CITIZEN INTELLIGENCE ARCHIVE

CIA-HOUSE-001: Where AIPAC's House Money Went

House Series, Model No. 1 | October 2026 | Money Test model, not a race file

THE SHORT VERSION: AIPAC and its super PAC spent about **$104 million** this election cycle. In the House, most of that money went into **primaries**, not November races. A lot of it went through new, hidden-name groups. This file shows where it went and who won.

$104.3M

AIPAC PAC + United Democracy Project (UDP), whole 2026 cycle (Sludge, Aug 2026)

How the money moves

STEP	WHAT HAPPENS
1. Big donors	UDP's biggest 2026 donors include Paul Singer, Blair Frank, Marc Rowan and Haim Saban (FactCheck.org).
2. UDP	UDP raised about $104M through June and had spent about $52.5M by June 30.
3. New groups	Politico reported UDP hid more than 40% of its primary spending behind pop-up and pass-through PACs. Voters see a new name on the ad, not "AIPAC."
4. The race	Ads run for or against a candidate, mostly in Democratic primaries in safe seats.

The races

RACE	MONEY	WHO IT WAS FOR / AGAINST	RESULT
Michigan Senate (primary)	$30.6M+ (UDP)	For Haley Stevens, against Abdul El-Sayed. The most AIPAC has ever spent on one race.	El-Sayed won the nomination. Stevens lost.
IL-9 (primary)	$5.8M+	For Laura Fine. Another group spent $1.2M in a race involving Bushra Amiwala.	Fine finished third. Daniel Biss won.
IL-7 (primary)	$5M+ (UDP)	For Melissa Conyears-Ervin	She lost to La Shawn Ford.
IL-2 (primary)	$4.3M+ (Affordable Chicago Now)	For Donna Miller	Won. November: vs. Republican Michael Scott Noack.
IL-8 (primary)	$3.9M (two new AIPAC-tied groups)	For Melissa Bean	

			Won. November: vs. Republican Jennifer Davis.
KY-4 (Republican primary)	$3M+ against, ~$500K for (UDP)	Against Rep. Thomas Massie, for Ed Gallrein	Massie lost to Gallrein on May 19.
NJ-11 (special primary)	$2M+ (UDP)	Against Tom Malinowski	He lost to Analilia Mejia on Feb 5.
MD-5 (primary)	$1M+ (UDP)	For Adrian Boafo	Won on June 23.
MI-11 and MO-1	Amounts not found	Described as AIPAC-backed: Jeremy Moss (open seat) and Wesley Bell (incumbent)	Both are the Democratic nominees.

WHAT THE TABLE SHOWS: The AIPAC-linked side won IL-2, IL-8, MD-5 and KY-4. It lost IL-9, IL-7 and the Michigan Senate primary. In NJ-11 the candidate UDP spent against also lost. Mixed results, but always big money.

Money Test

CANDIDATE	FLAG	NOTE
Bean (IL-8), Miller (IL-2)	**FLAGGED (outside spending)**	AIPAC-tied groups spent for them. This is outside spending, not a donation to their campaigns. The CIA framework treats it as a flag the voter should see. Their direct AIPAC PAC donations are **PENDING**.
Gallrein (KY-4)	**FLAGGED (outside spending)**	UDP spent about $500K for him and $3M+ against his opponent. Direct donations **PENDING**.
Moss (MI-11), Bell (MO-1)	**PENDING**	Described as AIPAC-backed by JNS. Amounts not verified.
Boafo (MD-5)	**FLAGGED (outside spending)**	$1M+ from UDP. Safe Democratic seat.

ARCHITECT ANALYSIS (opinion): The story is not that one group spent money. The story is that voters often cannot tell who paid. A new group with a nice name runs an ad, and the real source shows up in a federal filing months later. If you care who is behind a candidate, the filing is the X-ray. Also note this: in many of these seats, the primary *is* the election. Whoever wins the Democratic primary in a safe seat almost always wins in November.

STATUS: SESSION 1 WORKING DOCUMENT. All dollar amounts come from the sources below. Not yet verified against FEC filings. Open items: pull direct AIPAC PAC donations for each nominee; find MI-11 and MO-1 amounts; check Sludge's full by-member list; confirm KY-4 November opponent.
Sources: Sludge (Aug 3, 2026); FactCheck.org (Aug 2026); WTTW (Mar 18, 2026); JNS; New Jersey Monitor; Spectrum News Kentucky.

"I don't tell you how to vote. I give you the X-ray. You decide."
— Uma | PixelMagic / MindTraveler | People Over Party

CITIZEN INTELLIGENCE ARCHIVE

CIA-HOUSE-002: Did the Money Change the Outcome?

House Series, Model No. 2 | Session 1 working document | October 2026

> **THE QUESTION:** AIPAC-linked groups spent millions in these races. Did the spending match who won? This file lines up the money and the results from House Model #001. It does **not** prove the money caused any result.

All 435 House seats are on the ballot November 3, 2026. This model looks only at the eight races where AIPAC-linked spending was found and the primary is already decided. The Michigan row is a Senate race, shown for comparison.

The eight races

RACE	AIPAC-LINKED SPENDING	WHO THE MONEY WAS FOR / AGAINST	WHO WON THE PRIMARY	AIPAC-LINKED SIDE
MI Senate (for comparison)	$30.6M+	For Stevens, against El-Sayed	El-Sayed	**LOST**
IL-9	$5.8M+	For Laura Fine	Daniel Biss (Fine finished third)	**LOST**
IL-7	$5M+	For Conyears-Ervin	La Shawn Ford	**LOST**
IL-2	$4.3M+	For Donna Miller	Donna Miller	**WON**
IL-8	$3.9M	For Melissa Bean	Melissa Bean	**WON**
KY-4 (R primary)	$3M+ against, ~$500K for	Against Massie, for Gallrein	Ed Gallrein (Massie lost)	**WON**
NJ-11 (special)	$2M+	Against Tom Malinowski	Analilia Mejia (Malinowski lost)	**OPPOSITION EFFORT: target lost (not counted as win or loss)**
MD-5	$1M+	For Adrian Boafo	Adrian Boafo	**WON**

THE COUNT: AIPAC-linked side won **4** (IL-2, IL-8, KY-4, MD-5). It lost **3** (Michigan Senate, IL-9, IL-7). In **1** (NJ-11), money was spent against a candidate who lost.

What this shows, and what it does not

IT SHOWS	IT DOES NOT SHOW
Very large spending, with mixed results. The biggest single bet ($30.6M	That the money caused any win or loss. Incumbency, polling, local issues and other candidates' money also matter, and I

in Michigan) lost. In the Illinois races, the money came through new groups, not AIPAC's own name.	have not measured them. Anything about November. These are primary results only.

Early ideas to test (hypotheses, not findings)

1. Spending *against* a candidate may work differently than spending *for* one.
2. Timing and message may matter more than total dollars.
3. Open seats may respond differently than seats with incumbents.
4. More races are needed before any pattern can be claimed.

ARCHITECT ANALYSIS (opinion): If money always won, there would be nothing to learn. It does not always win. The $30.6M loss in Michigan is the proof. The better question for a voter is not "did the money win?" but "who was paying, and did they tell me?"

STATUS: SESSION 1. Amounts and outcomes from Sludge, FactCheck.org, WTTW, JNS, New Jersey Monitor, Spectrum News. Not yet checked against FEC filings. Open items: polling before each primary; November results; add more races.

"*I don't tell you how to vote. I give you the X-ray. You decide.*"
— Uma | PixelMagic / MindTraveler | People Over Party

CITIZEN INTELLIGENCE ARCHIVE

CIA-HOUSE-003: Who Funds the Influence?

House Series, Model No. 3 | Session 1 working document | October 2026

> **THE POINT:** This file follows the money from donors to ads. It uses the official FEC record for the United Democracy Project (UDP), AIPAC's super PAC, and shows what the FEC record can and cannot tell a voter.

Key figures: United Democracy Project (FEC committee C00799031)

Total receipts	Total disbursements	Independent expenditures
$109.7M	**$83.6M**	**$53.4M**

Coverage: Jan 1, 2025 to Aug 31, 2026. Exact FEC figures: receipts $109,721,116.19; disbursements $83,605,165.07; independent expenditures $53,414,686.72. Source: FEC committee page, checked October 8, 2026.

How the money moves

STEP	WHAT THE RECORD SAYS
1. Disclosed donors	FactCheck.org (Aug 2026) names UDP's largest 2026 contributors: Paul Singer, Blair Frank, Marc Rowan and Haim Saban.
2. UDP	A super PAC that spends on ads for or against candidates. It must report its donors to the FEC.
3. Other groups	Politico reported (June 23) that UDP "shielded more than 40 percent" of its primary spending through pop-up and pass-through PACs.
4. Voters	Ads reach voters on TV, digital, social media and mail.

What the FEC record can and cannot show

IT CAN SHOW	IT MAY NOT FULLY SHOW
Who gave to a committee. Where a committee spent money. Independent expenditures (ads made without working with a candidate's campaign).	The original source of money that passes through other groups. Everything in real time. Some reports come after a primary or election. Whether separate groups are working together, unless there is evidence.

Important lines

Independent spending is not a donation to a candidate. It pays for ads made without the candidate's campaign. It is legally separate from direct contributions.
Different groups, different rules. UDP and AIPAC's PAC are separate organizations. Money can move to other PACs with other names.
Spending does not guarantee a win. See CIA-HOUSE-002.

ARCHITECT ANALYSIS (opinion): The system is not secret. It is just slow and scattered. The names are on file. The trail is real. But a voter sees the ad first and the filing months later. The fix is for voters to know where to look.

STATUS: SESSION 1. FEC figures verified Oct 8, 2026. Donor names and the 40% figure come from FactCheck.org and Politico as reported. Open items: transaction-level tracing for specific pass-through PACs; update after the next FEC filing.
Sources: FEC (C00799031); FactCheck.org (Aug 2026); Politico (June 23, 2026).

"*I don't tell you how to vote. I give you the X-ray. You decide.*"
— Uma | PixelMagic / MindTraveler | People Over Party