



SPOTLIGHT

Do We Need a Spending Cap on Political Campaigns?

By Dale M. Glading

In 1860, Abraham Lincoln won the presidency in a three-way race by spending \$2.8 million in 2026 dollars. Fast forward to the 2024 presidential election and Vice President Kamala Harris raised \$1 billion from donors and another \$586 from political action committees (PACs). Meanwhile, President Donald Trump raised \$382 million from donors and another \$694 million from affiliated PACs.

In case you're math-challenged like me, that's \$2.662 billion total.

Overall, expenditures on presidential campaigns have increased 260-fold since Honest Abe's heyday, far outpacing the 40.12-fold increase in everyday living expenses during that same period according to Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Price Index (CPI) data.

Simply put, spending on political campaigns has become a runaway train and – like poor Nell Fenwick, who was constantly tied to the tracks by Snidely Whiplash – the American people are being rail-roaded by the Washington elite and moneyed powerbrokers across our fruited plain.

Worse yet, the locomotive is
continued on page 3

Democrat Candidates Get Wackier by the Minute

By Dale M. Glading

Over the past year, scientists affiliated with the Nippon Foundation-Nekton Ocean Census report discovering more than 1,100 new species of marine life. Among them are the "Ghost Shark" Chimaera, two kinds of seaworms, and the Mediterranean Shrimp. Most of the new life-forms were found in remote, deep-sea locations miles below the surface.

I wonder if that is where the Democrat Party found some of its latest class of congressional candidates.

Over the past 20 years or so, we have become numb to the Democrats trotting out one bizarre candidate after another – such as the purple-haired Rosa DeLauro, who has been serving Connecticut's 3rd congressional district since 1991. DeLauro also prefers to wear oversized green-tinted glasses, making her look more like Bozo the Clown than a supposedly distinguished member of Congress.

Well, it looks like Rosa may have to share the limelight, because the Democratic class of 2026 is chockfull of crazies.

Exhibit #1 is James Talarico, the Texas state representative who is running for the U.S. Senate. He will face Texas Attorney General Ken Paxton in November.

How clueless is Talarico? Despite God referring to Himself as "Father" more than 170 times in the Bible (160

times in the Gospels alone) – and there being close to 1,000 verses where God uses a masculine Greek noun as a direct reference to Himself – Talarico claims that God is "non-binary". "God is both masculine and feminine and everything in between," Talarico said.

I guess you could excuse such gross ignorance from a common layman, but Talarico holds a Master of Divinity degree from Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary.

Likewise, Talarico asserts that there are more than two biological sexes. At a Texas state house committee hearing on a bill to ban biological men from competing in women's sports, Talarico said the following...

"The one thing I want us to all be aware of is that modern science obviously recognizes that there are many more than two biological sexes. In fact, there are six... which honestly surprised me. The point is that biologically speaking, scientifically speaking, sex is a spectrum, and oftentimes can be very ambiguous."

Huh?

Talarico defended his outlandish claims by feigning ignorance, saying that he is a politician and not a scientist. And yet, Talarico taught school for two years and holds a master's in education policy from Harvard University, so you would think he would know better.

Exhibit #2 is Graham Platner, who won the Democratic nomination for the U.S. Senate seat currently held

continued on page 4

IN THIS ISSUE...



How to Ensure a Permanent GOP Majority...Page 2

How to Ensure a Permanent GOP Majority

By Dale M. Glading

According to USAFacts, there were 189.5 million registered voters in the states that report party affiliation as of August 2025. Only about 45% of them declared an affiliation with one of the two major parties, with the remainder being either unaffiliated/independent or registered with minor parties.

Ballotpedia reported similar figures as of June 2025. In the 30 states, the District of Columbia, and the U.S. Virgin Islands that reported party-registration data, there were 44.9 million registered Democrats (36.84% of registrants), 38 million registered Republicans (31.01%), 33.7 million independents or unaffiliated voters (27.7%), and 5.4 million voters registered with other parties (4.46%).

So how, you might wonder, do I propose to create a permanent GOP majority when the Republican Party is in the distinct minority by almost 7 million registered voters? Simple... just give the Democrats what they want.

And what they want – if you believe the polls – is to live anyplace other than the United States of America.

That's right, folks. In a new Elon University poll conducted by YouGov between April 30 and May 4, 55% of Democratic respondents said that there is another country on Earth that they would rather live in than the United States. Conversely, only 10% of Republicans said the same.

That means that – if given the chance – roughly 25 million De-

mocrats would say goodbye and good riddance to the ol' US of A... and not look back. And so, how about making their wish come true?

After all, the same Elon University poll uncovered a widespread disdain for America amongst the Democrats who were surveyed whereas Republican respondents mostly bled red, white, and blue.

When asked which term best describes how they feel about America turning 250 years old, 68% of Republicans said they felt proud; 19% said they felt grateful; 3% said they felt conflicted; 1% said they felt frustrated; 1% said they felt disappointed; and 9% said they had no strong feelings.

How did the Democrats respond to the same question? Only 18% said they felt proud; 17% said they felt grateful; 21% said they felt conflicted; 6% said they felt frustrated; 15% said they felt disappointed; and 24% said they had no strong feelings.

Folks, that is a whopping 50% differential between the two major parties when it comes to being proud of America's 250th birthday. Meanwhile, a disconcerting 39% of Democrats are either disappointed or have no strong feelings about our nation's semiquincentennial.

And believe it or not, it actually gets worse when Democrats are asked about their personal feelings towards our country in general.

Only 26% of Democratic respondents said that the statement "I am proud to be an American" was "very true"; 22% said it was "somewhat true"; 21% said it was neither true nor untrue; 18% said it was somewhat untrue; and 12% said it was very untrue.

Once again, a slight majority (51%) of Democrats are either ashamed of or ambivalent towards the United States of America. And so, I ask, why not send them packing?

Just imagine if the Republican Party – instead of spending its war chest on TV ads and bumper stickers – simply offered one-way airfare to a foreign destination of their choice to every registered Democrat? Heck, we could even throw in some free luggage, in-flight snacks, and an Uber driver to take them from the airport to their new home on foreign soil.

Of course, I make these suggestions in jest (sort of), but the underlying truth remains: one party loves America and the other loathes it. Which begs the question: Why should people who hold the United States in such open contempt be allowed to choose its leaders and make its laws?

Again, I ask that question tongue-in-cheek (sort of)...

Want more?

Read more of Dale Glading's political blog posts at www.daleglading.com

"The Senate Shootout in Texas"

"The Biblical Scores Are In... Garden State Version"

"Socialism Stinks... and Here's Why"

"Papal Pandering and the Vatican's Silly Study"

"Teenage Terrorists and Absentee Parents"

Do We Need a Spending Cap on Political Campaigns?

continued from page 1

picking up steam, with campaign spending having quadrupled from 2000 to 2012 alone. In 2016, expenditures for all federal campaigns totaled \$6.8 billion. By 2024, that number had mushroomed to \$21 billion... and counting.

This trend isn't just unhealthy. It is unsustainable... especially if we want to preserve our constitutional republic.

Do we really want billionaires like Michael Bloomberg spending \$935 million of his own money to win/buy a single mayoral primary in New York City? If so, every political office in the country will soon be up for sale – if it isn't already.

When I ran for the U.S. House of Representatives in New Jersey's 1st congressional district in 2008, I was told that because my district was in a major media market (the Philadelphia suburbs), I would need to raise \$2 million to run a credible campaign. That was simply impossible for several reasons.

First, I was running against an 8-term incumbent in one of the safest Democratic districts in the country where a Republican hadn't won since 1972. And so, no one wanted to donate to a candidate who didn't stand a chance – despite the fact that I earned the endorsements of the three largest newspapers in the area, including the liberal Philadelphia Inquirer and the Gannett-owned Courier-Post.

Second, as executive director of a prison ministry, one of my major responsibilities was to raise money to finance that organization. That led

me to tell potential donors to my campaign, "If you only have \$1 to give, donate it to my ministry, because it's more important to send an inmate to heaven than me to Washington."

Not the best fundraising appeal, I'll admit, but true nonetheless.

I raised a paltry \$30,000 but still managed to win more than 70,000 votes and a higher percentage than any Republican candidate in my district in 35 years. Building on that foundation, I was asked to run again in 2010, secured the GOP nomination for a second time, and raised \$60,000 this time around. The result at the polls was marginally better – I did 9% better and my opponent did 9% worse (an 18% swing). But at the end of the day, I learned a difficult lesson in Politics 101: money talks.

Actually, it screams.

It is now 16 years later, and money is shouting louder than ever. Rep. Thomas Massie (R-KY) just lost to challenger Ed Gallrein in the most expensive congressional primary in American history. The price tag for that race was an astronomical \$32 million and yet it paled in comparison to the \$120 million that was spent on the U.S. Senate primary in Texas between John Cornyn and Ken Paxton.

I am not the first person to sound the alarm about the spending on political campaigns getting out of control. The Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (FECA) established contribution limits, source restrictions, and disclosure requirements for federal candidates and committees with the Federal Election Commission (FEC) overseeing enforcement. Next came the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act (BRCA) of 2002, better known as

the McCain-Feingold Act, which expanded disclosure rules and created "soft money" bans.

However, some of those rules and restrictions were removed by the Supreme Court in its Citizens United v. FEC (2010) and McCutcheon v. FEC (2014) rulings, citing donors' First Amendment right to free speech. As a result, Timothy Mellon, the 82-year-old banking heir, was legally able to donate \$197 million to President Trump's 2024 campaign and various other GOP-affiliated PACs. Four others – including Elon Musk, casino magnate Miriam Adelson, and hedge fund investor Kenneth Griffin – donated more than \$100 million each to President Trump and his PACs in 2024.

And it's not just presidential races that are out of control. In 2024, spending on senate races in six states – Texas, Ohio, Montana, Maryland, California, and Arizona – exceeded \$100 million and the race in Texas came within \$40,000 of \$200 million.

That's insane! It's also very, very dangerous for democracy, because not only does it preclude average Americans from running for office but is also leaves those candidates who win overly beholden to their deep-pocketed donors.

Don't think for a minute that donors who write really big checks aren't expecting a favor or two down the road... and that goes double for PACs and special interest groups who demand VIP treatment when legislation that affects them comes up for a vote.

When I ran for Congress in 2008, there was a congressman in an adjacent district named Jim Saxton who was retiring after a distin-

continued on page 4

Do We Need a Spending Cap on Political Campaigns?

continued from page 1

guished 25-year career. His advice to me was simple: "Don't run unless you're willing to spend 3-4 hours every night, walking across the street from the Capitol building, to call people and beg them for money."

You see, House terms are just two-years long and so, no sooner are you elected and sworn into office, but you have to start raising money to be re-elected. Is that really how we want our elected officials to spend their time?

So, what's the solution?

I'm not sure if there is an easy one, but I might suggest the following: How about a spending cap, similar to what some of the major sports leagues in America have established?

The NBA instituted a hard salary cap in 1984, and the NFL did like-

wise in 1994, followed by the NHL in 2005. Whereas the Major League Baseball Players Association has resisted a salary cap, teams that exceed a specified total compensation figure are forced to pay a luxury tax each year. When the current collective bargaining agreement expires this December, MLB is expected to demand that the players' union accept a salary cap or be prepared for a lockout that could delay or cancel much of the 2027 season.

Simply put, the team owners have arrived at the same conclusion that I have: spending is out of control, and drastic measures must be taken to rein it in. We must do what is necessary to save America's National Pastime as well as this great experiment in democracy we call the United States of America.

Editor's Note: **Traditional PACs** are subject to both donation and spending limits. They can contribute up to \$5,000 per election to a candidate, \$5,000 annually to other PACs, and \$15,000 to national party committees each year. Individuals, other PACs, and corpo-

rations can donate up to \$5,000 annually to a traditional PAC. **Super PACs**, also known as independent expenditure-only committees, emerged after the 2010 *Citizens United v. FEC* decision. These PACs cannot donate directly to candidates or parties but can spend unlimited amounts on political advertising and other election-related activities that do not coordinate directly with candidates or parties. There are no limits on the amounts that individuals or corporations can donate to Super PACs. Super PACs cannot accept contributions from foreign nationals, federal contractors, national banks, or federally chartered corporations.

Hybrid PACs operate with two separate accounts to accommodate different functionalities. One account adheres to traditional PAC limits and can contribute directly to candidates, while the other operates like a Super PAC, making unlimited independent expenditures without direct coordination with candidates or parties. This dual structure was made possible by the 2012 *Carey v. FEC* decision.

Democrat Candidates Get Wackier by the Minute

continued from page 1

by Republican incumbent Susan Collins of Maine. Platner, an oyster farmer and Marine Corps veteran, has a very controversial background, starting with the skull-and-bones tattoo on his chest called a Totenkopf, a symbol worn by the Nazi Schutzstaffel or SS, a paramilitary organization.

Over the years, Platner has described himself as a "communist", "rabidly anti-Hillary", and a "veg-

etable growing, psychedelics taking socialist". He once said that "all cops are bast**ds" and agreed with a post calling rural white Americans "racist and stupid". Platner also wants to abolish ICE and blames Israel for the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

Despite his radical and racist positions, Platner has been endorsed by Sen. Bernie Sanders and Sen. Elizabeth Warren and stands a fighting chance of winning in November.

And so, there you have it folks, the stars of the Democrat Class of 2026.

Contact us...

at

dale@daleglading.com

to advertise or to order
free copies for
distribution or display.



Use the
QR code
for Dale's
latest
blogs!