

Will attack ads backfire in Coakley/Brown Senate Race?

I'm still voting for voting for Martha Coakley but am dismayed at the attack ads her campaign has unleashed on her Republican opponent for the Massachusetts Senatorial Seat— Republican State Senator Scott Brown.

Unfortunately, the ads fail to emphasize the important things Coakley stands for: health reform, civil rights, regulating greed, and finding intelligent ways to fight terrorism. They disseminate untruths about her opponent who, on Monday's hourlong [televised debate](#), said that he supports abortion (albeit not late term) and emergency contraception for rape victims (albeit not if it goes against health provider's personal beliefs) and, despite earlier statements, that he believes that global warming is not only natural, but also manmade.

Worse yet, the ads give Brown a perfect opportunity to appear reasonable, dignified and unflappable—Senatorial, if you will, compared with the ham-handedness evident in ads Coakley apparently approved.

A Brown win could end possibilities for health reform in the current Congressional session and beyond.

I'm very concerned that the ads will backfire— and, given my own strong reaction against them I believe they will. (I don't want to contribute money that could be used to fund them).

I just hope that Massachusetts citizens will look beyond the ads to Coakley's strong record of accomplishment and her belief in a government based on human and civil rights —hold their noses—and give her their votes.

—Anita M. Harris

New Cambridge Observer is a publication of the [Harris Communications Group](#) of Cambridge, MA. We also publish [HarrisComBlog](#) and [Ithaca Diaries](#) blog.