizations or individuals connected with the Arlington Group.

And two members of the Arlington Group were key players in the Ohio effort: Phil Burress of the Ohio-based Citizens for Community Values, a Focus on the Family affiliate,¹⁶ and Ohio Secretary of State J. Kenneth Blackwell.¹⁷

Not only did Arlington Group member organizations funnel financial resources to Ohio, but they also gave heavily in two other states considered to be presidential battlegrounds — \$546,600 in Michigan and \$138,360 in Oregon. However, Arlington Group contributions in these states made up a much smaller percentage of the total money favoring the amendments, representing 28 percent of the funds in favor in Michigan and 6 percent in Oregon.

Group’s Contributions, Efforts Add Up

Members of the Arlington Group backed their beliefs with their money and their organizational force.

- Focus on the Family, a Colorado-based organization headed by Arlington Group member James Dobson, created ballot measure committees to raise and spend money in seven of the 13 states: Arkansas, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Mississippi and Montana. It also gave \$255,600 in either direct or in-kind contributions to its committees, as well as to other committees in Ohio and Oregon. In addition, separate state groups related to Focus on the Family created their own ballot committees in Arkansas, Kentucky, Louisiana and Michigan. These state groups also contributed to other ballot committees in Arkansas, Michigan, Montana and Ohio.
- The Family Research Council gave \$376,400 to committees in Michigan, including \$186,400 to a committee it established there.
- Traditional Marriage Crusade ballot committees formed in nine states and raised \$27,600 in eight states. In many of those states, it was the first ballot committee to organize in support of the measure. On its statement of organization in Mississippi, the group described itself as a

¹⁶ *Citizens for Community Values* [on-line]; available from <http://www.ccv.org>; Internet; accessed Dec. 15, 2005.

¹⁷ “Arlington Group Members,” *American Policy Roundtable* [on-line]; available from http://www.ohioroundtable.org/untangling/arlington_Group.html; Internet; accessed Nov. 21, 2005.

“special campaign of The Foundation for a Christian Civilization,” which also is the corporate name of the American Society for the Defense of Tradition, Family and Property (TFP).¹⁸ C. Preston Noell III is on the TFP board of directors¹⁹ and is editor of *Crusade*, a TFP magazine.²⁰ He also is a member of the Arlington Group.²¹ The society was founded by a group of Catholic Americans in 1973;²² its Web site noted that it was working to get marriage amendments on ballots across the country and working with other organizations by sending postcards and making calls “to friends and supporters urging them to act.”²³

- The American Family Association and its broadcasting arm, American Family Radio, gave \$6,200 in Kentucky and Michigan. Its Kentucky affiliate also gave about \$29,350 to support the amendment there.

And the Arlington Group’s influence wasn’t limited to money. News reports noted that group members held weekly conference calls that included White House staff members.²⁴

Tables on the following page show how much money individuals or organizations associated with the Arlington Group gave in each of the states with a marriage-related ballot measure in 2004, as well as the total amount organizations associated with the group gave.

¹⁸ “The Idea of a Counter-Revolution: Who We Are,” *The American Society for the Defense of Tradition, Family and Property* [on-line]; available from http://www.tfp.org/who_we_are/the_counter_rev.html; Internet; accessed Sept. 9, 2005.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

²⁰ “About Crusade: A Magazine of the American TFP,” *The American Society for the Defense of Tradition, Family and Property* [on-line]; available from <http://www.tfp.org/magazine/about.htm>; Internet; accessed Dec. 12, 2005.

²¹ “Arlington Group Members,” *American Policy Roundtable* [on-line]; available from http://www.ohioroundtable.org/untangling/arlington_Group.html; Internet; accessed Nov. 21, 2005.

²² “The Idea of a Counter-Revolution: Who We Are,” *The American Society for the Defense of Tradition, Family and Property* [on-line]; available from http://www.tfp.org/who_we_are/the_counter_rev.html; Internet; accessed Sept. 9, 2005.

²³ “What Are You Doing to Stop Same-Sex Marriage?,” *The American Society for the Defense of Tradition, Family and Property* [on-line]; available from http://www.tfp.org/tfc/what_are_you_doing.htm; Internet; accessed Dec. 8, 2005.

²⁴ Alan Cooperman, “Evangelical Groups Plan Aggressive Drive for Nominee,” *Washington Post*, July 3, 2005, sec. Business, and “America’s Religious Right: You Ain’t Seen Nothing Yet,” *The Economist*, June 25, 2005, Issue 950.

ARLINGTON GROUP MEMBER CONTRIBUTIONS BY STATE, 2004

STATE	AMOUNT	% OF TOTAL RAISED IN FAVOR
Ohio	\$1,183,485	98%
Michigan	\$546,599	28%
Oregon	\$138,364	6%
Kentucky	\$67,543	33%
Arkansas	\$19,330	6%
Georgia	\$17,650	19%
Montana	\$8,959	82%
Mississippi	\$5,266	73%
Oklahoma	\$1,295	6%
Utah	\$643	0.1%
Louisiana	\$411	1%
TOTAL	\$1,989,545	29%

CONTRIBUTIONS FROM ARLINGTON GROUP AND RELATED ORGANIZATIONS, 2004

CONTRIBUTOR	TOTAL
Citizens for Community Values Action	\$1,182,139
Family Research Council	\$376,397
Focus on the Family	\$255,604
Michigan Family Forum	\$68,386
American Family Association of Kentucky	\$29,344
The Family Foundation of Kentucky Inc.	\$19,664
Public Interest Forum	\$19,500
Family Trust Foundation of Kentucky Inc.	\$14,395
Montana Family Foundation	\$6,765
The Foundation for a Christian Civilization Inc.	\$5,951
American Family Association	\$5,000
American Family Radio*	\$1,200
Arkansas Family Council	\$950
TOTAL	\$1,985,294

* American Family Radio is a division of the American Family Association.

THE FORCES AGAINST

While conservative groups banded together to support the marriage amendments, national gay- and lesbian-rights groups also were active. However, their efforts appeared less cohesive, and leaders of national groups acknowledged that at times, they were out-organized by the supporters of the amendments and had fewer resources to put into the states.²⁵

A few groups spent heavily in targeted states, in an effort to ward off limits on the definition of marriage or outright bans on civil unions. But most of the money to fight the amendments was generated by groups and individuals within the affected states.

Significant contributions came in from the following national groups:

- The Human Rights Campaign, which “works to advance equality based on sexual orientation and gender expression and identity.”²⁶ This group put nearly \$1.1 million into the ballot battles in five states: Michigan, Missouri, Ohio, Oregon and Utah.
- The National Gay and Lesbian Task Force, which describes itself as “the nation’s first national lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender civil rights and advocacy organization.”²⁷ It gave almost \$790,000 in six states: Kentucky, Michigan, Missouri, Montana, Oregon and Utah.
- The Log Cabin Republicans, which supports gay and lesbian rights and describes itself as “the nation’s leading voice for fairness, inclusion and tolerance in the GOP.”²⁸ The group gave \$40,000 in Oregon.

Funds from national groups made up nearly 30 percent to 40 percent of the total raised to fight the amendments in four of the seven states involved, falling below that level in Kentucky, Montana and Utah. But little other gay-rights giving crossed state lines. Instead, most groups concentrated their efforts on the states in which they were located, with the heaviest giving in Oregon and Utah.

The national groups appeared to give most heavily in states considered to be battlegrounds, giving much less to committees in states likely to vote Republican, such as Utah and Montana.

The table on the following page shows where national gay- and lesbian-rights groups put their funds.

²⁵ Monica Davey, “Sharp Reactions to Missouri’s Decisive Vote Against Gay Marriage,” *The New York Times*, Aug. 5, 2004, sec. A, p. 17, and Sandeep Kaushik, “Gay Marriage Backers Focus on Ore. Battle,” *Boston Globe*, Sept. 27, 2004, sec. A, p. 3.

²⁶ “About the Human Rights Campaign,” *Human Rights Campaign* [on-line]; available from http://www.hrc.org/Template.cfm?Section=About_HRC; Internet; accessed Jan. 10, 2006.

²⁷ “What We Do,” *National Gay and Lesbian Task Force* [on-line]; available from <http://www.thetaskforce.org/aboutus/whatwedo.cfm>; Internet; accessed Dec. 5, 2005.

²⁸ “About Log Cabin,” *Log Cabin Republicans* [on-line]; available from <http://online.logcabin.org/about/>; Internet; accessed Jan. 13, 2006.

NATIONAL GAY- AND LESBIAN-RIGHTS GROUP GIVING BY STATE, 2004

STATE	AMOUNT	% OF TOTAL RAISED IN OPPOSITION
Oregon	\$1,015,636	35%
Ohio	\$384,145	41%
Michigan	\$244,081	29%
Missouri	\$133,250	27%
Kentucky	\$73,350	14%
Utah	\$65,000	8%
Montana	\$10,000	19%
TOTAL	\$1,925,462	29%

Interestingly, the national gay- and lesbian-rights groups gave 29 percent of the total money raised to fight the measures in all 13 states, nearly identical to the percentage the Arlington Group members gave of the total dollars given in support of the amendments. And in all states where supporters of gay and lesbian rights contributed, the money — whether from individuals or from national, state or local groups — made up a sizable share of the money raised in opposition.

GAY- AND LESBIAN-RIGHTS GIVING BY STATE, 2004

STATE	AMOUNT	% OF TOTAL AGAINST
Oregon	\$1,400,679	48%
Ohio	\$547,076	58%
Utah	\$478,550	61%
Michigan	\$286,625	34%
Kentucky	\$157,681	30%
Missouri	\$147,294	30%
Montana	\$26,814	52%
Oklahoma	\$8,816	76%
North Dakota	\$2,000	22%
TOTAL	\$3,053,535	46%

The table below shows the top contributors among all groups supporting gay- and lesbian-rights.

TOP 10 NON-INDIVIDUAL GAY- AND LESBIAN-RIGHTS CONTRIBUTORS, 2004

CONTRIBUTOR	LOCATION	TOTAL
Human Rights Campaign	Washington, DC	\$1,089,754
National Gay & Lesbian Task Force	Washington, DC	\$789,358
Bruce W. Bastian Foundation	Orem, UT	\$239,000
Basic Rights Oregon	Portland, OR	\$184,243
Log Cabin Republicans	Washington, DC	\$40,000
Pride Source Media Group	Farmington, MI	\$24,995
Ohioans for Growth & Equality	Columbus, OH	\$20,000
Equality Utah	Salt Lake City, UT	\$17,500
Fairness Campaign	Louisville, KY	\$17,000
Pride Inc.	Helena, MT	\$15,067
TOTAL		\$2,432,917

Some individual contributors also gave heavily but primarily in only one state. The biggest individual contributors were:

- Bruce Bastian, the openly gay founder of WordPerfect software.²⁹ Bastian gave \$178,000 in Utah, Oregon and Ohio. He gave most heavily in his home state of Utah, contributing \$125,500 to the Don't Amend Alliance, the group fighting Amendment 3 there. He also gave \$27,500 in Oregon and \$25,000 in Ohio.
- Tim Gill, who co-founded the Quark software company and promotes fair treatment of gays and lesbians through his Gill Foundation,³⁰ ranked second among individual contributors, giving \$150,000 to oppose the Oregon ballot measure.
- David Maltz, who is involved with the Stonewall Democrats, a pro-gay rights group of Democrats. He gave \$101,383 in Ohio.

²⁹ Robert Gehrke, "Donors on Record Pace," *Salt Lake Tribune*, Aug. 23, 2004, sec. A.

³⁰ "Meet Tim Gill," *Gill Foundation* [on-line]; available from http://www.gillfoundation.org/about_show.htm?doc_id=75988; accessed Oct. 18, 2005.

TOP CONTRIBUTORS ACROSS THE 13 STATES

While the same-sex marriage debates stirred strong emotions in all 13 states, that emotion seemed to translate more readily into votes than into money. The cash to run the campaigns for and against the amendments came largely from big-dollar contributors, both individually and through organizations.

In fact, the top 20 individual and top 20 non-individual givers contributed \$7.2 million of the approximately \$13.4 million given to the ballot committees, or 54 percent of the total.

Citizens for Community Values Action led all contributors, pouring nearly \$1.2 million into Ohio's Issue 1 in 2004. The group is an offshoot of Citizens for Community Values,³¹ an Arlington Group member founded in 1983 by a group of Cincinnati-area ministers and now designed "to promote Judeo-Christian moral values."³² In addition to being listed as an Arlington Group member in its own right, Citizens for Community Values is also affiliated with Arlington Group member Focus on the Family.³³

The Human Rights Campaign put nearly \$1.1 million into the ballot-measure battles in Michigan, Missouri, Ohio, Oregon and Utah. The National Gay & Lesbian Task Force ranked third in contributions, giving \$789,360 to fight the amendments in Kentucky, Michigan, Missouri, Montana, Oregon and Utah.

Only one other contributor among the top non-individual givers spread funds to more than one state. Focus on the Family, the Arlington Group member based in Colorado Springs, Colo., gave \$255,600 to committees backing the amendments in Arkansas, Georgia, Michigan, Mississippi, Montana, Ohio and Oregon. The organization describes its mission as "disseminating the Gospel of Jesus Christ to as many people as possible and, specifically, to accomplish that objective by helping to preserve traditional values and the institution of the family."³⁴

CONTRIBUTIONS BY ORGANIZATIONS

The top 20 non-individual contributors gave \$6.1 million. Among these top givers, supporters of the proposals to limit marriage to a man and a woman gave more — \$3.8 million, or 62.5 percent of the \$6.1 million. Those organizations opposed to the amendments gave nearly \$2.3 million. The top contributors favoring the amendments gave most heavily in Michigan, Ohio and Oregon; nearly 90 percent of their contributions went to those three states. Those opposing the amendments gave most heavily in Oregon, channeling 51 percent of their dollars into that state, with Ohio and Utah receiving the next largest amounts of money.

³¹ April Yee, "Paid Recruits Fight Gay Marriage," *Cincinnati Post*, July 24, 2004 [newspaper on-line]; available from <http://www.cincypost.com/2004/07/24/pet072404.html>; accessed Oct. 18, 2005.

³² "Mission and Vision: Who Is CCV?," *Citizens for Community Values* [on-line]; available from http://www.ccv.org/About_CCV.htm; accessed Oct. 18, 2005.

³³ *Citizens for Community Values* [on-line]; available from <http://www.ccv.org>; Internet; accessed on Dec. 15, 2005.

³⁴ "Our Mission," *Focus on the Family* [on-line]; available from <http://www.family.org/welcome/aboutfot/a0005554.cfm>; accessed Sept. 9, 2005.

TOP 20 NON-INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTORS TO MARRIAGE AMENDMENTS, 2004

CONTRIBUTOR	LOCATION	POSITION	TOTAL
Citizens for Community Values Action*	Cincinnati, OH	For	\$1,182,139
Human Rights Campaign**	Washington, DC	Against	\$1,089,754
National Gay and Lesbian Task Force**	Washington, DC	Against	\$789,358
Archdiocese of Detroit	Detroit, MI	For	\$538,100
Christian Copyright Licensing Inc.	Portland, OR	For	\$410,000
Family Research Council*	Washington, DC	For	\$376,397
Focus on the Family*	Colorado Springs, CO	For	\$255,604
Bruce W. Bastian Foundation	Orem, UT	Against	\$239,000
Basic Rights Oregon	Portland, OR	Against	\$184,243
A.K. Holding Co.	Provo, UT	For	\$175,000
Marriage Education Initiatives	Salt Lake City, UT	For	\$171,000
Diocese of Lansing	Lansing, MI	For	\$133,350
Gateway Communications	Portland, OR	For	\$120,439
Diocese of Grand Rapids	Grand Rapids, MI	For	\$106,100
Diocese of Saginaw	Saginaw, MI	For	\$87,500
Michigan Family Forum*	Lansing, MI	For	\$68,386
Christian Values Fund	Muscatine, IA	For	\$50,000
Diocese of Gaylord	Gaylord, MI	For	\$49,250
Diocese of Kalamazoo	Kalamazoo, MI	For	\$47,450
Rolling Hills Community Church	Tualatin, OR	For	\$46,200
TOTAL TOP 20			\$6,106,270

*Arlington Group members or affiliates of Arlington Group members. Contributions totaled \$1.88 million.

** National gay- and lesbian rights group. Contributions totaled \$1.88 million.

CONTRIBUTIONS BY INDIVIDUALS

The top 20 individual contributors gave \$1.1 million, or about 8 percent of the total contributions reported by the marriage amendment committees. Amendment opponents gave two-thirds of that total, about \$753,000. In fact, four of the top five individual contributors gave to committees opposing the amendments. Supporters gave about \$363,770.

Top-contributing individuals who opposed the amendments gave most heavily in Oregon, which received about 40 percent of their contributions. Another 26 percent of their funds went to Utah, while 22 percent went to Ohio.

Top-contributing individuals who supported the amendments put 82 percent of their money into Michigan and Oregon, splitting it fairly evenly between the two states — \$150,500 to Michigan and \$148,000 to Oregon.

The table on the following page lists the individuals who gave \$20,000 or more to ballot committees.

TOP 20 INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTORS TO MARRIAGE AMENDMENTS, 2004

CONTRIBUTOR	HOMETOWN	INDUSTRY	POSITION	TOTAL
Bastian, Bruce W.	Orem, UT	Gay & Lesbian Rights	Against	\$178,000
Gill, Tim	Denver, CO	Gay & Lesbian Rights	Against	\$150,000
Maltz, David	Beachwood, OH	Gay & Lesbian Rights	Against	\$101,383
Nedelisky, Neil	West Linn, OR	Real Estate	For	\$101,000
Wilson, Robert W.	Brooklyn, NY	Finance	Against	\$100,000
Broekhuizen, Elsa Prince	Holland, MI	Securities & Investment	For	\$75,000
Marquardt, Jane A.	Salt Lake City, UT	Lawyers & Lobbyists	Against	\$47,670
Wallace, Carla	Louisville, KY	Gay & Lesbian Rights	Against	\$44,004
Lee, William	Saginaw, MI	Computer Equipment & Services	For	\$35,500
Gaby, Richard D.	Duluth, GA	Lodging & Tourism	For	\$25,000
Lewis, Jonathan	Coral Gables, FL	Real Estate	Against	\$25,000
Gilmour, Allan	Birmingham, MI	Automotive	Against	\$25,000
Templeton, John	Bryn Mawr, PA	Christian Conservative	For	\$25,000
Bisenius, James	Sherwood, OR	Securities & Investment	For	\$22,000
Marquardt, Robert	Ogden, UT	Miscellaneous Business	Against	\$22,000
Buttars, D. Chris	West Jordan, UT	Republican Officials/Candidates	For	\$20,269
DeVos Sr., Richard	Grand Rapids, MI	Retail Sales	For	\$20,000
Dewan, Michael	Putnam, MI	Retired	For	\$20,000
Heiner, Hal	Louisville, KY	Real Estate	For	\$20,000
Springer, Gerald N.	Chicago, IL	TV Production	Against	\$20,000
Stryker, Jon	Kalamazoo, MI	Construction Services	Against	\$20,000
Wexner, Abigail S.	Hudson, OH	Retail Sales	Against	\$20,000
TOTAL TOP 20				\$1,116,826

WHERE THE MONEY WENT

The ballot committees in the 13 states reported spending nearly \$12.2 million on their activities. Not surprisingly with such an emotionally charged issue, proponents and opponents turned to broadcast advertising to make their arguments and sway the voters.

Committees reported spending \$5.34 million on broadcast advertising. Those opposing the amendments spent \$3.34 million in this category, or 62.5 percent of the broadcast advertising total. Committees supporting the amendments spent \$2 million. Committees spent most heavily on broadcast advertising in Oregon, Ohio, Utah and Michigan.

The committees reported spending another \$1.7 million on consultants, about \$1 million on salaries, \$1 million on direct mail expenses, and nearly \$902,000 on get-out-the-vote efforts.

Committees in Michigan reported spending nearly \$1.1 million of the \$1.7 million spent on consultants, with pro-amendment committee Citizens for the Protection of Marriage spending all but \$10,000 of the money paid to consultants in Michigan. The committee paid the Sterling Corp., a political consulting firm that works primarily with Republicans, nearly \$985,000 for its services. It also paid \$136,300 to National Petition Management Inc., which is a “full-service petition management company” that helps organizations collect signatures to qualify measures for the ballot, through paid signature-gathering efforts or by managing volunteer efforts.³⁵

Direct mail expenses were far and away the highest in Oregon, where committees reported spending \$637,200 on costs related to mailings. Arkansas committees trailed at \$72,850.

Some companies did business with amendment committees in more than one state:

- Four committees fighting the amendments paid a combined \$177,500 for polling and research services from Decision Research, which describes itself as a “Democratic national public opinion research firm.”³⁶ Its client list includes the Human Rights Campaign, the top contributor to anti-amendment efforts. No on Constitutional Amendment 36, the group opposing the Oregon amendment, reported payments of \$88,341 to the company. Other committees that did business with this firm were the Don’t Amend Alliance in Utah, \$37,585; Kentucky Families for Fairness, \$31,920; and the Constitution Defense League in Missouri, \$19,620.
- Anti-amendment committees in three states hired Laguens Hamburger Stone for media and political advice, paying a combined total of nearly \$89,700. The company’s client list includes numerous Democratic candidates, as well as labor, environmental and progressive groups. It also includes the Human Right Campaign and Basic Rights Oregon,³⁷

³⁵ “About NPM,” *National Petition Management* [on-line]; available from <http://www.aboutnpm.com/index.htm>; Internet; accessed Jan. 17, 2006.

³⁶ “Introducing Decision Research,” *Decision Research* [on-line]; available from <http://www.decisionr.com/intro.htm>; Internet; accessed Jan. 6, 2006.

³⁷ “Past and Present Clients,” *Laguens Hamburger Kully Klose* [on-line]; available from <http://www.lhkkmedia.com/clients.html>; Internet; accessed Jan. 6, 2006. Web links to Laguens Hamburger Stone now go to the Web site for Laguens Hamburger Kully Klose, which is at the same Washington, D.C., address.

which contributed heavily to the anti-amendment effort in Oregon. No on Constitutional Amendment 36 in Oregon paid the firm \$76,634 for political consulting and ad preparation, while the Constitution Defense League in Missouri paid \$6,700 for production of television ads and Kentucky Families for Fairness paid \$6,350 for advertising.

- CC Advertising Inc., a Virginia firm, received \$70,200 from three committees supporting the amendments. The Yes! Marriage Amendment Alliance in Georgia paid \$36,621 for telephone surveys and canvassing, while the Ohio Campaign to Protect Marriage paid \$600 for an expense it described as a “phone blitz to churches.” The Defense of Marriage Coalition in Oregon paid the company \$33,000 for surveys and polls.
- David A. Smith Printing Inc. of Pennsylvania printed fliers and direct mail pieces for pro-amendment committees formed by the Traditional Marriage Crusade in six states: Arkansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Ohio and Utah. The company received payments totaling about \$6,270.

The Ohio Campaign to Protect Marriage also paid Design 4 Advertising \$600,000 for statewide TV advertising. Arlington Group member lists include an individual named Clint Cline who is listed as being associated with a company called Design 4.

LOOKING DOWN THE ROAD

The state-level ballot measures to constitutionally define marriage as the union of a man and a woman were wildly successful in 2004, leading to some introspection among gay-rights groups and plans for how to change the direction of the debate in the future.

Meanwhile, supporters of the marriage amendments, particularly members of the Arlington Group, indicated they would not merely rest on their laurels.

IN SEARCH OF NEW STRATEGIES

Where conservative groups appeared more unified after their push for the amendments, the groups opposing them appeared to suffer effects that went beyond the polls. Following the decisive defeats in November 2004, some activists began questioning the effectiveness of the Human Rights Campaign and the support it had given to state groups.³⁸ The campaign's executive director, Cheryl Jacques, resigned after holding the post for less than a year.³⁹

The battering that gay- and lesbian-rights advocates took at the polls also left key national groups looking for new ways to fight future attempts to further define marriage at the state level.

In a November 2005 speech, National Gay and Lesbian Task Force Executive Director Matt Foreman called on supporters to go on the offensive in the ballot-measure battle.

"First, let's start proclaiming our moral values — personal liberty and equality for all — not only for those who are white, or rich, or who subscribe to a particular kind of Christian dogma," he said, adding: "We must say over and over and over again, simply, directly and unambiguously that anti-gay, anti-lesbian, anti-bisexual and anti-transgender discrimination in all its forms is immoral."⁴⁰

Foreman suggested a plan that included having "non-gay people speak out with the same vehemence as they would if it was another minority under attack;" taking issue with putting the rights of a minority up for a popular vote; and including the religious community in the efforts.

"Now, more than ever, we need LGBT people of faith and their allies to speak to other religious people...and demanding — not pleading — for help," he said.

The Human Rights Campaign, meanwhile, has outlined its Marriage Project on its Web site. Strategies include developing language to counteract fears about gay marriage and cultivate support for marriage equality; presenting the stories of gay and lesbian couples through

³⁸ Sarah Wildman, "Tough Times at HRC," *The Advocate*, March 29, 2005, p. 30.

³⁹ Evelyn Nieves, "Largest Gay Rights Group Gets New Chief," *Washington Post*, March 10, 2005 [newspaper on-line]; available from <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A21703-2005Mar9.html>; Internet; accessed Sept. 9, 2005.

⁴⁰ Matt Foreman, "Reclaiming Moral Values: A Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Agenda for 2006," keynote address at the 18th Annual Creating Change Conference, *National Gay and Lesbian Task Force* [on-line]; available from <http://www.thetaskforce.org/downloads/ReclaimingMoralValues.pdf>; Internet; accessed Dec. 29, 2005.

advertising, legislative testimony, and media appearances; developing state-by-state strategies; and building alliances with other gay- and lesbian-rights groups.⁴¹

Another prominent gay-rights advocate, Tim Gill, has created the Gill Action Fund to, among other things, fight future constitutional amendment attempts at the state level.⁴² Gill, who founded software company Quark Inc. and profited substantially from the sale of his share of the firm, established the Gill Foundation in 1994 to support gay and lesbian rights. He gave \$150,000 of his own money to oppose the Oregon initiative in 2004.

His new political nonprofit organization will be funded solely by Gill and will work at the national level. Rodger McFarlane, executive director of the Gill Foundation, said the Gill Action Fund wasn't a reaction to the 2004 elections, saying instead: "This is the evolution of Tim Gill. This doesn't reflect anything more than his increasing influence and his own sense of responsibility as a citizen — and a very privileged citizen."⁴³

THE ARLINGTON GROUP'S CONTINUING INTERESTS

In his December 2004 column on the Renew America Web site, Paul Weyrich noted that the Arlington Group's activities were part educational and part lobbying, and could involve turning recalcitrant lawmakers out of office through the election process.

"Only God knows what we will be able to accomplish or how long we will be together," Weyrich wrote. "For now, the Arlington Group is the one bright spot in the body politick. It is the group of men and women, the leaders of the values voters, who seek to stem the tide of the culture decline of this once great nation."⁴⁴

He said the group planned to continue working on the marriage issue, and subsequent events show that it has, on many fronts.

For example, group members signed a letter to presidential adviser Karl Rove in January 2005, urging President Bush's unequivocal support on the Federal Marriage Amendment. They indicated they would have trouble encouraging their members to support Bush's controversial Social Security privatization plan if Bush was not willing to be more vocal in his support of the marriage amendment.

"We couldn't help but notice the contrast between how the President is approaching the difficult issue of Social Security privatization where public opinion is deeply divided and the marriage issue where public opinion is overwhelmingly on his side. Is he prepared to spend significant political capital on privatization but reluctant to devote the same energy to preserving traditional marriage?" the letter asked. "If so, it would create outrage with countless voters who stood with

⁴¹ "HRC Marriage Project," *Human Rights Campaign* [on-line]; available from <http://www.hrc.org/Template.cfm?Section=Center&CONTENTID=29316&TEMPLATE=/ContentManagement/ContentDisplay.cfm>; Internet; accessed Dec. 29, 2005.

⁴² Eric Gorski, "Benefactor's Group to Fight Effort to Ban Gay Marriage," *Denver Post*, Dec. 6, 2005, sec. B, p. 1.

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ Paul Weyrich, "The Arlington Group," *Renew America*, Dec. 3, 2004 [on-line]; available from <http://www.renewamerica.us/columns/weyrich/041203>; Internet; accessed Nov. 21, 2005.

him just a few weeks ago, including an unprecedented number of African Americans, Latinos and Catholics who broke with tradition and supported the president solely because of this issue.”⁴⁵

“When the Administration adopts a defeatist attitude on an issue that is at the top of our agenda,” the letter added, “it becomes impossible for us to unite our movement on an issue such as Social Security privatization where there are already deep misgivings.”

Arlington Group activity also was apparent in Kansas and Texas, where voters approved marriage amendments in 2005.

- A March 2005 article in the *Kansas City Star* announced an upcoming rally planned by area clergy members and the Coalition of African-American Pastors, to support the proposed Kansas constitutional amendment banning same-sex marriage. The article noted that the national leader for the effort was the Rev. William Owens, founder of the Coalition of African-American Pastors and co-chairman of the Arlington Group.⁴⁶

The Kansas Legislature ended up putting the amendment on the 2005 ballot, and it passed with 70 percent support. In 2004, Kansas legislators had defeated a similar proposal for a referendum. But the 2005 Legislature approved the referendum with the help of legislators elected in November 2004.⁴⁷ During the Kansas marriage campaign, Focus on the Family gave at least \$23,000 to the effort in support of the amendment.⁴⁸

- Texans approved a constitutional amendment defining marriage in November 2005. Kelly Shackelford of the Plano-based Free Market Foundation helped write the amendment and led the campaign in favor of it.⁴⁹ Shackelford is also a member of the Arlington Group,⁵⁰ and the Free Market Foundation is affiliated with Arlington Group member Focus on the Family.⁵¹

Texans for Marriage, a group promoting the amendment, published on its Web site a variety of print ads that could be run in local newspapers. The contact person for information about ad prices was Clint Cline of

⁴⁵ Letter to Karl Rove, *Marriage Amendment Project*, Jan. 18, 2005 [on-line]; available from http://www.nationalcoalition.org/Legal/Karl_Rove.pdf; Internet; accessed Nov. 21, 2005.

⁴⁶ “Clergy, Coalition Plan Rally Against Same-Sex Marriage,” *Kansas City Star*, March 26, 2005, sec. E, p.12.

⁴⁷ Diane Carroll, “Kansans Back Gay-Marriage Ban,” *Kansas City Star*, April 6, 2005, p.1.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ Robert B. Garrett, “Texas Votes for State Constitutional Ban on Gay Marriage,” *The Dallas Morning News*, Nov. 9, 2005.

⁵⁰ “Arlington Group Members,” *American Policy Roundtable* [on-line]; available from http://www.ohioroundtable.org/untangling/arlington_Group.html; Internet; accessed Nov. 21, 2005.

⁵¹ “About Free Market Foundation,” *Free Market Foundation* [on-line]; available from <http://www.freemarket.org/portal/index.php?option=displaypage&Itemid=47&op=page&SubMenu=>; Internet; accessed Dec. 15, 2005.

Design 4;⁵² Arlington Group member lists contain the name of a Clint Cline who is associated with a company named Design 4.⁵³

And the effort to amend state constitutions is continuing in numerous states in 2006. Arlington Group influence can be seen in many of these states, primarily from Focus on the Family:

- In Arizona, conservative social groups began a petition drive in May 2005 to place an amendment on the November 2006 ballot. The coalition backing the measure includes the Arizona Catholic Conference and the Center for Arizona Policy. The center is a family policy council listed on the Focus on the Family Web site;⁵⁴ the center's Web site notes that these councils are independent but also says it has been "selected and endorsed by Dr. Dobson and Focus on the Family to be the Family Policy Council for Arizona. CAP is deeply grateful for Focus on the Family's support through the provision of research, promotion, materials, prayers and guidance."⁵⁵ At the end of 2005, the center's director, Len Munsil, stepped down to pursue a bid for governor in 2006.
- In California, two groups launched initiative drives to put marriage amendments on the ballot. ProtectMarriage.com was promoting an initiative to limit marriage to a man and a woman, while VoteYesMarriage.com's initiative would ban gay marriages, as well as civil unions.

ProtectMarriage.com announced in December 2005 that it was dropping its effort, having failed to obtain the needed signatures.

ProtectMarriage.com was a project of California Renewal,⁵⁶ a political nonprofit affiliate of the California Family Council.⁵⁷ The California Family Council "serves as the statewide family policy council affiliated with Focus on the Family."⁵⁸

⁵² "Print Ads," *Texans for Marriage* [on-line]; available from www.texansformarriage.org/print_ads.htm; Internet; accessed Nov. 21, 2005.

⁵³ "Arlington Group Members," *American Policy Roundtable* [on-line]; available from http://www.ohioroundtable.org/untangling/arlington_Group.html; Internet; accessed Nov. 21, 2005.

⁵⁴ "State Family Policy Councils," *Focus on the Family* [on-line]; available from <http://www.family.org/cforum/fpc/>; Internet; accessed Dec. 14, 2005.

⁵⁵ "What is CAP?," *Center for Arizona Policy* [on-line]; available from <http://www.azpolicy.org/html/aboutus.html>; Internet; accessed Jan. 1, 2006.

⁵⁶ *ProtectMarriage.com* [on-line]; available from <http://www.protectmarriage.com>; Internet; accessed Dec. 28, 2005.

⁵⁷ "2005 Annual Report," *California Family Council* [on-line]; available from http://www.californiafamily.org/Site/current_detail.asp?IssueID=277; Internet; accessed Jan. 1, 2006.

⁵⁸ "About Us," *California Family Council* [on-line]; available from http://www.californiafamily.org/Site/cfc_about.asp; Internet; accessed Jan. 2, 2006.

VoteYesMarriage.com, meanwhile, plans to forge ahead with its petition drive. It is currently raising money to hire professional signature gatherers.⁵⁹

- In Colorado, Focus on the Family spokesman Tom Minnery said the group would be involved in an effort to collect signatures to place an amendment on the Colorado ballot in 2006.⁶⁰ Minnery was listed as an officer on all of Focus on the Family's state marriage amendment committees in 2004.
- In Florida, John Stemberger — head of Florida Family Action — created a committee to place an amendment on the state's ballot in 2006. Florida Family Action is the political action committee of the Florida Family Council, an affiliate of Focus on the Family.⁶¹ Stemberger also is listed as a member of the Arlington Group.⁶²
- In Massachusetts, amendment supporters have been gathering signatures to put the issue on the November 2008 ballot. The group spearheading the drive is VoteOnMarriage.org, whose spokesman is Kris Mineau, president of the Massachusetts Family Institute. Mineau also is a member of the Arlington Group,⁶³ and the Massachusetts Family Institute is an affiliate of Focus on the Family.⁶⁴ Larry Cirignano of Catholicvote.org also has been active in organizing the petition drive among Catholic Churches in Massachusetts.⁶⁵ Cirignano is also listed as an Arlington Group member.⁶⁶
- In Minnesota, the Minnesota Family Council has been backing a marriage amendment. It also organized a November 2005 gathering of pastors at which a Focus on the Family vice president encouraged the ministers to have their congregations join the fight.⁶⁷ The Minnesota Family Council is the parent organization of the Minnesota Family Institute, a state policy council listed on the Focus on the Family Web site.⁶⁸

⁵⁹ "Group Drops Bid to Ban Same-Sex Marriage," *New York Times*, Dec. 29, 2005, sec. A, p. 24.

⁶⁰ Eric Gorski, "Gay-Marriage Fight Looms," *Denver Post*, Feb. 11, 2005, sec. A, p. 1.

⁶¹ "Who Are We?," *Florida Family Policy Council* [on-line]; available from http://www.flfamily.org/welcome_letter.php?aboutid=3; Internet; accessed Jan. 1, 2006.

⁶² "Arlington Group Members," *American Policy Roundtable* [on-line]; available from http://www.ohioroundtable.org/untangling/arlington_Group.html; Internet; accessed Nov. 21, 2005.

⁶³ *Ibid.*

⁶⁴ "State Family Policy Councils," *Focus on the Family* [on-line]; available from <http://www.family.org/cforum/fpc/>; Internet; accessed Dec. 14, 2005.

⁶⁵ Michael Levenson, "Petition Bid to Ban Gay Marriage Said to Gain," *Boston Globe*, Oct. 3, 2005, sec. A, p. 1.

⁶⁶ "Arlington Group Members," *American Policy Roundtable* [on-line]; available from http://www.ohioroundtable.org/untangling/arlington_Group.html; Internet; accessed Nov. 21, 2005.

⁶⁷ Patrick Condon, "Pastors Meet, Push for Gay Marriage Ban," *Associated Press*, Nov. 11, 2005.

⁶⁸ "State Family Policy Councils," *Focus on the Family* [on-line]; available from <http://www.family.org/cforum/fpc/>; Internet; accessed Dec. 14, 2005.

- In North Carolina, Arlington Group member Tony Perkins of the Family Research Council and Focus on the Family Vice President Bill Maier spoke at a May 2005 rally organized by the North Carolina Family Policy Council and the group Called2Action, to pressure lawmakers to put a referendum on the ballot.⁶⁹ The North Carolina Family Policy Council is a state policy center listed on the Focus on the Family Web site;⁷⁰ Called2Action was later asked to join the Arlington Group.⁷¹
- In Wisconsin, the Family Research Institute of Wisconsin supported a proposal to place a referendum on the 2006 ballot. The institute is a Focus on the Family state policy council and, while independent, partners with other groups, including Focus on the Family, the Family Research Council and the Alliance Defense Fund.⁷² Tony Perkins of the Family Research Council and Alan Sears of the Alliance Defense Fund are both Arlington Group members.

And Arlington Group members are not limiting themselves to the push on marriage.

When U.S. Supreme Court Justice Sandra Day O'Connor announced in July 2005 that she would be leaving the court, the *Washington Post* reported that evangelical Christian groups planned to "rouse support for a thoroughly conservative replacement" by using "essentially the same game plan they used to win referendums against same-sex marriage."⁷³

At a nationally televised August 2005 event known as *Justice Sunday II—God Save the United States and this Honorable Court*, James Dobson of Focus on the Family urged viewers to defend Bush's first Supreme Court nominee, John Roberts, from U.S. Sens. Edward Kennedy and Patrick Leahy, as well as "all the other minions on the left."⁷⁴

The event focused on the direction of the nation's high court and was sponsored by both Focus on the Family Action, the political arm of Focus on the Family, and the Family Research Council.⁷⁵ Tony Perkins of the Family Research Council also spoke at the event, as did Arlington Group member Bishop Harry Jackson of Maryland, affiliated with the High Impact Leadership Coalition.

When Bush nominated longtime friend and current White House Counsel Harriet Miers to a second vacancy on the Supreme Court, numerous conservative groups opposed the nomination.

⁶⁹ Yonat Shimron and Jim Nesbitt, "Rally Seeks Marriage Law Amendment," *The Raleigh News & Observer*, May 11, 2005, sec. B, p. 1.

⁷⁰ "State Family Policy Councils," *Focus on the Family* [on-line]; available from <http://www.family.org/cforum/fpc/>; Internet; accessed Dec. 14, 2005.

⁷¹ Yonat Shimron, "A Grass-Roots Star Rises on the Right," *The Raleigh News & Observer*, July 10, 2005, sec. A., p. 1.

⁷² "About FRI," *Family Research Institute of Wisconsin* [on-line]; available from <http://www.fri-wi.org/about.html>; Internet; accessed Jan. 1, 2006.

⁷³ Alan Cooperman, "Evangelical Groups Plan Aggressive Drive for Nominee," *Washington Post*, July 3, 2005, sec. Business.

⁷⁴ Jeannine F. Hunter, "'Justice Sunday' Message: People Hold the Power," *The Tennessean*, Aug. 5, 2005, p. 1.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*

After she withdrew, Bush's subsequent nominee — Samuel Alito — drew praise from the same groups, including those involved with the Arlington Group.

"Everybody is totally on board," Weyrich said in a Nov. 1 *San Francisco Chronicle* article, which also reported that the Arlington Group had held a conference call to discuss the new nominee.⁷⁶

Many of the Arlington Group's activities in 2005 involved what Focus on the Family head James Dobson described as "the battles that lie ahead:" passing the Federal Marriage Amendment; ensuring "the right outcome" on judicial appointments; making known the ideological beliefs of judges who are up for election; and passing state-level marriage amendments.⁷⁷

But he also wrote in a piece on the Focus on the Family Action Web site that success on those issues is not enough: "As I continue to say, no matter how many ballot measures we pass, no matter how many constitutional amendments we support, no matter how many God-fearing and God-honoring women and men are elected and appointed to public office, until the hearts of the people change, we will not turn around this culture and restore our Biblical foundations. May we continue to collectively pray for this spirit of revival throughout America."

⁷⁶ Joe Garofoli, "Conservatives Delighted with Selection," *San Francisco Chronicle*, Nov. 1, 2005.

⁷⁷ Dr. James Dobson, "Looking Back, Looking Ahead," *Focus on the Family Action* [on-line]; available from <http://www.focusaction.org/articles/a0000050.cfm>; Internet; accessed Dec. 30, 2005.

ARKANSAS

Amendment 3 gained a spot on the Arkansas 2004 ballot following an initiative drive spearheaded by the Arkansas Marriage Amendment Committee and supported by Families First, the Arkansas Committee for Ethics Policy and Eagle Forum of Arkansas.⁷⁸ The state already had a law banning same-sex marriages. But initiative supporters pushed for a constitutional amendment, which was endorsed by Gov. Mike Huckabee.

Seven ballot committees in Arkansas raised nearly \$338,000 for the marriage amendment campaign, but just two committees raised the bulk of the money: the Arkansas Marriage Amendment Committee and Families First Action Committee. Both favored defining marriage in the state constitution. Only one group formed in opposition to Amendment 3, and it raised less than \$3,000.

ARKANSAS CONTRIBUTIONS BY COMMITTEE, 2004

BALLOT COMMITTEE	PRO/CON	TOTAL
Arkansas Marriage Amendment Committee	Pro	\$226,051
Families First Action Committee	Pro	\$73,374
Focus on the Family Arkansas Marriage Amendment Committee	Pro	\$17,380
Arkansas Committee for Ethics Policy (ACEP)	Pro	\$13,392
Traditional Marriage Crusade	Pro	\$3,529
Arkansans for Human Rights	Con	\$2,952
Churches in Support of Amendment 3	Pro	\$1,005
TOTAL		\$337,683

Families First Action Committee received its funds largely from Church of Christ congregations, which gave \$65,734, and some individuals. The Families First Foundation, its parent organization, serves Church of Christ leaders and members in Arkansas “as they attempt to address moral problems that plague the family.”⁷⁹

The Arkansas Committee for Ethics Policy drew two-thirds of its money from Baptist churches.

All but \$300 of the money reported by Arkansans for Human Rights, the sole committee opposing the amendment, came from contributions under the threshold amount for reporting the names of contributors.

Arlington Group Involvement

The Arkansas Marriage Amendment Committee operated out of the same address as the Arkansas Family Council, a group associated with Focus on the Family.⁸⁰ The committee received nearly one-fourth of its identified funds — about \$55,100 — from churches, including a number of Baptist churches. It reported \$56,700 as small contributions under the threshold for reporting the

⁷⁸ Associated Press, “Signatures Readied for Marriage Amendment,” *The (Memphis) Commercial Appeal*, June 29, 2004, sec. B, p. 6.

⁷⁹ “Ministry Statement,” *Families First Foundation* [on-line]; available from <http://www.arfamiliesfirst.org/ministry.shtml>; Internet; accessed Dec. 12, 2005.

⁸⁰ “A Letter from Arkansas Physicians Resource Council Board Chairman, Dr. Tad Pruitt,” *Arkansas Family Council* [on-line]; available from <http://www.familycouncil.org/aprcmission.html>; Internet; accessed Oct. 11, 2005.

names of contributors. The committee spent most of its money on salaries and mailings. Three of the committee's paid staff members are also staffers for the Arkansas Family Council: Jerry Cox, the council's executive director; Martha Adcock, the council's staff attorney; and John Thomas, the director of the council's Arkansas Physicians Resource Council.⁸¹ Thomas formerly served as a marriage and family policy analyst with Focus on the Family.⁸²

Focus on the Family also created its own committee in Arkansas. Focus on the Family was the only contributor to its committee, making in-kind donations of goods and services for a mailing and air time for radio broadcasts on its affiliate radio stations in Arkansas.

Another Arlington Group member, Traditional Marriage Crusade, reported raising about \$3,500, including \$1,960 it reported receiving without listing any source of contributions. It reported spending about \$1,650, including printing 10,000 fliers to encourage a favorable vote on the amendment.

TOP CONTRIBUTORS IN ARKANSAS, 2004

CONTRIBUTOR	LOCATION	INDUSTRY	PRO/CON	TOTAL
Westside Church of Christ	Russellville, AR	Clergy	Pro	\$20,000
Focus on the Family	Colorado Springs, CO	Christian Conservative	Pro	\$17,380
Fellowship Bible Church	Little Rock, AR	Clergy	Pro	\$10,000
Ligon Jr., Ed & Judy	Little Rock, AR	Steel	Pro	\$10,000
Missouri Street Church of Christ	West Memphis, AR	Clergy	Pro	\$9,066
Burklyn Co.	Warm Springs, AR	Education	Pro	\$6,500
Fellowship Bible Church	Lowell, AR	Clergy	Pro	\$6,000
Borbon, Laura C.	San Antonio, TX	Unknown	Pro	\$5,000
First Baptist Church of Springdale	Springdale, AR	Clergy	Pro	\$5,000
Soderquist, Don & Jo Ann	Rogers, AR	Commercial Banks	Pro	\$5,000
TOTAL				\$93,946

⁸¹ "Our Staff," *Arkansas Family Council* [on-line]; available from <http://www.familycouncil.org/fcstaff.html>; Internet; accessed Oct. 11, 2005.

⁸² "A Letter from Arkansas Physicians Resource Council Board Chairman, Dr. Tad Pruitt," *Arkansas Family Council* [on-line]; available from <http://www.familycouncil.org/aprcmission.html>; Internet; accessed Oct. 11, 2005.

GEORGIA

Only two ballot committees raised money in Georgia, and both supported Amendment 1, which the Georgia Legislature placed on the November ballot as a referendum. Other groups were active in the Georgia election,⁸³ but did not file campaign-finance reports. The state Christian Coalition published its usual voter guide, while the Georgia Baptist Convention aired television ads encouraging a vote for the amendment. Two groups opposing the amendment — Georgians Against Discrimination and Straights in Solidarity with Lesbian and Gay Civil Rights — conducted grass-roots efforts or rallies.

GEORGIA CONTRIBUTIONS BY COMMITTEE, 2004

BALLOT COMMITTEE	PRO/CON	TOTAL
Yes! Marriage Amendment Alliance Inc.	Pro	\$75,115
Focus on the Family Georgia Marriage Amendment Committee	Pro	\$17,650
	TOTAL	\$92,765

The Yes! Marriage Amendment Alliance Inc. received nearly all its money from four major contributors. Top individual contributor Richard Gaby operates a resort on a Caribbean island that is privately owned by the Van Andel family, co-founders of Amway. Gaby is married to Barbara Van Andel, daughter of Amway founder Jay Van Andel, who had traditionally given to Republican Party committees and conservative groups before his death in late 2004.⁸⁴ Van Andel founded Amway with Richard DeVos Sr., who — along with other DeVos family members — contributed heavily to a committee supporting the same-sex marriage ban in Michigan.

Arlington Group Involvement

Arlington Group member Focus on the Family established a Georgia committee and gave it the entire \$17,650 it raised, all through in-kind contributions of goods and services, including the costs of copying and sending a direct-mail piece.

Traditional Marriage Crusade also registered a committee with the Secretary of State's Office — the first ballot committee formed on the measure — but did not file any disclosure reports.

TOP CONTRIBUTORS IN GEORGIA, 2004

CONTRIBUTOR	LOCATION	INDUSTRY	PRO/CON	TOTAL
Capital Research Advisors	Sugar Hill, GA	Finance	Pro	\$25,000
Gaby, Richard D.	Duluth, GA	Lodging & Tourism	Pro	\$25,000
Focus on the Family	Colorado Springs, CO	Christian Conservative	Pro	\$17,650
Reagan, Robert W.	Atlanta, GA	Insurance	Pro	\$12,500
Stipe, Kevin M.	Alpharetta, GA	Insurance	Pro	\$12,500
		TOTAL		\$92,650

⁸³ Sonji Jacobs, "New Ads Encourage Voters to Ban Same-Sex Marriages," *The Atlanta Journal-Constitution*, Oct. 28, 2004, sec. C, p. 1.

⁸⁴ Denise Roth Barber, "Declining Fortunes: State Party Finances, 2004," *Institute on Money in State Politics*, September 2005, p. 11.

KENTUCKY

After weeks of divisive debate, the Kentucky Legislature passed a referendum putting the amendment question on the ballot in November 2004. Seven committees formed in the subsequent campaign on Amendment 1. Six committees worked to support the measure, while one formed in opposition. The single committee opposing the measure, Kentucky Families for Fairness, raised more than all the other committees combined, but the amendment still passed resoundingly.

KENTUCKY CONTRIBUTIONS BY COMMITTEE, 2004

BALLOT COMMITTEE	PRO/CON	TOTAL
Kentucky Families for Fairness	Con	\$522,864
Vote Yes for Marriage Committee	Pro	\$135,493
Yes for Traditional Marriage	Pro	\$41,308
Laurel County Citizens for KY Constitutional Amendment	Pro	\$13,191
Focus on the Family Kentucky Marriage Amendment Committee	Pro	\$7,449
Committee for the Defense of Traditional Marriage	Pro	\$1,950
Traditional Marriage Crusade	Pro	\$1,740
	TOTAL	\$723,995

Kentucky Families for Fairness reported nearly \$523,000 in contributions — more than twice the \$201,130 that committees promoting the measure reported raising. Nearly one-half its money, or about \$157,700, came from organizations and individuals supporting gay and lesbian rights. About half of the funds from gay- and lesbian-rights advocates came from out of state, while half came from contributors within the state. Key Kentucky contributors were the Fairness Campaign, a gay- and lesbian-rights group that helped organize Kentucky Families for Fairness, and its founder, Carla Wallace. Wallace, whose father was heir to a pharmaceutical fortune,⁸⁵ gave \$43,754, while the Fairness Campaign gave \$17,000.

Other contributors to Families for Fairness had ties to the gay and lesbian community. Carla Wallace's family members gave a combined total of at least \$38,175. And the Stinson-Lewis-Stinson Pride Foundation, a nonprofit that supports the arts and humanities,⁸⁶ gave \$40,000; the foundation is run by Ed Lewis and George Stinson, who operate a club for gay men.

The top individual contributor favoring the amendment, Hal Heiner, is a real estate developer and a Republican member of the Louisville Metro Council. He gave \$20,000 to the Vote Yes for Marriage Committee.

National Gay- and Lesbian-Rights Giving

National organizations, or individuals with ties to them, gave slightly less than \$77,000 to the Kentucky amendment fight. Most of the money came from the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force, which gave \$73,000, and its employees or board members, who gave an additional \$2,600.

⁸⁵ "Henry Wallace: (Part 2)," *Louisville Magazine* [on-line]: cached version available from <http://72.14.207.104/search?q=cache:iF70sJGvBmQJ:www.louisville.com/loumag/nov/henry2.htm+%22Henry+Wallace%22+smith+beecham+kline&hl=en&ie=UTF-8>; Internet; accessed Jan. 13, 2006.

⁸⁶ Tamara Ikenberg, "Cross-Dress for Success," *The Courier-Journal*, July 29, 2005 [newspaper on-line]; available from <http://www.courier-journal.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?Date=20050729&Category=FEATURES&ArtNo=507290306&SectionCat=&Template=printart>; Internet; accessed Dec. 28, 2005.

Arlington Group Involvement

Arlington Group members were active in a variety of ways, supporting the legislation that placed the measure on the ballot, organizing rallies at the Capitol during key points in legislative debates,⁸⁷ forming committees and contributing substantially to the effort to pass Amendment 1.

Kent Ostrander, executive director of the Family Foundation of Kentucky, not only organized much of the support for the legislation placing Amendment 1 on the ballot, but also was an officer of the Vote Yes for Marriage Committee. The Family Foundation of Kentucky, listed as a state policy council on the Focus on the Family Web site,⁸⁸ gave \$19,660 in in-kind contributions to the Vote Yes for Marriage Committee. Its parent organization, The Family Trust Foundation of Kentucky, gave another \$14,395, also as in-kind donations of goods or services. And three Family Foundation employees gave a combined \$1,200.

Focus on the Family established a Kentucky committee and reported raising \$7,449 in in-kind contributions; it did not report any expenditures.

The Yes for Traditional Marriage Committee was associated with the American Family Association of Kentucky,⁸⁹ an affiliate of the American Family Association,⁹⁰ an Arlington Group member. The American Family Association of Kentucky gave by far the largest amount of itemized contributions to this committee — about \$29,350 of the \$41,300 it raised. The committee reported only \$2,800 in itemized contributions from other sources.

In addition, American Family Radio gave \$1,200 to the Vote Yes for Marriage Committee; the radio network is a division of the American Family Association.

TOP CONTRIBUTORS IN KENTUCKY, 2004

CONTRIBUTOR	LOCATION	INDUSTRY	PRO/CON	TOTAL
National Gay & Lesbian Task Force	Washington, DC	Gay & Lesbian Rights	Con	\$73,000
Wallace, Carla	Louisville, KY	Gay & Lesbian Rights	Con	\$43,754
Stinson-Lewis-Stinson Pride Foundation	Louisville, KY	Nonprofit Institutions	Con	\$40,000
American Family Association of Kentucky	Louisville, KY	Christian Conservative	Pro	\$29,344
Kentucky Campaigns	Louisville, KY	Business Services	Pro	\$25,000
Heiner, Hal	Louisville, KY	Republican Officials	Pro	\$20,000
The Family Foundation of Kentucky	Lexington, KY	Christian Conservative	Pro	\$19,664
Fairness Campaign	Louisville, KY	Gay & Lesbian Rights	Con	\$17,000
Family Trust Foundation of Kentucky	Lexington, KY	Christian Conservative	Pro	\$14,395
DeVries, Sonja	Prospect, KY	TV & Movie Production	Con	\$10,000
Southland Christian Church	Lexington, KY	Clergy	Pro	\$10,000
Wallace, Henry	Prospect, KY	Agriculture	Con	\$10,000
TOTAL				\$312,157

⁸⁷ Bruce Schreiner, "Foundation a Force in Push for Gay Marriage Ban," *Lexington Herald-Leader*, April 11, 2004, sec. B, p. 1.

⁸⁸ "State Family Policy Councils," *Focus on the Family* [on-line]; available from <http://www.family.org/cforum/fpc/>; Internet; accessed Dec. 14, 2005.

⁸⁹ Sarah Vos, "Marriage Amendment Donations Listed," *Lexington Herald-Leader*, Oct. 12, 2004, sec. B, p. 1.

⁹⁰ "AFA State Affiliates: State Directors," *American Family Association* [on-line]; available from <http://www.afa.net/affiliates/kentucky.asp>; Internet; accessed Dec. 30, 2005.

LOUISIANA

Louisiana's Amendment 1 was placed on the ballot by the state Legislature. It drew support from four ballot committees, three of which reported raising money. A fifth committee, Forum for Equality, was the only group opposing the amendment. It raised \$23,500, or about 35 percent of the money that all committees reported raising.

LOUISIANA CONTRIBUTIONS BY COMMITTEE, 2004

BALLOT COMMITTEE	PRO/CON	TOTAL
Forum for Equality	Con	\$23,547
Louisiana Citizens for the Defense of Marriage Inc.	Pro	\$22,750
Louisiana Family Forum	Pro	\$14,824
Traditional Marriage Crusade	Pro	\$5,542
Focus on the Family Louisiana Marriage Amendment Committee	Pro	\$0
	TOTAL	\$66,663

About one third-of the Forum for Equality's funds came from lawyers or law firms, while another \$5,000 came from Club New Orleans, a club for gay men.

Louisiana Citizens for the Defense of Marriage received nearly half of its contributions from New Orleans developer Joseph Canizaro and his wife, Sue Ellen. Republican state Rep. Steve Scalise, who sponsored the legislation placing the referendum on the ballot, served as treasurer of this committee.

Top contributor Craig Hubbard gave \$8,000 to the Louisiana Family Forum. Hubbard is chief financial officer of SPC Pool Corp., a wholesale distributor for the pool and spa industry.

Arlington Group Involvement

Arlington Group member Focus on the Family established a committee but reported no contributions. It did report spending \$3,910: about \$2,900 for copying and postage for a mailing and slightly more than \$1,000 on radio broadcasts for its affiliate radio stations in Louisiana.

The Louisiana Family Forum was the only ballot committee to report money from churches, raising nearly \$4,500 of its \$14,824 from churches. According to the Family Forum's Web site, it maintains "a close working relationship" with Focus on the Family and the Family Research Council,⁹¹ also an Arlington Group member. Almost 81 percent of the Family Forum's expenditures went to its political action committee to buy ads. The group spent another \$5,614 on yard signs.

Traditional Marriage Crusade also formed a committee in Louisiana; most of its money came from out-of-state donors and was used to print letters, as well as 15,000 fliers and 25,000 inserts supporting the amendment.

⁹¹ "Louisiana Family Forum & Its Associations," *Louisiana Family Forum* [on-line]; available from <http://www.lafamilyforum.org/>; Internet; accessed Dec. 4, 2005.

TOP CONTRIBUTORS IN LOUISIANA, 2004

CONTRIBUTOR	LOCATION	INDUSTRY	PRO/CON	TOTAL
Hubbard, Craig	Folsom, LA	Wholesale Trade	Pro	\$8,000
Canizaro, Joseph C.	New Orleans, LA	Real Estate	Pro	\$5,000
Canizaro, Sue Ellen	New Orleans, LA	Real Estate	Pro	\$5,000
Club New Orleans	New Orleans, LA	Business Services	Con	\$5,000
Evans & Clesi	New Orleans, LA	Lawyers & Lobbyists	Con	\$3,750
Best & Koeppel	New Orleans, LA	Lawyers & Lobbyists	Con	\$2,500
Benedon, Debora	Manalapan, NJ	Unknown	Pro	\$2,000
Friends of Steve Scalise	Elmwood, LA	Candidate Committee	Pro	\$2,000
Walk, Frank H.	New Orleans, LA	Construction Services	Pro	\$2,000
Gillis, Charles W.	New Orleans, LA	Business Services	Con	\$1,200
TOTAL				\$36,450

MICHIGAN

Proposal 2 was placed on Michigan's ballot by citizen petition after the Michigan Legislature failed to approve a referendum. The heated battle over Proposal 2 in this presidential battleground state drew \$2.8 million into eight ballot committees, only one of which opposed the amendment. Several contributors were members of the Arlington Group, and some of the biggest payments went to businesses with strong GOP ties.

MICHIGAN CONTRIBUTIONS BY COMMITTEE, 2004

BALLOT COMMITTEE	PRO/CON	TOTAL
Citizens for the Protection of Marriage	Pro	\$1,626,582
Coalition for a Fair Michigan	Con	\$854,212
Family Research Council Inc.	Pro	\$186,397
Focus on the Family Michigan Marriage Amendment Committee	Pro	\$73,649
Oakland Citizens to Protect Marriage	Pro	\$27,397
Michigan Citizens Voting Yes for Marriage	Pro	\$7,000
Traditional Marriage Crusade	Pro	\$4,906
Marriage in the Public Interest Committee	Pro	\$4,500
TOTAL		\$2,784,643

Citizens for the Protection of Marriage raised the most among all committees, nearly \$1.63 million or 58 percent of the money raised by all committees. The group was heavily financed by the Catholic Church. Seven Catholic dioceses gave an even \$1 million, or 61 percent of the committee's total. The church coordinated an effort in support of Proposal 2 through the Michigan Catholic Conference, the public policy arm of the state's seven dioceses; Cardinal Adam Maida urged the state's Catholics to vote in favor of the amendment in an eight-minute videotape that was distributed to Michigan parishes, along with suggestions for points to make in sermons and other materials on issues related to the amendment.⁹²

The top individual contributor was Elsa Prince Broekhuizen, who gave \$75,000 to Citizens for the Protection of Marriage. Broekhuizen is the mother of Betsy DeVos, who was serving as chairman of the Michigan Republican Party in 2004. Betsy DeVos is married to Dick DeVos, currently a Republican candidate for governor of Michigan. Dick DeVos' father is Amway co-founder Richard DeVos Sr., who gave \$20,000 to the committee. Two other DeVos family members gave a combined \$30,000.

In addition, Elsa Prince Broekhuizen was a member of the board of directors of the Family Research Council.⁹³ In fact, her late husband, Edgar Prince, was a co-founder of the group.⁹⁴

⁹² Robert Delaney, "Cd. Maida: Vote 'Yes' for Prop. 2," *The Michigan Catholic*, Oct. 7, 2004 [on-line]; available from <http://www.aodonline.org/AODOnline/Archives+177/Michigan+Catholic+-+More+News+10-08-2004.htm>; Internet; accessed Nov. 10, 2005.

⁹³ "List of Officers, Directors, Trustees and Key Employees," IRS Form 990, *Evangelical Council for Financial Accountability* [on-line]; available from <http://files.ecfa.org/assoc/00000083.pdf>; Internet; accessed Jan. 3, 2006. The form covered the tax year beginning Oct. 1, 2003, and ending Sept. 30, 2004.

⁹⁴ Allison Connolly, "Blackwater's Best-Kept Secret: Its Founder," *Virginian Pilot-Ledger*, May 3, 2004, sec. A, p. 1.

Citizens for the Protection of Marriage paid the Sterling Corp. slightly more than \$1 million. This company provides campaign consulting services, primarily to Republican clients. Former Sterling Vice President Jeff Timmer left the company in February 2005 to become executive director of the Michigan Republican Party.⁹⁵

The committee also paid about \$110,000 to Public Opinion Strategies, which bills itself as a Republican polling firm.⁹⁶ Its Web site notes that it polled for both Citizens for the Protection of Marriage and the Ohio Republican Party on the marriage amendment. Marlene Elwell, who headed the committee, received nearly \$69,000, while a firm at the same address, Elwell Consulting, received another \$66,200. Elwell also is founder of Catholics in the Public Square, which describes itself as a group of Catholics who want to “share the beauty and richness of this Faith in the public arena through all venues available to us.”⁹⁷

The sole committee opposing the amendment, Coalition for a Fair Michigan, raised \$854,200, or 30 percent of the funds raised for the ballot fight. The largest segment of its itemized funds came from individuals and organizations supporting gay and lesbian rights — \$286,625.

However, much of the committee’s money remains unitemized, exemplifying a problem typical of ballot measure committees. The coalition did not file detailed information about contributors on its required periodic reports.⁹⁸ The state has notified the committee that it needs to file amended reports; a spokeswoman at the state office said those letters were returned as undeliverable. Phone numbers for the committee have been disconnected, as is often the case with short-lived political committees formed for one specific purpose.

National Gay- and Lesbian-Rights Giving

By far the largest portion of the itemized contributions reported by the Coalition for a Fair Michigan came from the national Human Rights Campaign. The Washington, D.C.-based organization gave \$231,081, or 42 percent of the \$543,950 of contributions for which the committee provided the names of contributors. The National Gay and Lesbian Task Force gave another \$13,000.

Arlington Group Involvement

Five Arlington Group members were active in the Michigan effort:

- The Family Research Council gave Citizens for the Protection of Marriage \$190,000. The council is headed by Tony Perkins, a key leader of the Arlington Group. The Family Research Council also established its own ballot committee in Michigan, and gave it \$186,397 — all the money the committee reported raising. Nearly all of this

⁹⁵ “Timmer Heads to Michigan Republican Party,” *The Sterling Corporation*, Feb. 25, 2005 [on-line]; available from <http://www.sterlingcorporation.com/news/default.aspx?cid=18>; Internet; accessed Dec. 7, 2005.

⁹⁶ “Research: Political Campaigns,” *Public Opinion Strategies* [on-line]; available from <http://www.pos.org/research/political.cfm>; Internet; accessed Sept. 14, 2005.

⁹⁷ “CPS Overview,” *Catholics in the Public Square* [on-line]; available from http://www.catholicsinthepublicsquare.org/aboutus_history.html; accessed Jan. 4, 2006.

⁹⁸ The Institute was able to obtain some of the missing information from the 24-hour reports the committee was required to file when it raised contributions of \$200 or more from a single contributor in the two-week period before the election; however, the committee reported raising another \$310,262 but provided no detailed information on the contributors.

money was reported as going to the Citizens for Protection of Marriage to support the amendment.

Because the amount raised by the Family Research Council committee and the amount the Citizens for the Protection of Marriage reported receiving from the Family Research Council are so similar, it is possible that the disclosure reports involve the same pool of money.

Also, as noted earlier, top contributor Elsa Prince Broekhuizen also was listed as a member of the Family Research Council board of directors for the tax year ending Sept. 30, 2004.

- Focus on the Family was active in two different ways. It established its own committee in Michigan, giving through in-kind contributions all of the \$73,650 the committee raised. In addition, the Michigan Family Forum, a state policy center listed on the Focus on the Family Web site,⁹⁹ gave \$63,386 to Citizens for the Protection of Marriage. And the Public Interest Forum, an offshoot of the Michigan Family Forum, gave \$19,500 — \$15,000 to Citizens for the Protection of Marriage and \$4,500 to the Marriage in the Public Interest Committee. This latter committee shares the same address as the Michigan Family Forum and the Public Interest Forum, and its treasurer was Brad Snavelly, executive director of the Michigan Family Forum.¹⁰⁰
- The American Family Association, headed by Arlington Group member the Rev. Don Wildmon, provided nearly all of the money for Michigan Citizens Voting Yes for Marriage — \$5,000 of \$7,000. In addition, Gary Glenn of the American Family Association of Michigan, an Arlington Group member himself,¹⁰¹ co-authored the amendment.¹⁰²
- Byron Voorheis III, a real estate developer, loaned Citizens for the Protection of Marriage \$20,000 a few weeks after it formed in March 2004 and contributed another \$2,000 in November. The committee repaid him \$20,000 in July 2004. Voorheis' name is on Arlington Group member lists, which identify him as Michigan chairman of Social Conservatives Bush-Cheney '04.¹⁰³
- Traditional Marriage Crusade established a committee in Michigan and reported raising slightly less than \$5,000, with most of it coming from

⁹⁹ State Family Policy Councils," *Focus on the Family* [on-line]; available from <http://www.family.org/cforum/fpc/>; Internet; accessed Dec. 14, 2005.

¹⁰⁰ "Committee Statement of Organization," *Department of State* [on-line]; available from http://miboecfr.nicusa.com/cgi-bin/cfr/com_det.cgi?com_id=512395; Internet; accessed Dec. 28, 2005.

¹⁰¹ Arlington Group Members," *American Policy Roundtable* [on-line]; available from http://www.ohioroundtable.org/untangling/arlington_Group.html; Internet; accessed Nov. 21, 2005.

¹⁰² "AFAMI News," American Family Association of Michigan [on-line]; available from <http://www.afamichigan.org/category/marriage/>; Internet; accessed Jan. 16, 2006.

¹⁰³ "Arlington Group Members," *American Policy Roundtable* [on-line]; available from http://www.ohioroundtable.org/untangling/arlington_Group.html; Internet; accessed Nov. 21, 2005.

out-of-state contributors. It paid approximately \$2,300 for a newspaper advertisement and gave its parent organization, The Foundation for a Christian Civilization, \$849 in leftover funds.

TOP NON-INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTORS IN MICHIGAN, 2004

CONTRIBUTOR	LOCATION	INDUSTRY	PRO/CON	TOTAL
Archdiocese of Detroit	Detroit, MI	Clergy	Pro	\$538,100
Family Research Council	Washington, DC	Christian Conservative	Pro	\$376,397
Human Rights Campaign	Washington, DC	Gay & Lesbian Rights	Con	\$231,081
Diocese of Lansing	Lansing, MI	Clergy	Pro	\$133,350
Diocese of Grand Rapids	Grand Rapids, MI	Clergy	Pro	\$106,100
Diocese of Saginaw	Saginaw, MI	Clergy	Pro	\$87,500
Focus on the Family	Colorado Springs, CO	Christian Conservative	Pro	\$73,649
Michigan Family Forum	Lansing, MI	Christian Conservative	Pro	\$68,386
Diocese of Gaylord	Gaylord, MI	Clergy	Pro	\$49,250
Diocese of Kalamazoo	Kalamazoo, MI	Clergy	Pro	\$47,450
TOTAL				\$1,711,263

TOP INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTORS IN MICHIGAN, 2004

CONTRIBUTOR	LOCATION	INDUSTRY	PRO/CON	TOTAL
Broekhuizen, Elsa Prince	Holland, MI	Securities & Investment	Pro	\$75,000
Lee, William	Saginaw, MI	Computer Services	Pro	\$35,500
Gilmour, Allan	Birmingham, MI	Automotive	Con	\$25,000
DeVos Sr., Richard M.	Grand Rapids, MI	Amway/Alticor	Pro	\$20,000
Dewan, Michael	Putnam, MI	Retired	Pro	\$20,000
Stryker, Jon	Kalamazoo, MI	Construction Services	Con	\$20,000
DeVos, Douglas L.	Grand Rapids, MI	Amway/Alticor	Pro	\$15,000
DeVos, Maria P.	Grand Rapids, MI	Amway/Alticor	Pro	\$15,000
Katz, Nancy	Plymouth, MI	Laywers & Lobbyists	Con	\$15,000
Blumenstein, Richard	Bloomfield Hills, MI	Real Estate	Con	\$11,000
TOTAL				\$251,500

MISSISSIPPI

Amendment 1 in Mississippi — placed on the ballot by the Legislature — drew little money. Only two committees formed, both created by groups with headquarters outside of the state and affiliated with the Arlington Group. They reported contributions of only \$7,200.

MISSISSIPPI CONTRIBUTIONS BY BALLOT COMMITTEE, 2004

BALLOT COMMITTEE	PRO/CON	TOTAL
Focus on the Family Mississippi Marriage Amendment Committee	Pro	\$5,266
Traditional Marriage Crusade	Pro	\$1,949
	TOTAL	\$7,215

Arlington Group Involvement

Focus on the Family created a Mississippi committee, providing all of the committee's funds through in-kind contributions of goods and services. The committee did not report any expenditures.

Traditional Marriage Crusade reported contributions of \$1,949. More than half — \$1,000 — came from Anthony Lomangino of Hobe Sound, Florida, owner of Southern Waste Systems and Recycling. The committee also reported \$749 in small contributions, made in amounts below the threshold for reporting the names of contributors. It spent \$550 on printing fliers and envelopes, and spent another \$615 on unitemized expenses.

MISSOURI

Missouri's Amendment 2 won resoundingly at the polls, with 71 percent of the vote — despite the fact that supporters raised a mere fraction of the amount the opponents raised. Supporters of the amendment raised just \$29,600, compared with the approximately \$488,000 opponents raised.

Although a handful of other states had enacted constitutional amendments defining marriage before 2004, Missouri was the first state to vote on the issue after the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court decision allowing same-sex marriages. The Legislature placed the measure on the Aug. 3 ballot, in what was widely viewed as a nationwide test of the issue.

MISSOURI CONTRIBUTIONS BY COMMITTEE, 2004

BALLOT COMMITTEE	PRO/CON	TOTAL
Constitution Defense League	Con	\$488,189
Coalition to Protect Marriage in Missouri	Pro	\$21,499
Missourians for Marriage	Pro	\$8,113
	TOTAL	\$517,801

The committee formed to oppose the amendment, the Constitution Defense League, raised 94 percent of the funds reported by ballot committees, as national gay- and lesbian-rights groups poured money into this first ballot-measure fight. Doug Gray, one of the top contributors to the committee, also served as its campaign manager, with \$7,500 of his nearly \$9,300 in contributions reported as in-kind donations of services or goods.

The Coalition to Protect Marriage in Missouri received the largest amount of its money from churches. And within that category, Baptist churches gave the most: \$3,610 of the \$6,785 in church funds.

Opponents used their campaign dollars to mount an advertising blitz, spending \$293,500 on television and print advertising. Supporters of the amendments turned to churches to get the word out, using phone lists developed from church rosters, offering downloadable inserts for church bulletins on a Web site, and urging ministers to preach in support of the amendment.¹⁰⁴

National Gay- and Lesbian-Rights Giving

National groups supporting gay and lesbian rights gave \$133,250 of the funds raised by the Constitution Defense League, or 27 percent of the committee's total. The Human Rights Campaign alone put in \$111,750. The National Gay and Lesbian Task Force added \$20,500 to the campaign, while the National Center for Lesbian Rights gave \$1,000.

The table on the following page shows the top contributors in Missouri.

¹⁰⁴ Matthew Franck, "Grass-Roots Battle Heats Up," *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, July 28, 2004, sec. B, p. 1.

TOP CONTRIBUTORS IN MISSOURI, 2004

CONTRIBUTOR	LOCATION	INDUSTRY	PRO/CON	TOTAL
Human Rights Campaign	Washington, DC	Gay & Lesbian Rights	Con	\$111,750
National Gay & Lesbian Task Force	Washington, DC	Gay & Lesbian Rights	Con	\$20,500
ACLU of Eastern Missouri	St. Louis, MO	Ideology/Single Issue	Con	\$11,500
Simon, Ray M.	St. Louis, MO	Construction Services	Con	\$10,000
Gray, Doug	Kansas City, MO	Business Services	Con	\$9,289
Committee for Fairness	Kansas City, MO	Gay & Lesbian Rights	Con	\$8,414
Tivoli Building LLC	St. Louis, MO	Real Estate	Con	\$8,400
Pilkenton, Jill	St. Louis, MO	Retail Sales	Con	\$7,026
Fischer, M. Peter	St. Louis, MO	Lawyers & Lobbyists	Con	\$5,000
Wells, Doug	Kansas City, MO	Business Services	Con	\$5,000
			TOTAL	\$196,879

MONTANA

Opponents to Montana's Constitutional Initiative 96, placed on the ballot by citizen petition, outraised supporters but lost at the ballot box. Montanans for Families and Fairness raised \$51,500, while two committees supporting the measure raised less than one-fourth of that amount.

MONTANA CONTRIBUTIONS BY COMMITTEE, 2004

BALLOT COMMITTEE	PRO/CON	TOTAL
Montanans for Families and Fairness/Against CI-96	Con	\$51,498
Montanans for Marriage/For CI-96	Pro	\$8,676
Focus on the Family Montana Marriage Amendment Committee	Pro	\$2,194
	TOTAL	\$62,368

National Gay- and Lesbian-Rights Giving

The National Gay & Lesbian Task Force gave \$10,000 to Montanans for Families and Fairness, or 37 percent of the contributions the committee received from individuals and organizations supporting gay rights and 19 percent of its total contributions. The Seattle-based Pride Foundation, which supports the gay and lesbian community in the Pacific Northwest, gave \$1,000.

Arlington Group Involvement

Arlington Group member Focus on the Family established a committee in Montana and gave it \$2,194 through in-kind contributions. It reported no expenditures.

Montanans for Marriage received 78 percent of its funds — \$6,765 — as in-kind contributions from the Montana Family Foundation, which is associated with Focus on the Family.¹⁰⁵ The foundation's president, Republican state Rep. Jeff Laszloffy, authored the ballot petition and acted as a spokesman.¹⁰⁶ He also served as treasurer for the Focus on the Family Montana Marriage Amendment Committee. In addition, a Voter Information Pamphlet statement from proponents directed readers to the Family Foundation's Web site for more information.¹⁰⁷

TOP CONTRIBUTORS IN MONTANA, 2004

CONTRIBUTOR	LOCATION	INDUSTRY	PRO/CON	TOTAL
Pride Inc.	Helena, MT	Gay & Lesbian Rights	Con	\$15,067
National Gay & Lesbian Task Force	Washington, DC	Gay & Lesbian Rights	Con	\$10,000
Montana Family Foundation	Laurel, MT	Christian Conservative	Pro	\$6,765
Montana Human Rights Network	Helena, MT	Human Rights	Con	\$3,959
Stranahan, Mary	Arlee, MT	Health Professionals	Con	\$3,000
Focus on the Family	Colorado Springs, CO	Christian Conservative	Pro	\$2,194
Milton, Maxwell	Helena, MT	Investor	Con	\$1,000
The Pride Foundation	Seattle, WA	Gay & Lesbian Rights	Con	\$1,000
		TOTAL		\$42,985

¹⁰⁵ *Montana Family Foundation* [on-line]; available from <http://www.montanafamily.org>; Internet; accessed Dec. 4, 2005.

¹⁰⁶ "Success! CI-96 Qualifies," *Montana Family Action* [on-line]; available from www.mtfamilyaction.com/index.asp?file=form; Internet; accessed Dec. 8, 2005.

¹⁰⁷ "Proponents' Rebuttal of Argument Against CI-96," *2004 Voter Information Pamphlet*, Montana Secretary of State's Office, October 2004, p. 28.

NORTH DAKOTA

North Dakota's Measure 1 was placed on the ballot through the initiative process. It drew relatively little in the way of campaign contributions, but passed with 73 percent of the vote.

The group opposing Measure 1, Equality North Dakota, raised \$8,974. The North Dakota Human Rights Coalition gave almost half of the committee's \$4,150 in itemized contributions, at \$2,000; the remainder of itemized contributions came from a handful of individuals. In addition, the committee raised another \$4,824 in contributions that, individually, fell below the \$100 threshold for reporting the names of contributors and the specific amounts they gave.

NORTH DAKOTA CONTRIBUTIONS BY COMMITTEE, 2004

BALLOT COMMITTEE	PRO/CON	TOTAL
Equality North Dakota	Con	\$8,974
Traditional Marriage Crusade	Pro	\$0
	TOTAL	\$8,974

Arlington Group Involvement

Traditional Marriage Crusade established a North Dakota committee, but reported no contributions. It reported only one \$35 unitemized expense.

OHIO

The pitched battle over Issue 1 in a battleground presidential state involved not only large amounts of out-of-state money, but also a paid signature-gathering drive, court challenges, a split among state officials on the amendment, and a complaint over disclosure of the proponents' finances.

Groups supporting the amendment raised about \$1.2 million, outpacing the one committee that opposed the measure. Ohioans Protecting the Constitution/Ohians for Fairness, the committee opposing Issue 1, raised about \$942,500, with 58 percent of the money coming from supporters of gay and lesbian rights. Two other big contributors to the anti-amendment effort were Abigail Wexner, whose husband owns The Limited clothing chain, and Nationwide Insurance Co. These Ohio-based companies had opposed the amendment, along with Ohioans for Growth & Equality, a statewide group that promotes business growth in Ohio "by advocating for equality under the law for all of its citizens."¹⁰⁸

And it appears that the Ohio Republican Party did some work on the marriage issue, although it did not make any direct contributions to any of the ballot committees. Public Opinion Strategies, a Republican polling firm, listed the Ohio Republican Party as a client for which it did polling work in favor of the Ohio marriage question.¹⁰⁹ The party reported paying Public Opinion Strategies \$221,500 for polling and another \$18,750 for consulting work in 2004, but did not have to specify the candidates or issues that the work covered.

OHIO CONTRIBUTIONS BY COMMITTEE, 2004

BALLOT COMMITTEE	PRO/CON	TOTAL
Ohio Campaign to Protect Marriage	Pro	\$1,194,808
Ohioans Protecting the Constitution/Ohians for Fairness	Con	\$942,421
Traditional Marriage Crusade	Pro	\$7,953
	TOTAL	\$2,145,182

National Gay- and Lesbian-Rights Giving

The Human Rights Campaign was the only national gay- and lesbian-rights group to contribute to Ohioans Protecting the Constitution. It gave \$384,000, representing about 70 percent of the \$547,100 given by gay-rights contributors. In addition, Bruce Bastian of Utah contributed \$25,000 to the committee, while James Hormel of San Francisco gave \$5,000. Hormel, whose grandfather founded the Hormel Meat Co., was the first openly gay person to be appointed U.S. ambassador to a foreign country, Luxembourg.

Arlington Group Involvement

Two Arlington Group members had high-profile roles in the Ohio amendment, while another formed a committee in support and a fourth contributed funds.

- Phil Burress of Citizens for Community Values led the push to gather signatures and also served as chairman of the Ohio Campaign to Protect Marriage, the primary committee supporting the amendment.

¹⁰⁸ "Frequently Asked Questions," *Ohioans for Growth & Equality* [on-line]; available from <http://www.ohioansforgrowth.org/>; Internet; accessed Oct. 5, 2005.

¹⁰⁹ "In the News: Initiatives & Referendums," *Public Opinion Strategies* [on-line]; available from http://www.pos.org/research/init_record.cfm; Internet; accessed Sept. 14, 2005.

- Ohio Secretary of State J. Kenneth Blackwell — an honorary co-chairman of President Bush’s Ohio re-election campaign¹¹⁰ — came out in support and did radio ads in favor of the amendment. Blackwell also sent a letter to 1,500 state GOP members in August 2004 saying that gay marriage would be important in “determining where Ohio’s electoral votes will go.”¹¹¹
- The Traditional Marriage Crusade formed a ballot committee, raising slightly less than \$8,000.
- Focus on the Family contributed slightly more than \$1,000 in radio air time to the Ohio Campaign to Protect Marriage.

Burress heads up Citizens for Community Values, a state organization officially associated with Arlington Group member Focus on the Family;¹¹² Burress also is listed in his own right as being an Arlington Group member.¹¹³ His group’s political action arm, Citizens for Community Values Action, was the largest contributor to the Ohio Campaign to Protect Marriage, giving \$1.18 million of the \$1.19 million that the pro-amendment group reported raising. Because Citizens for Community Values Action is a political action committee and was not formed specifically for the ballot campaign, it did not have to report its contributors. Thus the sources of the funds it gave to the Ohio Campaign to Protect Marriage are unknown. Two Cincinnati lawyers and others filed a complaint in October 2005 against Citizens for Community Values, contending it concealed the source of the funds its PAC gave to the ballot committee.¹¹⁴ The commission is expected to hear the complaint in early 2006.

Citizens for Community Values Action also paid to have professional signature-gatherers collect signatures for the ballot petitions;¹¹⁵ again, these expenses were not reported because they were not paid by committees formed specifically to campaign on the ballot measure.

The Ohio Campaign to Protect Marriage received only \$11,520 that did not come from either Citizens for Community Values Action, Focus on the Family or Phil Burress. The remainder came from individuals giving amounts generally ranging anywhere from \$5 to \$350, with only three contributors giving more than that amount and none giving more than \$2,000.

Blackwell’s role in the pro-amendment campaign was well documented, although his participation in the Arlington Group appeared far less well known. Blackwell’s name appears on lists of Arlington Group members, as affiliated with the American Center for Civic Character.¹¹⁶ That center’s Web site promotes its trademarked UncommonSense materials, described as “a

¹¹⁰ William Hershey, “Blackwell’s Tenure May Be Last of Kind,” *Dayton Daily News*, Nov. 1, 2005, sec. B, p. 1.

¹¹¹ Gregory Korte, “Marriage Question Seen as Boon to Bush,” *Cincinnati Enquirer*, Sept. 14, 2004, p. 1.

¹¹² *Citizens for Community Values* [on-line]; available from <http://www.ccv.org>; Internet; accessed on Dec. 15, 2005.

¹¹³ “Arlington Group Members,” *American Policy Roundtable* [on-line]; available from http://www.ohioroundtable.org/untangling/arlington_Group.html; Internet; accessed Nov. 21, 2005.

¹¹⁴ Jon Craig and Gregory Korte, “CCV, Others Hid Funding, Complaint Says,” *Cincinnati Enquirer*, Oct. 27, 2005, P. 2

¹¹⁵ April Yee, “Paid Recruits Fight Gay Marriage,” *Cincinnati Post*, July 24, 2004 [newspaper on-line]; available from <http://www.cincypost.com/2004/07/24/pet072404.html>; accessed Oct. 18, 2005

¹¹⁶ “Arlington Group Members,” *American Policy Roundtable* [on-line]; available from http://www.ohioroundtable.org/untangling/arlington_Group.html; Internet; accessed Nov. 21, 2005.

conscience-affirming character ethics framework designed by and for leading adults to contemplate, apply in their lives, adopt within their work teams and easily commend to those around them.”¹¹⁷

Blackwell’s name is not found on the center’s Web site, but a link to the trademarked UncommonSense materials went to Blackwell’s Secretary of State Web site. The link no longer works, but does give an error message showing Blackwell’s state site. And the Secretary of State’s Web site does contain the UncommonSense material, under a section named Ohio Center for Civic Character, described as a collaborative, statewide project for leaders of all types to build character. An Ohio newspaper described the Ohio center as a project that “elicits pledges of moral character from candidates for public office.”¹¹⁸

The Traditional Marriage Crusade brought less than \$8,000 into the costly battle, with half of that amount — \$4,000 — reported in a lump sum with no indication of the source of the funds. Most of the rest of the money came from outside of Ohio. The committee spent \$4,000 on unitemized expenses, as well as additional funds on printing. It gave about \$480 in excess funds to its parent group, The Foundation for a Christian Civilization.

TOP CONTRIBUTORS IN OHIO, 2004

CONTRIBUTOR	LOCATION	INDUSTRY	PRO/CON	TOTAL
Citizens for Community Values Action	Cincinnati, OH	Christian Conservative	Pro	\$1,182,139
Human Rights Campaign	Washington, DC	Gay & Lesbian Rights	Con	\$384,145
Maltz, David	Beachwood, OH	Gay & Lesbian Rights	Con	\$101,383
Bastian, Bruce W.	Orem, UT	Gay & Lesbian Rights	Con	\$25,000
Nationwide Mutual Insurance	Columbus, OH	Insurance	Con	\$20,000
Ohioans For Growth & Equality	Columbus, OH	Gay & Lesbian Rights	Con	\$20,000
Springer, Gerald N.	Chicago, IL	TV & Movie Production	Con	\$20,000
Wexner, Abigail S.	Hudson, OH	Retail Sales	Con	\$20,000
Forest City Enterprises Inc.	Cleveland, OH	Real Estate	Con	\$15,000
Wolfe Enterprises Inc.	Columbus, OH	Printing & Publishing	Con	\$15,000
TOTAL				\$1,802,667

¹¹⁷ “Our Uncommon Message,” *The American Center for Civic Character* [on-line]; available from <http://centralohiobbb-counties.org/characterusa/about.php>; Internet; accessed Nov. 30, 2005.

¹¹⁸ Julie Carr Smyth, “Ken Blackwell Ohio’s Man at the Center of the National Election Storm,” *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, Oct. 24, 2004, sec. A, p. 1.

OKLAHOMA

Oklahoma's campaign on Question 711 was low cost, with opponents of the amendment raising slightly more than half the amount the proponents did.

OKLAHOMA CONTRIBUTIONS BY COMMITTEE, 2004

BALLOT COMMITTEE	PRO/CON	TOTAL
Oklahomans for the Protection of Marriage	Pro	\$20,293
Protecting Oklahoma Families Fund	Con	\$11,616
Traditional Marriage Crusade	Pro	\$1,350
	TOTAL	\$33,259

Oklahomans for the Protection of Marriage, headed by Republican state Sen. James Williamson, reported raising \$20,293. Of that, \$19,000 came as contributions from a committee of the same name and \$600 came from Williamson, who had sponsored the legislation that placed Question 711 on the ballot. The group's Web site included a sample sermon and a list of individuals who had given their support to the amendment.¹¹⁹ The Web site did not indicate, however, whether the individuals had contributed financially to the committee.

The Protecting Oklahoma Families Fund received three-quarters of its money — \$8,816 — from Cimarron Equality Oklahoma and its chairman, Terry Gatewood. Cimarron advocates for gay and lesbian rights.

The amendment passed with 76 percent of the vote and also played out in the Oklahoma U.S. Senate race, where Democratic U.S. Rep. Brad Carson challenged Republican Tom Coburn, a former congressman. Carson was one of eight Democrats considered to be in highly competitive Senate campaigns.¹²⁰

Coburn received assistance in his campaign from Arlington Group members. He also was listed as a member of the board of directors of the Family Research Council, an Arlington Group member.¹²¹

Arlington Group Involvement

The Traditional Marriage Crusade established a committee in Oklahoma, and a group headed by another Arlington Group member — conservative activist Gary Bauer — ran ads against Carson.

The Traditional Marriage Crusade received nearly all of its money from its parent organization, The Foundation for a Christian Civilization. It spent its funds on printing and distributing fliers and a direct mail piece.

Well into the campaign, Bauer's Americans United to Preserve Marriage ran ads against Carson and several other Democratic Senate candidates. The ad against Carson suggested he might

¹¹⁹ *Oklahomans to Protect Marriage* [on-line]: available from <http://www.okprotectmarriage.govreach.com>; Internet; accessed Oct. 17, 2005.

¹²⁰ Andrea Stone, "Democrats Know Battle for Senate is on GOP Turf," *USA Today*, Aug. 26, 2004.

¹²¹ "List of Officers, Directors, Trustees and Key Employees," IRS Form 990, *Evangelical Council for Financial Accountability* [on-line]; available from <http://files.ecfa.org/assoc/00000083.pdf>; Internet; accessed Jan. 3, 2006. The form covered the tax year beginning Oct. 1, 2003, and ending Sept. 30, 2004.

someday be open to gay rights arguments.¹²² Carson, however, had publicly supported the proposed Federal Marriage Amendment, and then-Human Rights Campaign Executive Director Cheryl Jacques said Carson did not have a record of supporting gay rights.¹²³

Meanwhile, the Americans United to Preserve Marriage Web site singled Carson out among Senate candidates, with a home page section entitled *Brad Carson: A Risk to Your Values*¹²⁴ that displayed a video questioning Carson's commitment to faith-based groups and suggesting he supported gay partnerships. The Carson section was below two others on the Web site's home page: one was entitled *John Kerry: Too Liberal for America* and another encouraged viewers to "*Help Protect Marriage — Re-Elect George W. Bush.*"

TOP CONTRIBUTORS IN OKLAHOMA, 2004

CONTRIBUTOR	LOCATION	INDUSTRY	PRO/CON	TOTAL
Oklahomans for the Protection of Marriage	Tulsa, OK	Christian Conservative	Pro	\$19,000
Cimarron Equality Oklahoma	Oklahoma City, OK	Gay & Lesbian Rights	Con	\$6,300
Gatewood, Terry L.	Oklahoma City, OK	Gay & Lesbian Rights	Con	\$2,516
Foundation for a Christian Civilization	Spring Grove, PA	Christian Conservative	Pro	\$1,295
Prater, Larry	Oklahoma City, OK	Health Professionals	Con	\$1,000
TOTAL				\$30,111

¹²² David D. Kirkpatrick, "The 2004 Campaign: Gays; Marriage Between Gays Becomes Issue in Campaigns," *The New York Times*, Oct. 30, 2004, sec. A, p. 16.

¹²³ Ibid.

¹²⁴ *Americans United to Preserve Marriage* [on-line]; available from <http://www.americansformarriage.org/>; Internet; accessed Nov. 29, 2005.

OREGON

Measure 36 was placed on the ballot following a successful initiative drive generally attributed to four Oregon ministers.¹²⁵ It spurred high emotions and heavy giving from not only Oregonians, but groups and individuals around the country. Four committees raised slightly less than \$5.4 million, with the bulk of the money going to the No on Constitutional Amendment 36 committee and the Defense of Marriage Coalition PAC.

Although Oregon was seen by many as the state most likely to reject the marriage amendment, 57 percent of the voters supported it. However, that margin of victory was the smallest for any of the 13 amendments that came to a public vote in 2004.

OREGON CONTRIBUTIONS BY COMMITTEE, 2004

BALLOT COMMITTEE	PRO/CON	TOTAL
No on Constitutional Amendment 36	Con	\$2,928,380
Defense of Marriage Coalition PAC	Pro	\$2,414,438
Oregon Right to Life Issues PAC	Pro	\$20,015
Religious Response Network	Con	\$5,618
TOTAL		\$5,368,451

The primary committee opposing the measure, No on Constitutional Amendment 36, raised nearly \$3 million, garnering strong financial support from national and state gay- and lesbian-rights groups. Forty-eight percent of its funds, or about \$1.4 million, came from organizations and individuals supporting gay and lesbian rights. It raised another quarter of a million dollars from contributions that were below the limit for reporting the names of contributors.

The main committee supporting the amendment, the Defense of Marriage Coalition, was an offshoot of the Oregon Family Council and reported the largest segment of its contributions as coming from small donations under the threshold for reporting the names and occupations of the contributors — nearly \$530,000. Christian Copyright Licensing, which collects use fees for the owners of copyrighted church music and videos, gave \$410,000. Gateway Communications, an advertising firm whose head — Tim Nashif — served as political director of the Defense of Marriage Coalition, gave another \$120,400, but also received \$130,684 in payments from the coalition.

Church-related contributors to the Defense of Marriage Coalition — outside of Christian Copyright Licensing — gave \$276,800, led by Rolling Hills Community Church at \$46,200, Mount Olivet Baptist Church at \$20,000, and the City Bible Church at \$16,105.

Many contributors to the committee had ties in one way or another to the City Bible Church, which operates two campuses in the Portland area:

- The church's senior pastor, Frank Damazio, was one of the leaders of the petition effort,¹²⁶ along with Tim Nashif. Nashif, who is listed as a

¹²⁵ Steve Law, "Pastors Step from Pulpit into Public Fight over Gay Marriage," *Statesman-Journal*, April 16, 2004 [newspaper on-line]; available from <http://news.statesmanjournal.com/article.cfm?i=78740>; Internet; accessed Dec. 29, 2005.

¹²⁶ Ibid.

district pastor on the church's Web site, is also a co-founder and political director of the Oregon Family Council. The Defense of Marriage Coalition was a business name of the Family Council.¹²⁷

- The committee's largest contributor, Christian Copyright Licensing, is owned by Howard Rachinski, who is listed as an executive pastor on the Church's Web site. The business gave \$200,000 on Aug. 5, another \$200,000 on Sept. 22 and \$10,000 on Oct. 2. Rachinski contributed another \$5,000 of his own money on Oct. 13.
- Several contributors with the same names as ministers listed on the City Bible Church Web site gave a total of about \$32,000, including the \$5,000 from Rachinski and \$1,000 from Nashif. Both gave on Oct. 13; in fact, \$11,725 of the \$32,025 from these contributors came in to the committee on either Oct. 12 or Oct. 13.
- City Bible Church sponsors a ministry it calls Business with a Purpose, which encourages "Christian business owners, professionals & managers to use their talents, success and influence in the marketplace as their ministry for the kingdom of God."¹²⁸ Individuals and businesses listed on the Web site as participants in Business with a Purpose gave an additional \$17,500 to support the amendment.
- The Defense of Marriage Coalition paid the City Bible Church \$332 for an expense listed as "reimbursement of employee health."
- Focus on the Family founder James Dobson, a key Arlington Group member, met with Nashif and Damazio when he spoke to pastors in Portland.¹²⁹ The two also were among a small group of people Dobson singled out for praise after the November election.¹³⁰

All told, the committee raised \$475,653, or nearly 20 percent of its total funds, from individuals and businesses with apparent ties to City Bible Church.

National Gay- and Lesbian-Rights Giving

No on Constitutional Amendment 36 received about one-third of its contributions from three national gay- and lesbian-rights groups. The National Gay and Lesbian Task Force contributed nearly \$663,000, while the Human Rights Campaign gave about \$313,000. The Log Cabin Republicans gave \$40,000, making Oregon the only state in which it contributed to a ballot-measure fight in 2004.

¹²⁷ Ibid.

¹²⁸ "Our Vision," *Business With a Purpose* [on-line]; available from http://www.businesswithapurpose.org/_vision.html; Internet; accessed Nov. 4, 2005.

¹²⁹ Dr. James Dobson, "Marriage Under Fire," excerpt, *Focus on the Family* [on-line]; available from <http://www.family.org/docstudy/bookshelf/a0032438.cfm>; Internet; accessed Dec. 30, 2005.

¹³⁰ Dr. James Dobson, "Looking Back, Looking Ahead," *Focus on the Family Action* [on-line]; available from <http://www.focusaction.org/articles/a0000050.cfm>; Internet; accessed Dec. 30, 2005.

In addition, the Horizons Foundation of San Francisco gave \$10,000. The foundation supports programs and services for the gay and lesbian community, as well as efforts to advance their rights.¹³¹ The committee also received \$150,000 from Tim Gill of Colorado. Gill founded the software company Quark, and his Gill Foundation supports gay and lesbian rights. WordPerfect co-founder Bruce Bastian of Utah gave \$27,500 to fight the Oregon amendment, and gay-rights activist James Hormel of San Francisco gave \$5,000.

Arlington Group Involvement

Focus on the Family contributed to the Defense of Marriage Coalition, despite initially saying it saw no need to become involved in the effort on Amendment 36.¹³² The organization gave \$138,364 to the Oregon committee, ranking as its second-largest contributor; \$110,000 was given in direct contributions, while the remainder was given as in-kind services or goods.

As noted above, Focus on the Family founder James Dobson also spoke to Oregon ministers in April 2004.

Focus on the Family also organized an Oregon Marriage Amendment Committee, filing its statement of organization with the Secretary of State's office on Aug. 30. However, the group discontinued its activity on Oct. 15 and filed no reports.¹³³

TOP NON-INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTORS IN OREGON, 2004

CONTRIBUTOR	LOCATION	INDUSTRY	PRO/CON	TOTAL
National Gay & Lesbian Task Force	Washington, DC	Gay & Lesbian Rights	Con	\$662,858
Christian Copyright Licensing Inc.	Portland, OR	Clergy	Pro	\$410,000
Human Rights Campaign	Washington, DC	Gay & Lesbian Rights	Con	\$312,778
Basic Rights Oregon	Portland, OR	Gay & Lesbian Rights	Con	\$184,243
Focus on the Family	Colorado Springs, CO	Christian Conservative	Pro	\$138,364
Gateway Communications	Portland, OR	Business Services	Pro	\$120,439
Christian Values Fund	Muscataine, IA	Unknown	Pro	\$50,000
Rolling Hills Community Church	Tualatin, OR	Clergy	Pro	\$46,200
Planned Parenthood	Portland, OR	Health Services	Con	\$43,000
Log Cabin Republicans	Washington, DC	Gay & Lesbian Rights	Con	\$40,000
TOTAL				\$2,007,822

¹³¹ "About Us," Horizons Foundation [on-line]; available from <http://www.horizonsfoundation.org/page/aboutus>; Internet; accessed Dec. 29, 2005

¹³² Bill Graves, "National Gay Rights Groups Fight Measure," *The Oregonian*, Sept. 1, 2004, sec. C, p. 10.

¹³³ "Campaign Finance Activity," Focus on the Family Marriage Amendment Committee, *Oregon Secretary of State* [on-line]; available from http://egov.sos.state.or.us/elec/lpkg_el_web_ce_cmitee_query.p_ce_reports_query; Internet: accessed Dec. 30, 2005.

TOP INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTORS IN OREGON, 2004

CONTRIBUTOR	LOCATION	INDUSTRY	PRO/CON	TOTAL
Gill, Tim	Denver, CO	Gay & Lesbian Rights	Con	\$150,000
Nedelisky, Neil	West Linn, OR	Real Estate	Pro	\$101,000
Wilson, Robert W.	Brooklyn, NY	Investor	Con	\$100,000
Bastian, Bruce W.	Orem, UT	Gay & Lesbian Rights	Con	\$27,500
Lewis, Jonathan	Coral Gables, FL	Real Estate	Con	\$25,000
Templeton, John	Bryn Mawr, PA	Christian Conservative	Pro	\$25,000
Bisenius, James	Sherwood, OR	Securities & Investment	Pro	\$22,000
Bobosky, Robert S. (Bob)	Portland, OR	Investor	Pro	\$15,000
Zidell, Jason E.	Portland, OR	Real Estate	Con	\$11,500
Scheidler, Steve	Portland, OR	Electronics Manufacturing/ Services	Pro	\$11,000
TOTAL				\$488,000

UTAH

Amendment 3 in conservative, Republican-dominated Utah won, but with a smaller margin of victory than in many other states. Sixty-six percent of the voters supported the ban, which was placed on the ballot by the Utah Legislature.

The measure drew a surprising amount of money, considering many political observers believed its passage was a given. Ballot committees here raised \$1.3 million, ranking Utah fourth among the 13 states. The four committees supporting the amendment raised slightly less than \$507,000, or about two-thirds of the nearly \$781,000 that the opponents raised

UTAH CONTRIBUTIONS BY COMMITTEE, 2004

BALLOT COMMITTEE	PRO/CON	TOTAL
Don't Amend Alliance	Con	\$773,186
Utahns for a Better Tomorrow	Pro	\$354,113
The Constitutional Defense of Marriage Alliance	Pro	\$131,354
Yes for Marriage	Pro	\$20,813
Utah Lawyers for Sound Constitutional Amendments	Con	\$7,554
Traditional Marriage Crusade	Pro	\$643
	TOTAL	\$1,287,663

The main committee opposing the ban, the Don't Amend Alliance, raised 62 percent of its funds from contributors supporting gay- and lesbian-rights. Most of the money came from Bruce Bastian and his Bruce W. Bastian Foundation. Bastian, a Utah resident and gay-rights activist, co-founded WordPerfect software. He gave \$125,500 to the Don't Amend Alliance, while his foundation gave \$239,000.

More than one-third of the \$131,350 raised by one committee in favor, the Constitutional Defense of Marriage Committee, came from several developers who gave a combined \$50,000. Two Republican state legislators who served as co-chairmen of the committee gave another \$23,300; Sen. Chris Butters contributed about \$20,250, while Rep. F. Lavar Christensen gave \$3,000. Butters had sponsored legislation to define marriage in the law and declare same-sex unions performed in other states void in Utah. Christensen had sponsored the resolution that placed the constitutional amendment on the ballot.

Another committee supporting the marriage amendment, Utahns for a Better Tomorrow, received about half of its \$354,000 from a group called Marriage Education Initiatives. The source of those funds has remained under question; Marriage Education Initiatives formed as a nonprofit corporation on Oct. 18, the same day it gave a \$50,000 contribution to the ballot committee.¹³⁴ Scott McCoy, campaign manager of the Don't Amend committee, filed a complaint with the Utah Attorney General's office alleging that Marriage Education Initiatives was formed to circumvent state campaign-finance laws and hide the donors to Utahns for a Better Tomorrow. The complaint is under review.

¹³⁴ Rebecca Walsh, "Mystery Donor Backing Yes on 3," *Salt Lake Tribune*, Oct. 29, 2004, sec. B.

National Gay- and Lesbian-Rights Giving

Three national groups gave a combined total of \$65,000 in Utah. The national Human Rights Campaign kicked in \$50,000, while the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force gave \$10,000 and the National Center for Lesbian Rights gave \$5,000.

The contributions represented less than 10 percent of the total funds that the Don't Amend Alliance raised and about 14 percent of the total it received from organizations and individuals supporting gay- and lesbian-rights.

Arlington Group Involvement

The Traditional Marriage Crusade created a Utah ballot committee. All of its contributions came from its parent organization, The Foundation for a Christian Civilization, as in-kind contributions to cover printing and postage expenses.

TOP NON-INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTORS IN UTAH, 2004

CONTRIBUTOR	LOCATION	INDUSTRY	PRO/CON	TOTAL
Bruce W. Bastian Foundation	Orem, UT	Gay & Lesbian Rights	Con	\$239,000
AK Holding Co.	Provo, UT	Finance/Insurance/Real Estate	Pro	\$175,000
Marriage Education Initiatives	Salt Lake City, UT	Ideology/Single Issue	Pro	\$171,000
Human Rights Campaign	Washington, DC	Gay & Lesbian Rights	Con	\$50,000
Equality Utah	Salt Lake City, UT	Gay & Lesbian Rights	Con	\$17,500
National Gay & Lesbian Task Force	Washington, DC	Gay & Lesbian Rights	Con	\$10,000
SJ Fox Ridge LLC	Lehi, UT	Real Estate	Pro	\$10,000
VS Fox Ridge LLC	Lehi, UT	Real Estate	Pro	\$10,000
Willow Cove Apartments	South Jordan, UT	Real Estate	Pro	\$10,000
Jackie Biskupski Campaign	Salt Lake City, UT	Candidate Committee	Con	\$9,000
TOTAL				\$716,600

TOP INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTORS IN UTAH, 2004

CONTRIBUTOR	LOCATION	INDUSTRY	PRO/CON	TOTAL
Bastian, Bruce W.	Orem, UT	Gay & Lesbian Rights	Con	\$125,500
Marquardt, Jane A.	Salt Lake City, UT	Lawyers & Lobbyists	Con	\$47,670
Marquardt, Robert	Ogden, UT	General Business	Con	\$22,000
Buttars, D. Chris	West Jordan, UT	Republican Official	Pro	\$20,269
Matheson, Frank	Salt Lake City, UT	Gay & Lesbian Rights	Con	\$12,440
Heap, Ted	Lehi, UT	Real Estate	Pro	\$10,000
Jaffa, Scott	Park City, UT	Construction Services	Con	\$10,000
Sandlin, Julie L.	Draper, UT	Real Estate	Pro	\$10,000
Solomon, Elizabeth	Park City, UT	Gay & Lesbian Rights	Con	\$10,000
Roylance, Susan	Salt Lake City, UT	Christian Conservative	Pro	\$6,750
TOTAL				\$274,629

APPENDIX A

ARLINGTON GROUP MEMBERS

The following people were listed as Arlington Group members on the Ohio Roundtable Web site and on a Jan. 18, 2005, letter to presidential adviser Karl Rove that was attributed to the group.

NAME	ORGANIZATION
Dr. James Dobson	Focus on the Family
Paul M. Weyrich	Free Congress Foundation
Rich Bott	Bott Radio Network
Rod Parsley	Center for Moral Clarity
Janet Folger	Faith2Action
Donald E. Wildmon	American Family Association
Stuart Epperson	Salem Communications Corporation
Tony Perkins	Family Research Council
Gary Bauer	American Values
Kenneth Hutchenson	Mayday for Marriage
Bishop Harry R. Jackson	High Impact Leadership Coalition
Alan Chambers	Exodus International
Dick Bott Sr.	Bott Radio Network
Carl D. Herbster	Advance USA
Dr. Bill Maier	Focus on the Family
Rick Scarborough	Vision America
Keith Wiebe	American Association of Christian Schools
Leo Godzich	National Association of Marriage Enhancement
Ron Crews	Massachusetts Coalition for Marriage
Samuel Casey	Christian Legal Society
Colin A. Hanna	Let Freedom Ring Inc.
Byron Voorheis III	Michigan Chairman, Social Conservatives Bush-Cheney '04
Gary Glenn*	American Family Association of Michigan
Randy Thomas	Exodus International
Kelly Shackelford*	Free Market Foundation
Rev. William Owens	Coalition of African-American Pastors
Phil Burress*	Citizens for Community Values
Dr. S. Dale Burroughs	Biblical Heritage Institute
Clint Cline	Design 4
Larry Cirignano*	Catholicvote.org
C. Preston Noell	Tradition, Family, Property
Rev. Ted Haggard	National Association of Christian Evangelicals
Stephen M. Crampton	American Family Association Center for Law and Policy
Warren Kelley	National Center for Freedom & Renewal
Rev. Derek A. McCoy	High Impact Leadership Coalition
Dan Panetti	National Coalition for the Protection of Children and Families
Kristian M. Mineau*	Massachusetts Family Institute
John Stemberger*	Florida Family Policy Council Inc.
Al Laws Jr.	WIN Family Services Inc.
Diane Gramley	American Family Association of Pennsylvania
Matthew D. Staver	Liberty Counsel
Mark Benz	Men for Nations
Robert E. Reccord	North American Mission Board
Alan E. Sears	Alliance Defense Fund (for identification purposes only)
Richard D. Land	Ethics & Religious Liberty Commission
Frank Wright	National Religious Broadcasters
J. Kenneth Blackwell**	American Center for Civic Character

* Involved in state-level amendment efforts

**Also serves as Ohio's secretary of state

ABOUT THE INSTITUTE

Board of Directors

Adelaide Elm, President
Communications Director
Project Vote Smart

Larry Makinson, Secretary
Former Senior Fellow
Center for Public Integrity

Samantha Sanchez
Treasurer
Former Executive Director
Institute on Money
in State Politics

Edwin Bender
Executive Director
Institute on Money
in State Politics

Jeff Malachowsky
Malachowsky & Associates

Geri Palast
Former Executive Director,
Justice at Stake

Dan Petegorsky
Executive Director
Western States Center

Dennis Swibold
Associate Professor
of Journalism
University of Montana

Staff

Edwin Bender,
Executive Director
Barbara Bonifas,
Deputy Director
Sue O'Connell,
Research and
Communications Director
Mike Krejci,
Director of Technology
and Web Development
Linda King,
Operations Director
Rachel Weiss,
Research and
Communications Specialist

Research Unit

Denise Roth Barber
Linda Casey
Mark Dixon
Megan Moore

Data Acquisition Unit

Sara Christiansen
Cindy Garcia
Michelle Hoffart
Maria Kurtz
Shirlene Kuykendall
Lorna McMurray
Christiana Schweitzer

THE INSTITUTE ON MONEY IN STATE POLITICS grew out of an earlier organization based in the West that collected and analyzed state campaign-finance data for selected Western states. The Institute has steadily increased the number of states for which it collects data and now gathers reports from all 50 states. Its Web site makes this information available in an easily searchable format.

Who We Are

Executive Director Edwin Bender has headed the Institute since August 2003, after serving as the Institute's research director since its creation in 1999. In that role, he led the research functions of the Institute, directing both the development of campaign-finance databases and analysis of those databases. A former journalist, Edwin also worked for seven years as research director for the Money in Western Politics Project of the Western States Center. While there, he helped develop many techniques for researching state campaign-finance data.

Deputy Director Barbara Bonifas has more than 25 years of public sector and nonprofit management experience. Prior to joining the Institute, Barbara served for 10 years as financial officer and project planner for immigrant worker anti-discrimination activities at the National Immigration Law Center in Los Angeles.

Research and Communications Director Sue O'Connell is a former statehouse reporter who also served eight years as a press secretary for the Montana attorney general's office. Director of Technology and Web Development Mike Krejci, formerly of Project Vote Smart, oversees the operation of the Institute's Web site and its database systems. Operations Director Linda King supervises the Institute's financial and personnel matters and oversees the collection of the thousands of campaign-finance reports the Institute gathers each year.

How We're Funded

The Institute is funded primarily through foundation support and has no relationship with any political party, partisan issue group or elected official. Our independence is guaranteed by our no-strings-attached funding. Major sources of funding are The Pew Charitable Trusts, Carnegie Corporation of New York, Ford Foundation, Open Society Institute, the JEHT Foundation and the Rockefeller Brothers Fund.

Minor income is derived from interest and occasional fees for data entry, database development and customized research.