

Let's talk about campaign financing in Utah Congressional races. Go to the Open Secrets website at:

[www.opensecrets.org/races](http://www.opensecrets.org/races) ([Links to an external site.](#))[Links to an external site.](#)

Do some research on the financing of the most recent of Utah's House of Representatives races (2016) and the most recent Utah Senate race (2016). Really dig into this informative site. What do you find interesting about the money sources in these races? Do the overall money totals for incumbents and challengers fit patterns described in the packet? Can we make inferences about the candidates based on their money sources? What do you find interesting about the money sources in these races?

-----  
The most interesting thing I find about the money resources is that the ones who have raised the most money are the ones who either win their race or are the current person in that position. Such as Hatch, Bishop, Stewart and Love. It really should not be of any surprise that they raise the most money for re-election.

But what does that mean for the 3rd District replacement for Jason Chaffetz ? John Curtis and Katheryn Allen have raised a considerable amount of money in comparison to the rest. I am willing to bet one of those two will win the race for their district.

Most of Hatch's money seems to come from pretty large corporations, lawyers, medical agencies and investors. People who would have a vested interest in what he would support. So that also makes perfect sense. Bishops money comes from companies that also have a vested interest in what he supports. They seem to be manufactures and companies more fitting to the area in which he represents. Stewarts supporters are more industrial and financial corporations and with Allen and Curtis, they are getting money from super random companies. But all seem to fit education, tourism and banking of some sort. Mia Love seems to have her hand in quite a few sponsors such as banking, real estate and lawyers. A lot of smaller contributions but more of them. It's so interesting to see these companies with all these candidates put money where they know will benefit them the most. Equal values and supporting things like medical marijuana would warrant a contribution from a company that manufactures it.

This was eye opening.. And a little scary at the same time. I feel like companies really use the candidates and the candidates really rely on the companies so how do we really know what the truth is behind it ? Does it sway them to lean more towards one side of an issue if they received a large contribution from a company that would benefit financially from a certain candidate being in office ?