

Goldwater, though the clear implication was that the conservative, promilitary Goldwater was likely to lead the nation to a nuclear war. Amid cries of “Foul!” from Goldwater’s Republican supporters, the ad was aired only once, but it became a classic example of the sort of ad that seeks to play on the fears of its viewers.

- **Is the ad true?** FactCheck.org, a project of the Annenberg Public Policy Center, is an excellent resource for monitoring factual accuracy in campaign ads. Other media outlets like the *New York Times* will often run “ad watches” to help viewers determine if the information in an advertisement is true. If it is not (and sometimes

even if it is), you can usually count on hearing a response from the attacked candidate rebutting the charges. Occasionally candidates have chosen not to respond, claiming to take the high road, but as Michael Dukakis’s dismal performance in the 1988 election showed, false attacks left unanswered can be devastating. Try to conduct your own “ad watch.” Study the campaign ads and evaluate their truthfulness.

1. Alexandra Marks, “Backlash Grows Against Negative Political Ads,” *Christian Science Monitor*, September 28, 1995, 1.
2. Roger Stone, “Positively Negative,” *New York Times*, February 26, 1996, 13.
3. Ibid.