

Supreme Court of the United States
Washington, D. C. 20543

CHAMBERS OF
JUSTICE SANDRA DAY O'CONNOR (RET.)

August 2010

Dear Reader:

I am pleased to introduce *The New Politics of Judicial Elections, 2000-2009: Decade of Change*. This report, the latest in a series begun in 2000, provides a comprehensive review of the threat posed by money and special interest pressure on fair and impartial courts.

We all expect judges to be accountable to the law rather than political supporters or special interests. But elected judges in many states are compelled to solicit money for their election campaigns, sometimes from lawyers and parties appearing before them. Whether or not these contributions actually tilt the scales of justice, three out of every four Americans believe that campaign contributions affect courtroom decisions.

This crisis of confidence in the impartiality of the judiciary is real and growing. Left unaddressed, the perception that justice is for sale will undermine the rule of law that the courts are supposed to uphold.

To avoid this outcome, states should look to reforms that take political pressure out of the judicial selection process. In recent years, I have advocated the system used in my home state of Arizona, where a bipartisan nominating committee recommends a pool of qualified candidates from which the governor appoints judges to fill vacancies. Voters then hold judges accountable in retention elections. Other promising state initiatives have included public financing of judicial elections, campaign disclosure laws, and recusal reforms.

We all have a stake in ensuring that courts remain fair, impartial, and independent. If we fail to remember this, partisan infighting and hardball politics will erode the essential function of our judicial system as a safe place where every citizen stands equal before the law.

For 10 years, the *New Politics* reports have played a leading role in documenting the growing threat to the credibility of our courts. I applaud the authors—Justice at Stake, the Brennan Center for Justice, the National Institute on Money in State Politics, and the Hofstra Law School—for working to protect the courts that safeguard our rights.

Sincerely,



Sandra Day O'Connor

717 D Street, NW, Suite 203
Washington, D.C. 20004
Phone (202) 588-9700 • Fax (202) 588-9485
info@justiceatstake.org
www.justiceatstake.org

The Justice at Stake Campaign is a nonpartisan national partnership working to keep our courts fair and impartial. Across America, Campaign partners help protect our courts through public education, grass-roots organizing, coalition building and reform. The Campaign provides strategic coordination and brings unique organizational, communications and research resources to the work of its partners and allies at the national, state and local levels.

The New Politics of Judicial Elections 2000–2009: Decade of Change *Published August 2010*

Visit us at www.justiceatstake.org

THE NEW POLITICS OF JUDICIAL ELECTIONS 2000-2009

DECADE OF
CHANGE

by

James Sample

Hofstra University School of Law

Adam Skaggs and Jonathan Blitzer

Brennan Center for Justice at NYU School of Law

Linda Casey

National Institute on Money in State Politics

Charles Hall, Editor

Justice at Stake Campaign



Justice at Stake
c a m p a i g n

**BRENNAN
CENTER
FOR JUSTICE**

at New York University School of Law



Table of Contents

List of Charts and Figures	page vi
Executive Summary	page 1
Chapter 1	
The Money Explosion	Page 5
Rise of the Super Spenders	Page 9
The Threat to Justice	Page 9
How We Got Here	Page 14
Rise of the Super Spenders: Alabama	Page 15
Super Spenders in Other States	Page 16
Triumph of the Super Spenders: Illinois	Page 16
Money: Focus on 2007-08	Page 17
Other States of Note in 2007-08	Page 21
2009 High Court Elections: Costly Trends Continue	Page 21
Chapter Notes	Page 23
Chapter 2	
Court TV: The Rise of Costly Attack Ads	Page 24
Introduction: After the Flood	Page 24
Independent Ads Lead the Attack	Page 25
Party Ads Crucial in '08	Page 28
State in Focus: Michigan	Page 30
TV: Focus on 2008	Page 31
State in Focus: Wisconsin	Page 32
2007: TV Spending in an Off Year	Page 36
Chapter Notes	Page 37
Chapter 3	
Who Played? Who Won?	Page 38
Nationalizing of Court Elections	Page 39
The Left: Organizing at the State Level	Page 41
The National Networks	Page 42
American Justice Partnership	Page 42
U.S. Chamber of Commerce Network	Page 43
American Tort Reform Association	Page 44
The Secret Money Players	Page 44
Democratic Judicial Campaign Committee	Page 44
State-Level Coalitions	Page 45
Texas Titans: Bob Perry and Fred Baron	Page 45
Focus on Alabama: Shell Game on the Left	Page 46

Michigan/Wisconsin: What's Behind the Curtain?	Page 48
Georgia: Here Today, Gone Tomorrow	Page 49
The Battle for America's Courts	Page 50
Quotes From the Decade	Page 52
Chapter Notes	Page 54

Chapter 4

Litigation: The Battle Inside the Courtroom Page 55

<i>Caperton v. Massey</i> : When Judges Must Step Aside	Page 55
Who Decides What Is Fair and Impartial?	Page 56
An Earlier Case of Election Bias?	Page 57
The Caperton Coalition: Diverse Groups Rally to Defend Impartial Justice	Page 58
Judicial Speech: How Far Can Candidates Go?	Page 61
Campaign Finance Returns to the High Court	Page 62
Balancing Two Constitutional Rights: Free Speech and Fair Trials	Page 64
Chapter Notes	Page 66

Chapter 5

Public Takes Note, Decision-Makers Begin to Follow Page 67

Recent Reform Efforts	Page 67
The Broader Reform Menu	Page 69
The Rise and Fall of Judicial Tampering by Ballot Measures	Page 71
The Media Take Note	Page 72
Judicial Appointments: The Emerging Battlefield	Page 73
U.S. Chamber of Commerce and Merit Selection	Page 74
The Voters Weigh In	Page 74
Debate in the Business Sector	Page 75
Hanging a 'For Sale' Sign Over the Judiciary	Page 76
Chapter Notes	Page 76

Appendices

Appendix 1: State Profiles, 2000–2009	Page 78
Appendix 2: Supreme Court TV Advertisements 2008	Page 86
Appendix 3: Facts About State Court Election and Appointment Systems	Page 99
Appendix 4: About the Authors	Page 100

Photo Sources Page 102

Index Page 104

List of Charts and Figures

Chapter 1

The Money Explosion

1. State Supreme Court Fundraising by Biennium	Page 5
2. Total Supreme Court Fundraising Ranked by State, 2000–2009	Page 6
3. Contributions by Sector, 2000–2009 High Court Elections	Page 8
4. Super Spenders and What They Spent	Page 10
5. Total Spending for Top 10 States, 2000–2009 High Court Elections	Page 12
6. Top U.S. Super Spenders, 2000–2009 High Court Elections	Page 13
7. Supreme Court Fundraising: Partisan, Nonpartisan and Retention Elections	Page 14
8. Total Supreme Court Spending: Top 10 States, 2007–08	Page 17
9. Top 10 Supreme Court Super Spenders, 2007–08	Page 18
10. Contributions by Sector, 2007–08	Page 19
11. Supreme Court Fundraising by Candidates on Ballot, 2007–08	Page 20

Chapter 2

Court TV: The Rise of Costly Attack Ads

12. Number of TV Ad Airings by Year, 2000–2009 High Court Elections	Page 25
13. Total Spending on TV Ads, 2000–09	Page 26
14. Ohio 2000 Ad: Is Justice for Sale?	Page 26
15. High Court Election TV Spending, 2000–2009	Page 27
16. Top 12 TV Ad Spenders, 2000–2009 High Court Elections	Page 28
17. Greater Wisconsin Committee, TV Ad from 2008	Page 29
18. TV Spending, 2008 High Court Elections	Page 29
19. The Sleeping Judge: Democratic Ad Slams Michigan Chief Justice	Page 30
20. Sponsors and Tone, 2008 High Court Election Ads	Page 31
21. 2008 Anti-Butler Ad Triggered Questions on Truth, Race	Page 33
22. Alabama 2008: Ad Ties Candidate to Special Interests	Page 34
23. Michigan 2008: Challenger Assailed as Soft on Terrorism	Page 35
24. TV Spending, 2007 High Court Elections	Page 36
25. TV Spending in Off-Year High Court Elections, Pennsylvania and Wisconsin	Page 36

Chapter 3

Who Played? Who Won?

26. Washington 2006: National Groups Finance Attack Ads in State Race	Page 38
27. Top Supreme Court Spenders, 2000–09 and 2007–08	Page 40
28. PACs Used by Beasley Allen to Mask High Court Donations	Page 47
29. Map: The Battle for America’s Courts	Page 50

Chapter 4

The Battle Inside the Courtroom

30. <i>New York Times Caperton</i> Headline	Page 55
31. Chronology of <i>Avery v. State Farm</i> Controversy	Page 57
32. <i>Washington Post Citizens United</i> Headline	Page 63

Chapter 5

Public Takes Note, Decision-Makers Begin to Follow

33. What the Public and Business Leaders Think	Page 68
34. South Dakota Amendment E Ad	Page 71
35. Ad for Greene County Nonpartisan Court Plan	Page 73
36. Ad against Greene County Nonpartisan Court Plan	Page 73

