

**Political One-Stop-Shopping:
The Unique Campaign of Dan Patrick**

Presented By
Jay Hargett

To
The Raleigh Tavern Philosophical Society
Tomball, Texas

April 12th, 2006

© 2006, Jay Hargett

In the beginning, God created Populist Activism...

On December 29th, 2005, Dan Patrick, owner of Houston Broadcasting's AM 700 KSEV and host of his own 2 hour radio talk show host, formally filed paperwork with the State Republican Party announcing his intent to run for State Senator for District 7. This position will be vacated by Jon Lindsay at the end of this current term of office (2006), leaving an open seat in the Texas State Senate. Patrick's campaign has raised some serious ethical questions about the process of campaigning while maintaining an ownership management position in a media outlet within the political district the candidate runs in. But first, a little history is in order.

Dan Patrick is a career broadcaster, who arrived here at Houston's KHOU-TV Channel 11, as Sports Director, in 1979. After leaving broadcasting in 1984, he opened an eatery that would ultimately cost him a bankruptcy. He returned to broadcasting in 1988 to KSEV as it's general manager, but ultimately lost this position when Clear One purchased their sister station, AM 950, KPRC. This left an opening for a "management / partnership arrangement, under the created broadcasting company of Houston Broadcasting, with Lieberman Broadcasting, where Dan and former Texas State Senator Michael Richards would manage KSEV as ownership partners. Patrick would serve as VP and GM...¹"

In this process, Patrick also made a name for himself on important political, as well as social, issues in the Houston / Harris County area. Most notably, the issues associated with anything that soaked the membranes of the taxpayer's pocketbook. It began with the creation of Metro and it's creation of contra-flow, followed by the

building of the George R. Brown Convention Center, the establishment of the Houston Sports Authority, the building of the downtown sports venues like Minute Maid Park and Reliant Stadium, the rail system downtown, and other such fiscal issues he opposed. I note them here in passing, because while Patrick was able to get votes called on many of these expenditures, he ultimately failed to get a majority of votes to stop their construction. On social issues, he's had a bit more success, such as the recent initiative on the proposition banning gay marriage.

Upon his minority ownership position acquisition of the AM 700 frequency KSEV, he then began what was ultimately to be the business plan for his radio station management, called "Radio Active". This is a clever way of describing the slogan-like station promo tags that sell, "We're not just talking about it, we're doing something about it." This tag between programming content began when the property tax issue became the forefront of the populist activism sold on a daily basis on KSEV. It also mirrors the non-profit political action committee, started by Patrick, called **Citizens Lowering Our Unfair Taxes**, or C.L.O.U.T., for short².

Created to operate as a lobby to the state legislature for a lowering of the property tax cap from 10% to somewhere between 3% and 5% (depending on which day of the week it is), C.L.O.U.T. has garnered more than 21,000 members and 3 member radio stations, according to their own reported figures. This also includes the ability to accept soft money donations for the lobbying efforts made on its member's behalf. Edd Hindee, his morning talk show host and owner of the West Houston Steakhouse, "A Taste of Texas", was assigned to its Executive Directorship. His daughter, Lisa Hindee, is the webmaster for their web site. You can well imagine how gracious members of the state

legislature have been to such an organization. But if you can't, it will suffice to say that the state legislature has welcomed them to the property tax debate like a hip-hop concert would welcome Barry Manilow as a guest artist. State Representative Fred Hill, Chairman of the State House Local Government Ways & Means, would not even let them testify before his committee in 2004, when Dan and others, who commuted to the hearings in busses, went to testify before the Ways & Means committee about reducing the 10% tax cap.

Lieutenant Governor David Dewhurst (now lampooned by Patrick, et. al as "Darth" Dewhurst) would not even let the previous house bill that lowered the property tax cap from 10% to 5% to even come to a vote in the legislature. What makes this unique is that both men are Republicans, not Democrats. Characterized as R.I.N.O.'s (Republicans In Name Only), these sacrilegious Republicans have incurred the wrath of many people on both sides of the isle. But this debate about tax caps has not been limited to the players in Austin.

They had a local target: Mayor H.G. "Hap" Harrington, Mayor of Tomball, Texas. Both Dan and Edd have publicly referred to the Mayor as "Hap-less Harrington" because of his letter to the State Legislature explaining why these caps have helped with shortfalls from past legislative cuts due to reduced tax revenues from previous economic downturns. This is an email I sent to both men, concerning this subject:

Why haven't these 2 men (Hap Harrington and the Mayor of Friendswood) responded to your calls for explanations of their opposing points of views on property tax caps lower than 10%?

I can clean this up in a single statement:

Neither men want to go up against a professional talk show host, or blog writer, that works for a station/blog that dresses up their profit motive with populist activism. Simply put: You

don't get to frame the debate since it take 2 to have one. If you want to have a forum, then you'll need to have one that is respectful to both sides of the issue. It is the way and manner in which the challenges of a response are made that lacks respect, not the information that would be imparted. Why would either men want to be "side-swiped" in such a manor?

This heresy on the Mayor's behalf eventually caused the Mayor to be forced to change his views on the issue³ to be in line with what Dan has indicated the citizens of Tomball want from their elected officeholders. As many as 150 local citizens turned out for a rally at the local eatery, "The Rib Tickler" to voice their opposition to the mayor's position. The fact that there are over 12,000 residents in the City of Tomball was apparently irrelevant, as the 150 that showed their opposition self proclaimed to represent the majority. It is this issue, property tax caps, that has animated Patrick more than any other issue.

Through a process of evolution, he has now been able to galvanize a support base of loyal listeners that also loyally patronize advertisers of KSEV, making Patrick's station a player in the 7th largest AM radio market in the nation, with an Arbitron Cumulative Rating of 1.8 share⁴. This equals, according to my calculations, 35,000 listeners per one-quarter hour.

Put Up or Shut up....

Callers to Patrick's afternoon talk show had repeatedly encouraged him to run for public office, which he good-naturedly declined, explaining that he was perfectly happy to do what he was doing at the time. Fresh from a published book, "The Second Most Important Book You Will Ever Read⁵", he began capitalizing on the populist issues of tax relief, brought on by his long time friend, Paul Bettencourt, Tax Assessor / Collector for Harris County⁶. These requests to run for public office were made during the re-districting debate of this area of Texas, after the last census indicated that a new congressional district was needed. With the Republican controlled House, Senate, Presidency, and state and local government, this made a new congressional district a lock.

After seriously considering running for congress in this newly created district, and eventually deciding not to, former Harris County Judge Ted Poe⁷ successfully stepped up to the plate, and is now a regular contributor to the station's programming. But another opportunity to run for public office would soon come his way which would require a change of residency.

Former Harris County Judge Jon Lindsay was elected to the Texas State Senate in 1996⁸. Having served in government for more than 20 years, most notably on Harris County Commissioner's Court, he announced in 2005 that he would retire from the State Senate, leaving an open seat in the very Senate that had, without even a vote being taken, refused to take on "real" Property Tax Cap Legislation that had been sponsored by C.L.O.U.T. and others in the Texas State House, HJR 35⁹. This set the stage for launching a 'populist' candidacy for this vacant seat. On Tuesday, October 11th, 2005,

Dan Patrick announced his intention to run for this position, without the needed formal residency in Senate District 7.

Now The Fun Begins...

This is an email I sent to Candidate Dan Patrick, days after his decision to run, and his Republican opponents that had announced their intentions to run:

Why This Conservative Christian Will Not Be Voting For Dan Patrick

It's been interesting to have watched Dan Patrick (Goeb) [Goeb is his former given name] over the years. As a native Texan, and resident of Harris County since 1978, I've watched him succeed and fail consistently ever since he got to town. But, he seems to have hit a cord that is resonating throughout the area, and that cord is Populist Activism. I've been a long time supporter of such activism, and see it as a needed "check and balance" to established and entrenched political malaise that seems to affect both sides of the isle. Where I have to part company with such activity is when I see it being used for economic gain, with no investiture in the outcome. I believe that Dan Patrick is selling Populist Activism for fun and profit, with no accountability for either winning or losing the debate.

Radio is fueled by ratings that are then used to justify advertising rates on the station. The more people that listen, the higher the advertising rates. Since adopting this "radio-active" business plan, he has been very successful at selling such debate, to the point of being able to have several spin-offs: they being the gadflies of the non-profit organization "Citizens Lowering Our Unfair Taxes" (C.L.O.U.T., for short, and run by his morning employee, Edd Hindee) and the web blog Lone Star Times (previously known as www.chronicallybiased.com). The latter has been divested by Patrick to his editor, David Benzion, for the stated reasons that Patrick doesn't want any conflict of interest, I guess. Suffice to say that since hitting on this business plan of "radio-active", KSEV's rate card has increased, and profits have soared. I'm not complaining

about profit, mind you; I like it too. Frankly I wish I'd have thought of it. But, using such a business plan as part of an election strategy is just wrong. Patrick has stated repeatedly that he intends to "pull the curtains back" on what goes on in Austin (a reference to the Wizard of Oz), and plans to use his radio station for that purpose.

The point here is that the incestuous nature of all of these organizations has a specific purpose: to add to increased listener-ship. C.L.O.U.T. has had no legislative success whatsoever, yet maintains tens of thousands of members, a sizeable budget, the ability to legitimate tax deductible receipts, and increase advertising rates for Houston Broadcasting, the parent corporation of AM-700, KSEV. You see, win or lose the debate, Patrick still gets to keep the check, and deduct the expenses. This campaign achieves the same goal; improved listener-ship = improved advertising rates. It's a win-win strategy, if you have the ability to convince enough people it's legitimate. I am not one of those people.

What his campaign will provide is a means to instill accountability for his actions. First, he can start by releasing all of the tax returns from 2002 - 2004 for Houston Broadcasting, KSEV, C.L.O.U.T. and Lone Star Times. Second, he can admit that he's proving the reason why candidates want to run for an elected office that only pays a little over \$7,000 a year: it's good for business. After all, Dan's business will benefit from the office with increased listener-ship, which equals an increase in advertising rates. His actions are essentially answering the on-air question he asked, which was why anyone would want the job. Finally, he can prove just how serious he really is about representing his constituency by divesting his ownership position in Houston Broadcasting, to eliminate any potential for a conflict of interest. Until he does these things, and answers the questions about accountability, I will not be voting for him. You see, I just don't trust him.

To date, neither Patrick nor any of his campaign representatives have responded with anything other than the automated email response that thanks the sender for their comments. But, I did hear from the campaign managers of Patrick's opponents who indicated that all of the candidates up against Dan Patrick were having the same concerns

about this incestuous relationship with Patrick's access to the airways on a station that he himself owns. Both candidates, Mark Ellis and Joe Nixon, had hired consultants to examine whether or not such relationships are either illegal or unethical, but were understandably reluctant to go public with such complaints.

So, I did.

This is the summary of the ethics complaint I filed, dated December 29th, 2005, with the Texas Ethics Commission:

To the members of the committee:

On December 29th, 2005, Dan Patrick made his candidacy formal by officially filing his paperwork for his campaign for Texas State Senate District 7 to the Harris County Republican Party. As a candidate for public office, there is not a single precedence for a media figure to run (and possibly be elected) to public office that had an ownership position in the media organization in which he or she was employed. That has now changed. Dan Patrick, part owner of Houston Broadcasting's AM700 KSEV, has formally entered the race for Texas State Senate District 7. KSEV Radio is a radio media outlet in the seventh largest radio market in the nation, and has an Arbitron cumulative rating (as of the last ratings period) of a 1.8 share. This raises very disturbing possibilities for ethical violations based on campaign finance. As stated by the candidate himself on his afternoon radio broadcast of Dec 29th, 2005, he intends to continue to be an active part of its daily operations while being technically "off the air", stating that he "...can be back for interviews..." His continued participation in the day-to-day ownership management operations of AM700 KSEV represent a business plan that includes his Republican candidacy (and possible election) for public office, in the race for the Texas Senate District 7 seat that is now being vacated. This raises some disturbing ethical issues, referenced here:

1. Revenues generated from advertising sold by AM700 KSEV to businesses and other entities that have business before the Texas State Legislature represents possible ethics violations based on campaign finance. During Dan Patrick's afternoon radio show on Dec. 29th, 2005, the station's traffic break contained a commercial for Time Warner Cable. I believe that this commercial "tag" represents revenues paid to be aired on KSEV and is a possible ethical violation based on campaign finance.

2. State entities that advertise on AM700 KSEV generate advertising revenues and subsequently enriches a candidate for the Texas State Senate. On Dec. 29th, 2005, a traffic report containing a commercial for the Texas State Lottery was presented during a paid campaign ad for Dan Patrick's Senate Race. The candidate stated that the entire hour of this broadcast, in which the commercial aired, was a political campaign ad. This represents a possible conflict of interest and a possible ethical violation based on campaign finance.

3. "In-Kind" contributions back to the station's other owners for when he talks about his campaign on the air may or may not be actually being made. I understand that he is a minority owner of the station. For his campaign activity on the station to be legal, all of his other owners would have to be a business entity that is not corporate in nature, i.e., a partnership with no corporate partners, sole proprietorships, etc. If there is any corporate ownership, i.e. Houston Broadcasting, in KSEV, he may be breaking the law unless he reimburses the other owners for their lost ad revenues - otherwise they are making a corporate contribution to Candidate Patrick's campaign and he is receiving a corporate contribution - both of which may be violations of state law.

4. Callers who call into the station during local radio talk show programs on KSEV, advocating Dan Patrick's candidacy, can be planted there to get around the "Equal Time" clause of campaign finance. It is virtually impossible to monitor such activity, and represents a possible ethical violation based on campaign finance.

The Interview...

Well, word got out that a complaint had been filed, as I suppose these things do in a town like Austin, and I'm contacted by someone called Harvey Kronberg via a one-way email address. Seems Harvey has some type of localized Austin version of the Drudge Report, called "The Quorum Report"¹⁰ only without the clout, name recognition, or publicity outside of the clap-trap of the Austin area. I then received a call from one of his "cub reporters" apparently, and we talk at length about the complaint, and there seemed to be a pattern to the questioning that there was some type of ulterior motive or political campaign motive associated with it. At any rate, the questioning was followed up with an emailed response from Court Koenning, campaign chair for the Patrick campaign, emailed to me for consideration. A second phone call is made to me for my comment on this, on the record, and the reporter and I have a good laugh. Here was that response Koenning made to Kronberg, a member of the press and on the record:

Very interesting. First off a bit of background. This is a common campaign tactic of one of our opponent's campaign consultant. In fact, this tactic was employed twice during the City of Houston election this past November. Should the standard hold true you will soon see campaigning with the message "Mr. Patrick is being investigated by the Texas Ethics Commission." It is shameful that our opponent would create an Ethics Commission complaint only to then use such a complaint in an attack campaign.

That being said, let me address each item of the complaint:

1) Metro News, not Houston Broadcasting or KSEV, sells ads during traffic/news breaks. (see emphasis added in your original email)

2) *Metro News, not Houston Broadcasting or KSEV, sells ads during traffic/news breaks. (see emphasis added in your original email)*

3) *Houston Broadcasting is a Limited Partnership; there are no corporate partners in the company. In fact, the only members of the partnership are the Patricks.*

4) *"Ifs and buts were candy and nuts we would all have a merry Christmas." It is ridiculous to claim we have planted any calls. There is no evidence to suggest such. I bet if the complainant (opponent) had any evidence (emails, phone messages, letters, etc.) they would have supplied those.*

All of these claims could have been checked out with about 5 minutes worth of investigative work. That is assuming the complainant (opponent) wanted to know the facts. It is obvious they did not, all they want is something to use in an attack piece.

These shenanigans are a desperate act by a desperate candidate who has no positive message and no momentum. Dan is focused on finding solutions to our illegal immigration problem, curbing our over burdening property tax problem and reducing state government's spending. Our opponents are focused on filing baseless ethics complaints.

Here was my response to the points Mr. Koenning made here:

Uh, I'm not one of Patrick's opponents. I don't have any vestiture in any campaign, don't work for any campaign and have not endorsed any candidate. I work in I.T. at a local community college, and do not have any political affiliation. I only suffer from being "politic 'd" into awareness.

[1.] Correct. It does. I ought to know, I used to work for a similar service in college called Metro Traffic. These are service contract entities that provide local radio stations with local traffic feeds without having the invested capital in personnel and equipment to do all of this in-house. And, so, is there a revenue sharing clause in the

contract that benefits the station's revenues? It does, at the very least, improve programming content, which then translates to increased listener-ship. This equals increased ability to charge more for advertising on the station. Think "follow the money", here.

[2.] Yea, I got it the first time you wrote it. The next one's the biggie.

[3.] ...and? While Houston Broadcasting might be a limited partnership, Liberman Broadcasting of Houston Licensing Corp. is not. Oh, he forgot to mention: Liberman is majority owner of KSEV while Dan Patrick owns Houston Broadcasting which leases KSEV from them. The difference here is, of course, money. Does the lease agreement include revenue sharing? Is Dan "sharing the pain" with those other 'Patricks'? Are any of these other 'Patricks' incorporated? You left a great deal out, here, Court.

*[4.] I guess he didn't read the rest I wrote, there: **'It is virtually impossible to monitor such activity'....***

[concluding paragraph]

What opponent? Anyway, it took me less than 5 minutes to respond to your response, Court, but it took a bit longer for the station's business plan to land a solid moneymaker like populist activism. I think it's called, "Radio-Active", and seems to be working for your man so far. But, enough of the sniping; lets get right down to the real issues here.

I'm willing to drop my ethics complaint and endorse his campaign if Dan Patrick will put Houston Broadcasting into a blind trust. I've never had a problem with the

message; only the messenger. The message is irrelevant if the messenger is without the character needed to make the populist activism credible.

Since I'd been interviewed on this, also on the record, I posted all of this it on my blog.¹¹ Well, you can imagine the complaints of privacy violation, betrayal of trust and etcetera, but the final analysis is that he simply trusted a part-time employee with duties and responsibilities that he himself should have taken care of. I posted it on my website with a clear conscience and it will continue to be so.

You can well image the carping about how this was planted, my political affiliations, my parentage and my personal favorite, my masculinity, regardless of the facts or the words written about this issue. I now understand why there is such loathing of both journalists and politicians, and why there is an entire industry devoted to "spin". So, here was Kronberg's response to my posting, and my response to that:

It was John Reynolds mistake that he forwarded my personal communication with Court Koennig¹² to you. John has only been working for me for two weeks and did not understand the profound mistake he made. Trust me. He does now.

It was even more of a mistake that you posted a private communication on your blog without permission. These are multiple betrayals that dramatically reduces the value or your claim that you are unaffiliated with any of the campaigns.

I am not sure what philosophers your club studies, but I would be hard pressed to believe any of them would endorse the betrayal of confidential materials between two parties for cheap sensation. We are going to deal with this story, but I look forward to never having anything to do with you again. By the way, I found the Patrick's campaign

responses to be legitimate and responsive to your allegations. You certainly have my permission to post this communication

Harvey Kronberg

I posted a firm retort:

Okay, Harvey, now I know, too, about the privacy issue. Needless to say, I didn't when your 'cub' phoned me. And, just because you say "These are multiple betrayals that dramatically reduces the value of your claim that you are unaffiliated with any of the campaigns," does not mean that my affiliation with non-politically motivated organizations is less valid, or untrue. As I've stated: I am not affiliated, registered or otherwise active, past or present, in any political party, campaign or consultancy to said organizations. I told your man that, and I re-state it here. You're right, they wouldn't approve. Neither would I. Since my comments to your apparent representative, about the issues dealt with here, were on the record, I posted them with a clear conscience. So, if the communications in question were indeed intended to be private communications, why wasn't I informed of it?

You see, there's no sensationalism here, sir. After all, you [meaning your organization, apparently] contacted me, not the other way around, so what I've said to your reporter, ON THE RECORD, is represented here. Since you've blocked all incoming emails to the account you've been using for these one-way communications, I feel that they would not have been distributed without such notations of confidentiality on them. At the very least, a statement on your representative's behalf would have been in order.

Perhaps you can explain how such follow-ups about such issues is to be done electronically with these null accounts you seem to be fond of using.

Remember, I'm just a little 'ole I.T. guy, unschooled in the ways of political and journalistic machinations. So, if this made you look bad, I do apologize. Truly, I do. If I'd written something to you I wanted to keep confidential, I'd have said so, and off the record. And, I'd be upset too if it was posted. But I didn't. That's the difference here, and as for me, I'm not going anywhere. I'll be right here, as I've always been. Oh, I almost forgot: was the response from the Patrick campaign you received from Court Koenning on or off the record? I couldn't tell by the forwarded email to me.

I'm glad you will be dealing with the story. And, likewise, then, on the 'never having anything to do with you again' comment. No problem on the Patrick campaign response, either. I've said my piece, above. And, bless your little 'ole heart for allowing me to post your response, here. Next time, do this type of thing yourself, and be a bit clearer in your intent. I know I have. And, if you'd like me to pull any of this from this site, I will.

By the way, Kronberg, true to his word, did “deal” with it. But, for reasons of copyright, I can’t show it here. Most of the article is behind his \$275.00 a year subscription wall anyway. You can access it at:

<http://www.quorumreport.com/buzz/buzz.cfm/index.shtml>

The gist of the ‘dealing with it’ was that the Patrick Campaign denies any in-kind corporate contributions. I think you now have the whole story that’s fit to be printed. Or at least what I’m willing to pay for, which is not one penny.

As of this writing, I've not had a single request to remove any part of the 'back-and-forth' I've written about here. It seems strange to me that if I had such a losing argument, they'd want to make a response, even if it were just on principle. But, I guess that's what has become of debate in this era of email and real-time news coverage. I've seemed to have gotten a good dose of it. No one seems to have noticed, but the complaint did not make any accusations, or include any proof, of any illegal activity. That was not its purpose. The purpose was to question the ethics of a radio station owner that wants to run for public office; an office of influence and trust. If I question the ethics of any candidate, it should have a core in credibility. I believe I've achieved that in this instance.

But, it appears that I'm not the only one who is having problems with the character and truthfulness of the Patrick Campaign. Representative Corbin Van Arsdale is also under assault. Once being supported by Patrick, Van Arsdale crossed swords with Patrick over the revelation that Patrick's homestead was outside the district he's running in.

He even sent out an email¹³ with scans of the actual documents that Patrick had filed for the exemption. This has led to charges of 'district shopping' because of the dates associated with his closing on the condo purchased inside the district. Van Arsdale made it clear in his email letter that he accurately quoted Patrick as saying that Senate District 7, out of the 3 that Patrick was considering running in, was "...tailor-made for me." This email from Van Arsdale was the catalyst that emboldened the Nixon Campaign to follow suit.

It is here that I should mention that, in the run-up to the Republican Primary, I am in almost daily communication with the Nixon and Ellis Campaigns, as well as Rep. Van

Arsdale. My website has now become a 'clearing house' for the 'loyal opposition'. I learned only later why. Basically, I was a third party, non-registered person who had no vestiture in any campaign, and had nothing to lose. It amazed me the stuff that came out during the run-up, and it was all posted on my web site.

With the Van Arsdale email, the Nixon Campaign then emailed, to essentially anyone who'd listen, an email that detailed the 'hit squad' used to torpedo the Nixon campaign. It detailed ties between the Patrick Campaign and billionaire lawyer John Eddy Williams, who was adversely affected by tort reform legislation limiting liability claims from lawsuits. This legislation was put forward by none other than Rep. Joe Nixon. I would not normally include such things a campaign would provide to discredit another campaign, but this email has a bit more underlying truth to it than the normal mud-slinging. The 'connect-the-dots' email is presented here:

As most of you are aware, billionaire personal injury trial lawyer John Eddie Williams has spent years, and hundreds of thousands of dollars, fighting conservative candidates and causes – but until this year, he's never had a Republican candidate and his media team helping him.

Between 2000 and 2002, Mr. Williams contributed more than \$600,000 to Democratic candidates and Democratic Party PACs. During that same period, Mr. Williams also reportedly camouflaged more than \$300,000 that he injected into state politics by shuffling money through ambiguously named PACs, attempting to hide the origin of the funds before it landed in the hands of favorite candidates.

This year, Mr. Williams is at it again. As he confirmed in last Friday's Houston Chronicle (<http://www.chron.com/disp/story.mpl/metropolitan/mack/3681923.html>) Mr. Williams gave \$33,000 to the Texans for Good Leaders for the specific purpose of attacking one candidate: Rep. Joe Nixon. Why? Joe is the conservative leader in the Texas House who passed historic lawsuit reforms in 2003 and again 2005, ending the kind of frivolous lawsuits that some unscrupulous personal injury trial lawyers exploited en route to becoming very rich.

So Mr. Williams' attacks make sense. It's political revenge of the worst kind, but at least it makes sense.

What is deeply disturbing is that Dan Patrick's campaign team is helping Mr. Williams.

That's right: the Dan Patrick campaign media team, C&M Marketing, which shares the same office space as Dan Patrick's radio station and Dan Patrick's campaign, is also the PR firm of record for Mr. Williams' law firm (see below).

What does this mean? Despite Mr. Patrick's claims of running a positive campaign, it appears the sleazy and discredited attacks by the Texans for Good Leaders have been orchestrated from Mr. Patrick's campaign office. It also means you can add Dan Patrick to names like Hillary Clinton, Al Gore, and Bill Clinton who have benefited from Mr. William's political help.

But it begs the question that every Republican needs to ask themselves: what does Mr. Williams want for attacking Mr. Patrick's main opponent? If Dan Patrick was willing to form this kind of unholy alliance during a campaign, how could you possibly trust him in office? Texas conservatives cannot afford to take that chance.

For more documented information, follow along below as we connect the dots.

For starters, KSEV, C&M Marketing, and the Patrick campaign all share physical office space behind the same front door:

KSEV Radio

<http://www.ksevradio.com/contactus.asp>

11451 Katy Freeway Ste. 215

Houston , TX 77079

C&M Marketing and Communications

<http://www.c-mmarketing.com/contact.html>

11451 Katy Freeway, #215

Houston , Texas 77079

Dan Patrick Campaign

<http://www.danpatrickforsenate.com/>

(Check the very bottom of the page)

11451 Katy Freeway, Ste. 215

Houston , TX 77079

Moreover, on their December 31st campaign finance report (<http://txprod.ethics.state.tx.us/public/299651.pdf>), the Patrick campaign reports that C&M Marketing gave \$24,146.07 in in-kind advertising to the Patrick campaign. If you've been around politics for any amount of time, you know that the only kinds of people who make in-kind contributions to political candidates are personal friends and

close business associates. The Patrick campaign, meanwhile, reported spending \$55,402.71 with C&M on advertising on their Dec. 31st report.

On their February 7th (30 days before election) report (<http://txprod.ethics.state.tx.us/public/301727.pdf>), the Patrick campaign reported it received an additional \$5,745.00 in in-kind contributions from C&M, while it also reports paying out \$14,450 to C&M for advertising.

So what we know from the public record to date is that C&M Marketing has a \$100,000 stake in the Patrick campaign. **In fact, after Mr. Patrick himself and then Mr. Patrick's radio station, C&M Marketing is the third largest donor to the Patrick campaign.**

Now we learn that Mr. Patrick's captured marketing firm – with whom Mr. Patrick shares a front door – is the media team of record for the Williams Bailey law firm.

At least as of this afternoon, the Williams Bailey Law Firm was openly listed at <http://www.c-mmarketing.com/productionservices.html> as a client of C&M Marketing of Houston. In fact, if you click on <http://www.c-mmarketing.com/work-samples/work-williamsbailey.html> you can see the three TV ads C&M produced for the firm.

Liberal trial lawyer John Eddie Williams publicly confirmed in last Friday's Houston Chronicle that he provided the funding behind the Texans for Good Leaders. In recent weeks, Mr. Williams has been attacking Rep. Joe Nixon based on discredited information that was dismissed by Travis County District Attorney Ronnie Earle over two years ago. You can see this for yourself at (http://system.gocampaign.com/joenixon_com/RonnieEarleLetter030.pdf).

A Texan who can't or won't look you in the eye when he talks to you doesn't deserve your vote, and both Mr. Williams and the Patrick team for a time have tried to conceal the truth about the Texans for Good Leaders and the Patrick-Williams relationship .

THE KEY QUESTION IS: DO YOU THINK REPUBLICAN PRIMARY VOTERS WILL BE VERY PLEASED TO KNOW THAT A LIBERAL TRIAL LAWYER AND CLINTON/GORE PAL LIKE JOHN EDDIE WILLIAMS IS INTERFERING IN THE GOP PRIMARY WITH HELP FROM MR. PATRICK AND HIS TEAM??

And, it gets better. There is now credible evidence that some of the Republican Precinct Chairs the Patrick Campaign claimed to have supported his candidacy, and listed as supporters in his campaign literature¹⁴, were not even Precinct Chairs at all. There are even Precinct Chairs that were claimed to support the Patrick campaign that did not¹⁵.

...and the winner is...

On March 7th, 2006, The Patrick campaign won a decisive victory, with 68.82%¹⁶ of the total vote. This landslide victory eliminated the need for a run-off, effectively electing him to the senate seat in an overwhelmingly Republican district.

The Follow-up

I don't vote in primaries. You become a de-facto member of that party when you do, and I cherish my independence. So that has made me an observer of a political coup which supplanted one political machine for another on March 7th, 2006 in the Texas State Senate District 7 Primary Election. This new machine was very effective in getting Republican Candidate Dan Patrick a clear victory among a firm slate of equally qualified opponents without so much as a run-off. You can't argue with success but you can examine it closely to see if any missing parts fall out. Here are two, in the way of comments made by Patrick on his station the morning after the primary. One statement he attributes to a Republican Party official, the next is Patrick himself:

1. *"It's not who runs, but what they run on."*

2. *"There is a new voice in Austin; yours."*

Let's take them on, one at a time, shall we?

RE #1: Wasn't Bill Clinton elected on that premise? "It's the economy, stupid"

The caterwauling that came from the Republicans was that "character matters" and Clinton was certainly lacking in that category. I've chronicled Patrick's 'lapses' here, from the incestuous nature of the C&M Marketing and Communications 'hit squad' housed in the same office suite as Patrick's radio station, to John Eddy Williams' involvement with the Patrick Campaign's marketing firm of record and the number they and Williams did on Patrick's opponents. There were also the issues with the mystery party chairs that were listed as supporting the Patrick campaign that were not even party chairs at all. Some were even included in his literature that did not endorse his candidacy, and included without their permission.

RE #2: Patrick didn't finish the thought. It should read, "There is a new voice in Austin; yours. [And make sure it's all done on AM700 KSEV: that way I can profit from the increased ratings by using my potential public office as a revenue stream for increasing my advertising rates.]"

So, what have we learned, boys and girls?

Well, for one thing, you can supplant one political machine for another if you can sell it on your radio station using feigned populist activism. After all, "It's not who runs, but what they run on." And, always follow the money. Especially when you spend almost a half a million dollars to be elected to a job that pays less than \$8K/year.

People tend to believe what they want to believe. You would think that a healthy helping of skepticism would be something most would find somewhat refreshing, but you'd be wrong when it's their pet beliefs being questioned. So, when an argument is made that challenges those pet beliefs, the reaction is swift and emotional. 'You're a hack'; 'this smells like a planted issue'; 'who would you vote for, if not Dan'; 'you have no credibility on this issue'; 'what a clumsy attempt'; 'this has no legs'; the list goes on.

It would seem, by this exercise, that both sides of the isle have the ability to condemn the skeptic with the ever-useful moniker of "heretic". The various campaigns I've had the pleasure of conversing with have unanimously characterized the Patrick Campaign as being "cult-like". I must agree with this assessment, based on what I've observed and have been subjected to.

Penn and Teller, comedians and magicians, have a saying that they made public in their Showtime TV series, "Bulls**t" (yes, I've had to expurgate the title, because that's

what it is, in fact, called). That saying is, “Everybody got a gree-gree¹⁷.” A “gree-gree” is from a voodoo word meaning an item carried or worn to ward off evil omens, i.e. talisman. Whether it’s the belief that bottled water is somehow better or you, belief in global warming, belief in the economic benefits of recycling, or belief in the sainthood of populist activists, we as a society have begun to lose that healthy skepticism that existed when this nation was a bit younger.

Let me, by way of an example, illustrate the context of the issues presented here. Let's say that Mr. Gotrocks, of Gotrocks Industries, has a bill before the state legislature that could make Gotrocks Industries a lot of money. And, let's say that in order to get that bill influenced enough to pass, he's going to need to buy himself a state senator. He only has to do 2 things; a) find one for sale, and b) figure out how to pay for it. So, Mr. Gotrocks sees a radio station owner that wants to be a state senator, and Mr. Gotrocks has himself an idea. If Mr. Gotrocks drops a few million on advertising with an advertising agency, and that agency is told to buy advertising time on that radio station that candidate owns, why, he might just have himself a successfully passed bill on his hands, if that radio station owner wins the election November 7th, 2006.

Think all of this is nothing more than an unfair attempt at character assassination? Are you thinking that the radio station owner, who is professing such loyalty to the voters, and possessing such upstanding character, would never do such a thing? Has any politician achieved such trust that his motives are that unquestionable?

I present to you this article¹⁸ that appeared in the Saturday, 3/25/06, edition of the Houston Chronicle:

Lobbyists organize Patrick fundraiser

Nominee flayed primary foe over donations from special interests

By *CLAY ROBISON*

Copyright 2006 Houston Chronicle Austin Bureau

AUSTIN - State Senate nominee Dan Patrick, who blasted an opponent in the recent Republican primary for taking contributions from lobbyists, is having a fundraising reception in Austin next week, hosted by lobbyists for a range of special interests, including casinos.

Lobbyist Steve Bresnen, whose clients include the Texas Trial Lawyers Association, the Texas State Association of Fire Fighters and the Bingo Interest Group, said he organized the Thursday event at the private Austin Club.

He said he wanted to give other lobbyists a chance to "meet and greet" the conservative radio personality, who is expected to handily win Houston's District 7 Senate seat over Democratic and Libertarian opponents in November.

"It was strictly my idea," Bresnen said.

Bresnen also lobbies for the North Harris County Regional Water Authority, thousands of whose residents live in District 7, but he said the water authority wasn't involved in the reception.

It is not unusual for newly elected legislators or legislative candidates to have Austin fundraisers, but Patrick, campaigning before the primary as a political outsider, all but condemned the lobby.

In a campaign television spot, he urged voters to help him "take our state back from the special interests and the lobbyists."

"It's time for change," he said.

In an interview Thursday, Patrick said his principles haven't changed. He said he still isn't soliciting special interest money but would take some donations if they were offered with the understanding that no strings were attached.

"I have a lot of debt (more than \$300,000) to retire," he said.

If a donor later suggests that he has bought his influence, Patrick added, "I will escort him to the door."

The nominee said he will refuse money from abortion rights groups, trial lawyers and people trying to expand gambling. He said that ban didn't apply to lobbyists, such as Bresnen, who represents trial lawyers and bingo interests but has other clients as well.

"You know how the system works. One person (lobbyist) represents a lot of interests," he said. "They (lobbyists) want to meet me. People in Austin don't know me."

Swamped opponents

Patrick swamped three opponents — state Reps. Joe Nixon and Peggy Hamric and former Houston City Councilman Mark Ellis — to win the GOP nomination to succeed the retiring Sen. Jon Lindsay.

The fight between Patrick and Nixon, who enjoyed strong lobby support, was particularly contentious.

At a candidates' forum at the Cy-Fair Republican Women's Club in October, Patrick called for a \$1,000 limit on donations to state Senate campaigns and criticized Nixon's fundraising ability.

"One of my opponents had a fundraiser the other night and collected \$217,000 and bragged about it," Patrick said then. "I'd be ashamed, because that money didn't come from the people."

"We must have campaign reform in this state, like this maximum \$1,000, and it should only come from people in the district," he added.

Patrick on Thursday said he has since determined that a \$5,000 limit is more reasonable.

"Back in October, I didn't realize how expensive it was to run a campaign," he said.

No set donations

Bresnen is expecting 40 or 50 people may attend the Austin reception, and said some may not donate money. There is no schedule of suggested contribution amounts, but the

invitation calls the event a "fundraising reception" and includes an address to which checks can be mailed.

Co-hosts, whom Bresnen said he rounded up at random, include TEXPAC, the doctors' political arm, and lobbyists Kent Hance, Robert Floyd, C.J. Tredway, Mark Seale and Deborah C. Ingersoll.

Hance's and Floyd's clients include Boyd Gaming Corp., a Las Vegas-based company that owns casinos.

Patrick may be campaigning as an Austin outsider, but "he still needs to see and know the players," Hance said. [End]

It would appear that Mr. Gotrocks is now making his down payment.

The bottom line is that this new blurring of the lines between politics and communications is rife with the possibility of miss-use, and I'd like to think that we, as a society, would not want to learn this the hard way. The simple truth is that had Patrick placed his business into a blind trust, as every other politician has been required to do when any possible issue of 'conflict of interest' was raised, none of this would even be an issue, and I wouldn't have this paper to present.

¹ www.aimpress.com/patrickbio.htm

² www.clouttexas.com

³ *ibid*

⁴ http://www1.arbitron.com/tlr/public/report.do;jsessionid=x-w-L4XOj3Gww99ZJLbcMg**

⁵ http://www.amazon.com/gp/product/0785262865/qid=1136494099/sr=8-1/ref=pd_bbs_1/102-5933451-7937725?n=507846&s=books&v=glance

⁶ <http://www.tax.co.harris.tx.us/>

⁷ <http://www.house.gov/poe/>

⁸ <http://www.senate.state.tx.us/75r/Senate/members/dist7/dist7.htm>

⁹ <http://www.clouttexas.com/>

¹⁰ <http://www.thequorumreport.com>

¹¹ <http://www.jayhargett.com>

¹² I left Kronberg's misspelling of Koenning's last name intact

¹³ www.jayhargett.com/

¹⁴ <http://www.jayhargett.com/Patrick%20Precinct%20Chair%20Prevarication.pdf>

¹⁵ <http://www.jayhargett.com/Martha%20Murray%203.pdf>

¹⁶ <http://enr.sos.state.tx.us/rep1county100.htm>

¹⁷ A voodoo word meaning an item carried or worn to ward off evil omens, i.e. talisman.

¹⁸ <http://www.chron.com/disp/story.mpl/headline/metro/3747413.html>