

## **“Battle of the Extremes”: Party Polarization in the 2010 Pennsylvania Senatorial Election**

By Emily Lieffers

**Abstract:** This paper provides an in-depth analysis of the senatorial election held in Pennsylvania in November of 2010. The paper outlines the state's primary election campaigns and the eventual campaign between two ideologically-opposed candidates, Sestak and Toomey. By referencing extensive primary source documents (interviews, campaign videos, and speeches), supported by scholarly secondary sources, this paper argues that Pennsylvania's senatorial election is emblematic of greater party polarization across the United States. The candidates' unwillingness to provide moderate solutions to appeal to voters in this swing state is noteworthy and is reflective of the decline of centrist politics in the country. Though narrow in scope, the argument put forth in this paper has broader implications for polarization and political engagement in contemporary American politics.

A recurring topic in contemporary American politics is the growth of ideological polarization, and while scholars differ on its causes, a consistent finding is that the electoral process itself contributes greatly to such internal divisions in American politics and the alienation of moderate voters from the political process. The broad issue of party polarization was clearly reflected in Pennsylvania's 2010 midterm senatorial race between the Democrat candidate Joe Sestak and Republican candidate Pat Toomey, both former Congressmen, in which the GOP candidate won by a slim margin. While ideological difference is expected between the different regions in the U.S., Pennsylvania offers a unique case study in that its election saw extreme polarization *within* this swing state. Primary elections in the state saw the defeat of more moderate candidates, thus leaving Sestak and Toomey as two ideological opponents who tactically painted each other as “extreme” and out of touch with mainstream Pennsylvanian voters. This essay argues that the 2010 senatorial election in Pennsylvania is emblematic of national polarization in U.S. politics and that while conflict is expected in elections, the selection of such ideologically-opposed candidates, the heightened “extremist” rhetoric, and the seeming inability to compromise between the two candidates make this race noteworthy. This essay will explore how the ideologically-disparate Sestak and Toomey were nominated and will evaluate how polarization played itself out in the race, particularly with regard to the key issue of fiscal management.

### **NOMINATING SESTAK AND TOOMEY: THE REMOVAL OF THE MODERATE**

The 2010 midterm elections saw widespread Republican gains in Pennsylvania, a “quintessential swing state”<sup>i</sup> that has only slightly more registered Democrat voters than Republicans.<sup>ii</sup> The state was Democrat-leaning in the 2008 elections, electing President Barack Obama and twelve Democrats and seven Republicans into the House of Representatives.<sup>iii</sup> In the 2010 midterm elections, however, a Republican governor replaced a Democrat while twelve Republicans and seven Democrats were elected to the House of Representatives.<sup>iv</sup> Democrat

senatorial candidate Sestak was also defeated by Republican Toomey by a margin of 48.4% to 51.6% of the popular vote, a narrow victory which suggests voters were deeply divided between the two candidates.<sup>v</sup> Pennsylvania's shift from Democrat to Republican can largely be explained by the broader workings of U.S. midterm elections. Scholars Alberto Alesina and Howard Rosenthal note that "the midterm cycle is ... institutional balancing" as voters, no longer unsure of their president's identity, seek to moderate his control by electing the other party into Congress.<sup>vi</sup> Democrat losses were widespread across the U.S. and Pennsylvania does not stand out in this respect.<sup>vii</sup> Noteworthy to Pennsylvania's senatorial contest, however, was the extreme personality clash and ideological polarization between the two candidates that left voters without a moderate choice. "Moderate" in this case can be defined as a politician willing to adopt centrist policies that compromise between the ideological extremes. Particular developments in Pennsylvania's primaries and local politics can illuminate how such ideologically-disparate candidates came to run against each other.

Pennsylvania's dramatic Democrat primary election eliminated the party's moderate or centrist element and helped produce this ideologically-contested race. In late April 2009, Republican Senator Arlen Specter switched parties to become a Democrat, largely in anticipation of a difficult Republican primary against Toomey. In the 2004 Republican primary, Toomey lost to Specter by only 17,000 votes,<sup>viii</sup> and Specter reportedly noted that his prospects for winning the 2010 primary "[were] bleak."<sup>ix</sup> In a personal statement explaining his move, Specter stated that his support of the 2009 stimulus bill created an irreconcilable schism with Republicans and that his first allegiance was to Pennsylvanian voters, not his party.<sup>x</sup> Some journalists have suggested that this defection of one of the last GOP moderates in Senate has left Republicans moving toward "a hard-core base."<sup>xi</sup> Specter was in many ways a political chameleon who "charted a path ... defiant of an ideological label":<sup>xii</sup> the senator, both pro-choice and pro-gay rights,<sup>xiii</sup> was one of only three north-eastern GOP moderates to vote for President Obama's stimulus bill in the Senate.<sup>xiv</sup> Despite having President Obama's support, Specter was defeated by the more hard-line Sestak in the Democrat primary.<sup>xv</sup> Specter's party switch alienated both Democrats and Republicans during the primary and allowed Sestak to portray himself as a "real Democrat" and mobilize liberal Democrat support.<sup>xvi</sup> Abramowitz notes that Specter was one of "the last survivors of a dying breed" of Senate moderates, a group whose absence in Congress has national polarizing implications beyond the scope of Pennsylvania.<sup>xvii</sup>

Pennsylvania's Republican Party also eliminated its moderate element by nominating the conservative Toomey. Pennsylvanian Republicans, both at the state and federal level, have increasingly tapped into a "constant demographic" of conservatism in western Pennsylvania, an area in which voters are growing disaffected by economic and social policy from Washington.<sup>xviii</sup> Furthermore, the Party Leadership Conference (PCL), created in 1989 as a yearly weekend forum for the state's conservatives and their financial backers,<sup>xix</sup> is increasingly offering opportunities for alliance between traditional conservatives and energetic Tea Party activists who seek a more direct reading of the U.S. Constitution.<sup>xx</sup> Specter switched parties partly due to his belief that his moderate Congressional record was no longer attractive to Pennsylvanian Republicans.<sup>xxi</sup> Even during his years as a Republican, Specter was never invited and never attended the right-wing PCL's meetings.<sup>xxii</sup> The growth of conservative think tanks also contributed to hard-line partisanship in the state. Toomey headed the Club for Growth, a well-funded and fiscally-conservative national organization that lobbies for tax reform.<sup>xxiii</sup> Toomey's

membership ensured the group's endorsement and financial backing, even against other Republicans,<sup>xxiv</sup> and by March 2010 Toomey had raised more money than any other Senate challenger in the country.<sup>xxv</sup> Scholar Sean M. Theriault suggests that U.S. party polarization is exacerbated by extreme single-issue party activists who assert themselves at early stages in elections and endorse hard-line candidates.<sup>xxvi</sup> Ideologically-pure interest groups provided funding to Toomey and “a further goad to partisan posturing,” thus pushing the moderate base of Pennsylvania's Republican Party, including Specter, out of the race.<sup>xxvii</sup> In the primary, the conservative Toomey would easily defeat Peg Luksik, a candidate who failed to garner much financial support, with 81.5% of the vote.<sup>xxviii</sup>

Both primaries in Pennsylvania thus removed centrist elements and produced two ideologically-opposed candidates fighting for an open senate seat. Pennsylvania often acts as a swing state, and Abramowitz notes that in regions where the party balance is relatively close, campaigns usually attempt to appeal to swing voters while simultaneously mobilizing core party supporters.<sup>xxix</sup> Significantly, in their effort to appeal to mainstream voters, Sestak and Toomey did not advance ideologically-centrist platforms that could have appealed to voters from both parties. Instead, the candidates attempted to discredit each other as the more “extreme” and “un-Pennsylvanian” candidate as their method of suasion. The heightened polarization in the Pennsylvania senatorial race was evident in each candidate's concerted effort to paint his opponent as reckless, ideologically-extreme, and responsible for a stagnant economy.<sup>xxx</sup> Indeed, political commentator George Stephanopoulos characterized their October 20 debate as a “Battle of the Extremes.”<sup>xxxi</sup> Through personality linkages to other polarizing figures, appeals to the Constitution, and ideologically-opposed solutions to the state's economic woes, Pennsylvania's senatorial candidates provided few moderate solutions and instead split their electorate sharply down the middle, as discussed below.

## **THE CAMPAIGN: A “BATTLE OF THE EXTREMES”**

Both Sestak and Toomey characterized their opponent as the more “extreme candidate” through personality linkages to polarizing figures in U.S. politics. In doing so, the candidates attempted to isolate their opponents from mainstream politics and sow division among Pennsylvanian voters. In their October 20 debate, Sestak linked Toomey to Tea Party activists, citing in particular Sarah Palin's endorsement. Sestak stated “I understand the anger of the Tea Party ... and I appreciate their activism” yet expressed concern about such “extreme candidates” taking advantage of an “extreme fringe” of American voters.<sup>xxxii</sup> Sestak also linked Toomey with Christine O'Donnell, Delaware's Tea Party-backed senatorial candidate who was often depicted unflatteringly by the media. Sestak reminded viewers of “Miss O'Donnell next door,” referencing Pennsylvania's proximity to “extreme” Tea Party candidates that, according to Sestak, “want to do away with the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment” and “actually [think] there can be a state-established religion.”<sup>xxxiii</sup> Sestak also linked Toomey to former President George W. Bush, a president with historically-low approval ratings. Noting that the recession began and national debt doubled during the “Toomey/Bush era,” and that he went to Congress “to control the damage of the Bush/Toomey era,” Sestak was keen to distance voters from Toomey's peers. Sestak meanwhile associated himself with popular former President Bill Clinton and referenced the twenty-three million jobs created during the “the eight years in the Clinton Administration

where I worked.”<sup>xxxiv</sup> Sestak was therefore keen to associate himself with popular mainstream leaders while discrediting not just Toomey but his “extreme” peers, former party leader, and supporters as well.

Toomey played a similar polarizing game against Sestak and in particular emphasized Sestak’s consistent voting record with Democrat Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi. Significantly, Toomey did not criticize Sestak’s allegiance to President Obama, likely a concession given that Pennsylvania supported the executive by a ten point margin in 2008.<sup>xxxv</sup> Pelosi, however, was fair game. In an online advertisement, Toomey characterized Sestak as “just another San Francisco liberal,” an obvious reference to Pelosi’s hometown, and stated “Joe Sestak Votes with Nancy Pelosi 100% of the Time.” The perceived extremism Pelosi’s agenda was articulated in the video’s statement “That Might Fly in San Francisco But it’s Too Extreme for Pennsylvania.”<sup>xxxvi</sup> Though Sestak argued that Toomey’s advertisement was false,<sup>xxxvii</sup> the succour enjoyed by Toomey’s critique demonstrated that American voters favour a “maverick” delegate model of representation that puts local needs over party allegiance in Washington. In a January 2010 speech, Toomey criticized Sestak’s voting record, stating “Pennsylvanians don't want a senator who's a rubber stamp for the Reid-Pelosi big government agenda.”<sup>xxxviii</sup> Another advertisement said Toomey put “Principles Ahead of Party Line Obedience.”<sup>xxxix</sup> Sestak, during the October 22 debate, attempted damage control by noting “I’m standing here because I bucked my own party,” in reference to the primary against Specter, but was unable to shake the perception that he put party allegiance in distant Washington ahead of Pennsylvania’s local needs.<sup>xl</sup>

Toomey’s campaign also polarized Sestak from moderates within his own party. A Toomey advertisement, for example, asked “Can You Tell Which Democrat is not Like the Others?” and showed various Democrat members expressing their opinions on cap-and-trade policies next to Sestak stating that he wanted “something more.”<sup>xli</sup> In their October 20 debate, Toomey once again stated that Sestak “distanced himself from the mainstream of Congress” when voting for bailouts and called Sestak a very liberal “fringe” Democrat.<sup>xlii</sup> The selection of hard-line left-wing candidate thus proved a bane to Pennsylvanian Democrats who had to fight the allegation that Sestak’s congressional activities were irreconcilable with not just mainstream Pennsylvanians but average Democrats as well. Rather than present moderate solutions as one might expect in a swing state, much of Toomey’s campaign instead relied on discrediting and alienating the “extreme” Sestak from mainstream Pennsylvanian voters.

In a political environment “decidedly toxic for incumbents,”<sup>xliii</sup> both candidates were also keen to distance themselves from Washington and assure voters that they were “more Pennsylvanian” than their ideologically-extreme opponent. On the one hand, Sestak consistently emphasized that, as the grandson of a local steel worker and son of a navy captain, the welfare of Pennsylvanians remained his greatest interest. In a September 2010 speech, Sestak stated “my values are grounded right here, right here in Pennsylvania.”<sup>xliv</sup> When discussing fiscal policy, Sestak’s personal appeal emerged from his ability to prove that Toomey was not “one of them,” emphasizing Toomey’s fiscal conservatism and corporate links. Sestak referenced Toomey’s time working on Wall Street and for a Chinese billionaire in Hong Kong, and suggested that the Republican’s allegiance was to the “richest of the rich” and not mainstream voters.<sup>xlv</sup> Toomey, on the other hand, released an online advertisement outlining why mainstream Democrat voters

were alienated by Sestak's "extreme" voting record. The advertisement asked "Why are Democrats supporting Pat Toomey?" and included testimonial of Democrat voters expressing anxiety about Sestak, with one voter stating that "[Sestak's] views are just too extreme for Pennsylvania."<sup>xlvi</sup> While Toomey highlighted Sestak's cohesion with the apparently excessive Democrat agenda in Washington and Sestak emphasized Toomey's links off "Main Street," both candidates worked to denigrate each others' loyalty to Pennsylvanians.

Both sides of the race were also keen to reference their own interpretations of the Constitution, which points to the salience of appealing to historical, foundational myths in U.S. politics. A recurring theme in Sestak's rhetoric was his desire to return to the Constitution's original purpose of aiding the American people. Referencing the October 20 debate's setting, Constitution Hall in Philadelphia, Sestak stated that the Constitution says "We the People," not "We the Corporations."<sup>xlvi</sup> Toomey similarly returned to foundational myths about the U.S. at a 2009 town hall meeting with Sestak about healthcare. Toomey noted Pennsylvanians' frustration and anger about government encroachment and stated "[t]his is starting to look almost a little bit like a different country" a comment met by strong applause from the audience.<sup>xlvi</sup> Toomey also stated that the U.S. had not become a superpower "by believing the government was the answer to all our problems," thus appealing to the nation's tradition of limited state welfare and to the Constitution, with its emphasis on personal freedom and responsibility, as authority.<sup>xlvi</sup> The election's lack of moderation was highlighted by Sestak's statement that the disparity of the candidates' readings of the Constitution was "the difference in this election."<sup>l</sup> This perceived disagreement about the U.S.'s core values points to the breadth and depth of ideological polarization between the two candidates which caught voters squarely in the middle.

With reference to fiscal management and tax reform, Sestak and Toomey saw little room for compromise and were keen to emphasize the dramatic timing of the election in the wake of current economic woes. While each candidate promised to restore jobs to the state, which currently sits at 8.8% unemployment,<sup>li</sup> the disparity in Sestak and Toomey's solutions highlighted the fiscal and ideological opposition between the two candidates. A questioner in their October 20 debate noted that Pennsylvania faces a "three-headed monster" in that small businesses are failing and big businesses are sending jobs overseas or to other states with "friendly" business practices.<sup>lii</sup> Sestak stated that restoring small businesses is the basis for economic restoration in the state because they create 80 percent of all jobs, and suggested offering tax credits to small businesses for every new payroll job created. He went on to attack Toomey's trickle-down ideology and stated that Toomey "believes it's about corporations and helping them create jobs elsewhere," including China. Meanwhile, Toomey stated that "this out of control agenda in Washington" was having "a chilling effect" on job creation in the U.S. He stated that Americans must "get spending under control, lower taxes, and create the kind of incentives so that we can get the job growth we badly need."<sup>liii</sup> Toomey also brought the point back to Pennsylvania, stating that Sestak wanted to "punish" Pennsylvanian businesses and "[r]aise their taxes because they have a prosperous overseas business."<sup>liiv</sup> Toomey and Sestak's ideological differences were made clear in their disparate economic policies, and Toomey's links to the low-tax Club for Growth were evident in his policy proposals.

As pointed out by France E. Lee, debates over budget reform are "frequently vehicles for one party to impeach the fiscal management of the other"<sup>lv</sup> and the party out of power is likely to

express greater alarm and paint a bleak budget pictures.<sup>lvi</sup> It is unsurprising, therefore, that budget concerns would play a large role in the October 20 debate, especially in the wake of recent government bailouts. Toomey criticized not just Democrat bailouts but Sestak's personal voting record, stating that "Joe's voted for all the bailouts" and that in each case he "distanced himself from the mainstream of Congress, and said these things should have gone further." Toomey characterized Sestak's votes on fiscal management as irrational, stating that Sestak voted against "commonsense measures that might have restricted the size and scope of Fannie [Mae] and Freddie [Mac]." Furthermore, in Toomey's estimation, Sestak and other Washington liberals "famously decided to roll the dice" and made the present size of government "disastrous."<sup>lvii</sup> Toomey also discredited Sestak's desire to curb budget spending, stating that "for Joe to seriously try to pretend that he has any interest in getting spending under control is simply laughable."<sup>lviii</sup> Sestak's usual response was to claim that the deficit began during Toomey's time in Congress, a period which left "the largest deficit in the history of America."<sup>lix</sup> Sestak also chided Toomey for criticizing current levels of spending, reminding viewers that "[n]ow, he wants to finger point,"<sup>lx</sup> and even likening Toomey's repeated criticism to his "parrot at home."<sup>lxi</sup> Toomey and Sestak thus attempted to connect their opponents to big Washington spending and underline their differentiated voting records; in the issue of fiscal reform, polarization was evident and the "extreme" candidates represented two core and opposing ideological approaches to economic policy.

## CONCLUSION

The 2010 Pennsylvania senatorial race between Sestak and Toomey is a valuable case study for those seeking to understand party polarization in contemporary American politics. The almost evenly-split vote in the election points to the electorate's difficulty choosing between two ideologically-disparate candidates after more moderate candidates were removed from the race. Significantly, instead of proposing centrist solutions to appeal to undecided voters, the candidates instead attempted to capture moderate voters by discrediting the "extremism" of their opponents, a potentially troubling trend for national politics. Through negative personality linkages, disparate readings of the Constitution and accusations of fiscal mismanagement, Sestak and Toomey isolated each other from mainstream Pennsylvanian voters. As noted by Garfinkle and Yankelovich,<sup>lxii</sup> the majority of the American electorate may be no more ideologically extreme than in the past,<sup>lxii</sup> yet the electoral workings of this particular race left Pennsylvanian voters with two excessively partisan candidates. Deeper issues of American partisanship were clearly reflected in this election, in which heightened rhetoric, especially over fiscal matters, removed the possibility of ideological overlap or Congressional bipartisanship. One wonders if the candidates' accusations of extremism, in attempting to capture the moderate vote, did any more than further disillusion voters about Congress, the people's body, and alienate Americans from the political process itself.

## Notes

---

- <sup>i</sup> Karen Tumulty, "Arlen in the Middle," *Time* (22 March, 2010), 27.
- <sup>ii</sup> Pennsylvania Department of State, "Voter Registration Statistics," last modified 9 February, 2009, [http://www.portal.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt/community/voter\\_registration\\_statistics/12725](http://www.portal.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt/community/voter_registration_statistics/12725).
- <sup>iii</sup> Pennsylvania Office of the Governor, "Governor Rendell's Biography," accessed 27 November, 2010, [http://www.governor.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt/community/governor\\_rendell/3080](http://www.governor.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt/community/governor_rendell/3080); Congressional Pictorial Directory, "State Delegations: Pennsylvania," last modified 15 July, 2009, <http://www.gpoaccess.gov/pictorial/111th/pa.html>.
- <sup>iv</sup> Pennsylvania Department of State, "2010 General Election: Official Returns," accessed 27 November, 2010, <http://www.electionreturns.state.pa.us/ElectionsInformation.aspx?FunctionID=13&ElectionID=39&OfficeID=11>
- <sup>v</sup> Pennsylvania Department of State, "2010 General Election: Official Returns," accessed 27 November, 2010, <http://www.electionreturns.state.pa.us/>
- <sup>vi</sup> Alberto Alesina and Howard Rosenthal, *Partisan Politics, Divided Government, and the Economy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 2.
- <sup>vii</sup> Elections 2010," *Reuters Online*, accessed 27 November, 2010, <http://www.reuters.com/politics/elections-2010>
- <sup>viii</sup> Tumulty, 28.
- <sup>ix</sup> Kris Maher, "Specter Move Follows Pennsylvania's Transformation," *Wall Street Journal, Eastern Edition* (4 May, 2009).
- <sup>x</sup> Chris Cillizza, "Specter to Switch Parties," *The Washington Post Online* (28 April, 2009), [http://voices.washingtonpost.com/44/2009/04/28/specter\\_to\\_switch\\_parties.html?wprss=44](http://voices.washingtonpost.com/44/2009/04/28/specter_to_switch_parties.html?wprss=44)
- <sup>xi</sup> Tumulty, 27.
- <sup>xii</sup> *Ibid.*, 28.
- <sup>xiii</sup> *Ibid.*, 29.
- <sup>xiv</sup> Abramowitz, 2.
- <sup>xv</sup> Peter Nicholas and Josh Drobynk, "Obama supporting Specter in primary battle," *Los Angeles Times Online* (15 September, 2009), <http://articles.latimes.com/2009/sep/15/nation/na-obama-specter15>
- <sup>xvi</sup> Tumulty, 28.
- <sup>xvii</sup> Alan I. Abramowitz, *The Disappearing Center: Engaged Citizens, Polarization, and American Democracy* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2010), 2.
- <sup>xviii</sup> Jeffrey Lord, "Red Tide Rising," in *American Spectator* 39, no. 8 (October 2006), 36.
- <sup>xix</sup> *Ibid.*, 35.
- <sup>xx</sup> John Gizzi, "Gizzi on Politics," in *Human Events* (26 April, 2010); Kate Zernike, *Boiling Mad: Inside Tea Party America* (New York: Times Books, 2010), 4.
- <sup>xxi</sup> Maher.
- <sup>xxii</sup> Lord, 36.
- <sup>xxiii</sup> Tumulty, 28.
- <sup>xxiv</sup> Richard Wolf, "Vows to wage war on taxes," *USA Today* (11 April, 2010).
- <sup>xxv</sup> Tumulty, 28.
- <sup>xxvi</sup> Sean M. Theriault, *Party Polarization in Congress* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 4.
- <sup>xxvii</sup> Norton Garfinkle and Daniel Yankelovich, *Uniting America: Restoring the Vital Center to American Democracy* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2005), 3.
- <sup>xxviii</sup> Pennsylvania Department of State, "2010 General Primary: Official Returns," accessed 27 November, 2010, <http://www.electionreturns.state.pa.us/ElectionsInformation.aspx?FunctionID=12&ElectionID=34>
- <sup>xxix</sup> Abramowitz, 104-105.
- <sup>xxx</sup> Mark Levy (Associated Press), "Sestak, Toomey Debate in Pennsylvania's Tight Senate Race," *cnsnews.com* (21 October, 2010), <http://www.cnsnews.com/news/article/sestak-toomey-debate-pennsylvania-s-tigh>
- <sup>xxxi</sup> George Stephanopoulos, "George's Bottom Line," *ABC News Online* (20 October 2010), <http://blogs.abcnews.com/george/2010/10/-battle-of-the-extremes-joe-sestak-and-pat-toomey-face-off-in-pennsylvania-senate-debate.html>
- <sup>xxxii</sup> "ABC News' Pennsylvania Senate Debate - Transcript Part I," *ABC News Online* (20 October, 2010), <http://blogs.abcnews.com/george/2010/10/abc-news-pennsylvania-senate-debate-transcript.html>

---

<sup>xxxiii</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>xxxiv</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>xxxv</sup> Abramowitz, 99.

<sup>xxxvi</sup> ToomeyForSenate, “Joe Sestak ... Just Another Nancy Pelosi Liberal,” Youtube video, 1:42, posted 21 June, 2010, <http://www.youtube.com/user/ToomeyForSenate#p/u/42/kCwRafxRdM0>

<sup>xxxvii</sup> Mark Levy (Associated Press), “2 Pa. TV stations pulling anti-Sestak Senate ad,” *The Boston Globe Online* (15 July 2010),

[http://www.boston.com/news/nation/articles/2010/07/15/2\\_pa\\_tv\\_stations\\_pulling\\_anti\\_sestak\\_senate\\_ad/](http://www.boston.com/news/nation/articles/2010/07/15/2_pa_tv_stations_pulling_anti_sestak_senate_ad/)

<sup>xxxviii</sup> Salena Zito, “Toomey doubles size of lead over Specter,” *Pittsburgh Tribune-Review Online* (22 January, 2010), [http://www.pittsburghlive.com/x/pittsburghtrib/news/regional/s\\_663504.html](http://www.pittsburghlive.com/x/pittsburghtrib/news/regional/s_663504.html)

<sup>xxxix</sup> ToomeyForSenate, “Extreme One Party,” Youtube video, 0:19, posted 5 July, 2010,

<http://www.youtube.com/user/ToomeyForSenate#p/u/35/SeGDLsrPuv0>

<sup>xl</sup> James O’Toole, “Toomey, Sestak exchange barbs in final TV debate,” *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette Online* (23 October, 2010), <http://www.post-gazette.com/pg/10296/1097505-178.stm>.

<sup>xli</sup> ToomeyForSenate, “Joe Sestak: To the Left of Democrats on Cap-and-Trade,” Youtube video, 1:51, posted 5 July, 2010, <http://www.youtube.com/user/ToomeyForSenate#p/u/41/gPs7q3F0vec>

<sup>xlii</sup> “ABC News’ Pennsylvania Senate Debate - Transcript Part I.”

<sup>xliii</sup> Tumulty, 27.

<sup>xliv</sup> Sestak2010, “Joe Speaks on the Economy in Pittsburgh,” Youtube video, 2:47, posted 28 September, 2010,

[http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AfiEzLAp4qU&feature=player\\_embedded](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AfiEzLAp4qU&feature=player_embedded)

<sup>xlv</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>xlvi</sup> ToomeyForSenate, “Democrats for Toomey,” Youtube video, 1:06, posted 27 October, 2010,

<http://www.youtube.com/user/ToomeyForSenate#p/u/4/0Uh2Swd6e6I>

<sup>xlvii</sup> “ABC News’ Pennsylvania Senate Debate - Transcript Part I.”

<sup>xlviii</sup> Sestak2010, “Health Care Town Hall Debate with Joe Sestak and Pat Toomey,” Youtube video, 1:36:15, posted 5 September 2009, [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=expwwDF-SHw&feature=player\\_embedded](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=expwwDF-SHw&feature=player_embedded)

<sup>xlix</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>l</sup> “ABC News’ Pennsylvania Senate Debate - Transcript Part I.”

<sup>li</sup> Bureau of Labor Statistics, United States Department of Labor, “Local Area Unemployment Statistics,” accessed 27 November, 2010, <http://www.bls.gov/lau/>

<sup>lii</sup> “ABC News’ Pennsylvania Senate Debate - Transcript Part I.”

<sup>liii</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>liv</sup> “ABC News’ Pennsylvania Senate Debate - Transcript Part II,” *ABC News Online* (20 October, 2010),

<http://blogs.abcnews.com/george/2010/10/abc-news-pennsylvania-senate-debate-transcript-part-ii.html>

<sup>lv</sup> Frances E. Lee, *Beyond Ideology: Politics, Principles, and Partisanship in the U.S. Senate* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2009), 122.

<sup>lvi</sup> *Ibid.*, 123-124.

<sup>lvii</sup> “ABC News’ Pennsylvania Senate Debate - Transcript Part I.”

<sup>lviii</sup> “ABC News’ Pennsylvania Senate Debate - Transcript Part II.”

<sup>lix</sup> “ABC News’ Pennsylvania Senate Debate - Transcript Part I.”

<sup>lx</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>lxi</sup> “ABC News’ Pennsylvania Senate Debate - Transcript Part II.”

<sup>lxii</sup> Garfinkle and Yankelovich, 247.

---

## Bibliography

- “ABC News' Pennsylvania Senate Debate - Transcript Part I.” *ABC News Online*, 20 October, 2010. <http://blogs.abcnews.com/george/2010/10/abc-news-pennsylvania-senate-debate-transcript.html>
- “ABC News' Pennsylvania Senate Debate - Transcript Part II.” *ABC News Online*, 20 October, 2010. <http://blogs.abcnews.com/george/2010/10/abc-news-pennsylvania-senate-debate-transcript-part-ii.html>
- Abramowitz, Alan I. *The Disappearing Center: Engaged Citizens, Polarization, and American Democracy*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2010.
- Alesina, Alberto and Howard Rosenthal. *Partisan Politics, Divided Government, and the Economy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics, United States Department of Labor. “Local Area Unemployment Statistics.” Accessed 27 November, 2010. <http://www.bls.gov/lau/>
- Cillizza, Chris. “Specter to Switch Parties.” *The Washington Post Online*, 28 April, 2009. [http://voices.washingtonpost.com/44/2009/04/28/specter\\_to\\_switch\\_parties.html?wprss=44](http://voices.washingtonpost.com/44/2009/04/28/specter_to_switch_parties.html?wprss=44)
- Congressional Pictorial Directory. “State Delegations: Pennsylvania.” Last modified 15 July, 2009. <http://www.gpoaccess.gov/pictorial/111th/pa.html>
- “Elections 2010.” *Reuters Online*. Accessed 27 November, 2010. <http://www.reuters.com/politics/elections-2010>
- Garfinkle, Norton and Daniel Yankelovich. *Uniting America: Restoring the Vital Center to American Democracy*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2005.
- Gizzi, John. “Gizzi on Politics.” *Human Events*, 26 April, 2010.
- Lee, Frances E. *Beyond Ideology: Politics, Principles, and Partisanship in the U.S. Senate*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2009.
- Levy, Mark (Associated Press). “2 Pa. TV stations pulling anti-Sestak Senate ad.” *The Boston Globe Online*, 15 July 2010. [http://www.boston.com/news/nation/articles/2010/07/15/2\\_pa\\_tv\\_stations\\_pulling\\_anti\\_sestak\\_senate\\_ad/](http://www.boston.com/news/nation/articles/2010/07/15/2_pa_tv_stations_pulling_anti_sestak_senate_ad/)

- 
- Levy, Mark (Associated Press). "Sestak, Toomey Debate in Pennsylvania's Tight Senate Race." *cnsnews.com*, 21 October, 2010. <http://www.cnsnews.com/news/article/sestak-toomey-debate-pennsylvania-s-tigh>
- Lord, Jeffrey. "Red Tide Rising." *American Spectator* 39, no. 8 (October 2006): 34-39.
- Maher, Kris. "Specter Move Follows Pennsylvania's Transformation." *Wall Street Journal, Eastern Edition*, 4 May, 2009.
- Nicholas, Peter and Josh Drobnyk. "Obama supporting Specter in primary battle." *Los Angeles Times Online*, 15 September, 2009. <http://articles.latimes.com/2009/sep/15/nation/na-obama-specter15>
- Pennsylvania Department of State. "2010 General Election: Official Returns." Accessed 27 November, 2010. <http://www.electionreturns.state.pa.us/ElectionsInformation.aspx?FunctionID=13&ElectionID=39&OfficeID=11>
- Pennsylvania Department of State. "2010 General Election: Official Returns." Accessed 27 November, 2010. <http://www.electionreturns.state.pa.us/>
- Pennsylvania Office of the Governor. "Governor Rendell's Biography." Accessed 27 November, 2010. [http://www.governor.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt/community/governor\\_rendell/3080](http://www.governor.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt/community/governor_rendell/3080)
- Pennsylvania Department of State. "Voter Registration Statistics." Last modified 9 February, 2009. [http://www.portal.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt/community/voter\\_registration\\_statistics/12725](http://www.portal.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt/community/voter_registration_statistics/12725)
- Pennsylvania Department of State. "2010 General Primary: Official Returns." Accessed 27 November, 2010. <http://www.electionreturns.state.pa.us/ElectionsInformation.aspx?FunctionID=12&ElectionID=34>
- O'Toole, James. "Toomey, Sestak exchange barbs in final TV debate." *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette Online*, 23 October, 2010. <http://www.post-gazette.com/pg/10296/1097505-178.stm>.
- Sestak2010. "Health Care Town Hall Debate with Joe Sestak and Pat Toomey." Youtube video, 1:36:15. Posted 5 September 2009. [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=expwwDF-SHw&feature=player\\_embedded](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=expwwDF-SHw&feature=player_embedded)
- Sestak2010. "Joe Speaks on the Economy in Pittsburgh." Youtube video, 2:47. Posted 28 September, 2010. [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AfiEzLAp4qU&feature=player\\_embedded](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AfiEzLAp4qU&feature=player_embedded)

- 
- Stephanopoulos, George. "George's Bottom Line." *ABC News Online*, 20 October 2010.  
<http://blogs.abcnews.com/george/2010/10/-battle-of-the-extremes-joe-sestak-and-pat-toomey-face-off-in-pennsylvania-senate-debate.html>
- Theriault, Sean M. *Party Polarization in Congress*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- ToomeyForSenate. "Democrats for Toomey." Youtube video, 1:06. Posted 27 October, 2010.  
<http://www.youtube.com/user/ToomeyForSenate#p/u/4/0Uh2Swd6e6I>
- ToomeyForSenate. "Extreme One Party." Youtube video, 0:19. Posted 5 July, 2010.  
<http://www.youtube.com/user/ToomeyForSenate#p/u/35/SeGDLrPuv0>
- ToomeyForSenate. "Joe Sestak ... Just Another Nancy Pelosi Liberal." Youtube video, 1:42.  
Posted 21 June, 2010.  
<http://www.youtube.com/user/ToomeyForSenate#p/u/42/kCwRafxRdM0>
- ToomeyForSenate. "Joe Sestak: To the Left of Democrats on Cap-and-Trade." Youtube video, 1:51. Posted 5 July, 2010.  
<http://www.youtube.com/user/ToomeyForSenate#p/u/41/gPs7q3F0vec>
- Tumulty, Karen. "Arlen in the Middle." *Time*, 22 March, 2010. 26-29.
- Wolf, Richard. "Vows to wage war on taxes." *USA Today*, 11 April, 2010.
- Zernike, Kate. *Boiling Mad: Inside Tea Party America*. New York: Times Books, 2010.
- Zito, Salena. "Toomey doubles size of lead over Specter." *Pittsburgh Tribune-Review Online*, 22 January 2010.  
[http://www.pittsburghlive.com/x/pittsburghtrib/news/regional/s\\_663504.html](http://www.pittsburghlive.com/x/pittsburghtrib/news/regional/s_663504.html)