

# I can't find much about Victor Marx relevant to the Colorado Governor's election. What distinguishes Marx from the Republican candidates who have come up through the caucus system? What are his plans and policies for Colorado?

---

**Victor Marx is a Republican candidate for Colorado governor in the 2026 election (primary June 30, 2026; general November 3, 2026), running in a crowded GOP field to succeed term-limited Democratic Gov. Jared Polis.**

He is the founder and president of All Things Possible Ministries (a Colorado Springs-based nonprofit focused on combating human trafficking, supporting at-risk women and children, and aiding veterans/orphans/widows), a U.S. Marine Corps veteran, author, motivational speaker, husband, and father. His campaign emphasizes faith, family protection, and "common sense solutions that put Coloradans first," framing him as an outsider who has spent decades in direct service rather than elected office.

## What distinguishes Marx from Republican candidates who came up through the caucus/assembly system

Colorado's Republican Party uses a hybrid nomination process: candidates can qualify for the primary ballot via the state assembly (where delegates—party activists—vote and can designate candidates who reach a vote threshold, typically the more "insider" or establishment path) **or** by collecting petition signatures from registered Republicans (a grassroots/outside route that bypasses heavy reliance on delegate support).

Marx took the petition route aggressively—he turned in over 28,500 signatures in March 2026 (far exceeding requirements, with volunteers covering every congressional district)—while also actively courting delegates at the April 2026 state assembly and running delegate-training events. He has described this as "no shortcuts" and ensuring "every Republican deserves a voice," but his massive volunteer-driven petition drive and social-media-heavy campaign (hundreds of thousands of followers across platforms) set him apart from candidates who primarily build support through traditional party caucuses, elected office, and insider networks.

- **Background contrast:** Most other prominent GOP contenders (e.g., state Sen. Barbara Kirkmeyer, who also filed petitions but is a longtime elected official and party figure) have risen through legislative or party ranks and naturally leverage the caucus/assembly process. Marx has never held elected office; he positions himself explicitly as a non-career-politician "outsider" forged through

ministry work, veteran service, and frontline anti-trafficking efforts rather than Denver politics or legislative deal-making.

- **Campaign style:** He has a large grassroots/volunteer operation and online reach but has drawn some criticism for skipping certain local forums while focusing on bigger rallies, online outreach, and petition drives. Supporters see this as fresh energy; critics call the approach “curious” or less engaged with traditional party activists.

In short, Marx’s path and profile emphasize faith-based service, direct community impact, and petition-powered grassroots energy over the conventional elected-official/caucus ladder that many Republican candidates climb.

## Marx’s plans and policies for Colorado

His platform (detailed on [victor2026.com](http://victor2026.com)) is organized around “common sense solutions” in these priority areas. He frequently ties proposals to Colorado statutes (C.R.S.), the state constitution, and practical fixes like audits, parental rights, and law-and-order measures. Key excerpts from his platform include:

- **Election Integrity & Secure Voting:** Require Voter ID for all ballots (in-person, mail, absentee); annual voter-roll maintenance with cross-checks; strict chain-of-custody and bipartisan oversight rules for ballots/drop boxes.
- **Veterans & Seniors:** Expand mental health/long-term care and job-transition programs for veterans; freeze property taxes for fixed-income seniors; strengthen elder-fraud protections and veteran housing.
- **Cybersecurity & Security:** Create a Colorado Cyber Defense Center; mandate audits and zero-trust standards for state infrastructure; restrict foreign (especially adversarial) ownership of land, water rights, and critical assets.
- **Immigration & Sanctuary Policies:** End sanctuary policies and mandate cooperation with federal ICE/DHS (including honoring detainers for serious offenders); target border-linked crime/trafficking with strike forces; limit state benefits to citizens/legal residents.
- **Agriculture, Rural Colorado, Energy, Water & Environment:** Protect water rights under the Colorado River Compact and prior appropriation; expand rural broadband and wildfire mitigation on working lands; all-of-the-above energy (renewables + oil/gas/hydro/nuclear); cut red tape for family farms; stop water speculation.
- **Education & Parental Rights:** Guarantee parents access to curriculum and school-choice funding that follows the student; age-appropriate K–6 standards; redirect lottery funds to trade/vocational schools; raise teacher pay by cutting administrative overhead.
- **Government Accountability & Transparency:** Immediate full audits of every state agency (financial, performance, compliance) with public results and budget consequences; real-time

transparency dashboard for spending/contracts; stronger whistleblower protections; annual performance reports.

- **Housing & Cost of Living:** Slash permitting red tape and roll back cost-inflating mandates to speed homebuilding; protect homeowners from backdoor fees/taxes (TABOR compliance); targeted tax relief and insurance-market reforms to lower premiums.
- **Jobs, Taxes & Economic Growth:** Phased, responsible income-tax cuts tied to surpluses and performance budgeting; close “fees” loopholes that bypass TABOR; eliminate ESG mandates on businesses; expand apprenticeships and workforce pipelines in trades/energy/tech.

Overarching themes from his campaign materials and rhetoric include restoring “law and order” (backing police, zero tolerance for violent crime/drug trafficking), auditing state spending to cut waste/corruption, making Colorado affordable again for families, and prioritizing parental rights, election security, and public safety over what he calls “failed leadership” and “godless ideology.” He repeatedly stresses balanced budgets, protecting agriculture/energy, and serving “people over politics.”

Marx’s campaign website ([victor2026.com](http://victor2026.com)) and social channels have the most direct, up-to-date details; he has participated in candidate forums/interviews (including AARP-focused and unfiltered ones) where he expands on these points. The field is still developing, so positions could evolve, but this reflects his current platform as of late March 2026.

## **Please rank the Republican Governor Candidates according to the chance they'll win the 2026 Colorado Governorship election, detail the specific points under each candidate to support your ranking.**

---

**As of late March 2026 (with the Republican primary on June 30, 2026, and general election on November 3, 2026), the Republican field for Colorado governor remains crowded (originally 20+ candidates), but has consolidated around a few viable contenders.**

Colorado is rated a **Solid Democratic hold** by forecasters (Cook Political Report, etc.), with no Republican winning the governorship since 2002 and Democrats holding large legislative majorities. The Democratic nominee (likely Sen. Michael Bennet or AG Phil Weiser) is heavily favored in the general. Thus, any Republican’s overall chance of winning the governorship is low (analysts like Colorado Pols peg the top GOP contenders at ~20% or less for the general). Ranking is driven primarily by probability of winning the GOP primary, with minor adjustments for general-election viability (e.g., experience, appeal to independents, and moderation vs. base mobilization).

No public head-to-head primary polls exist yet, but **prediction markets, fundraising, petition signatures, straw polls/county assemblies, and analyst consensus provide a clear picture.**

## **Ranked by chance of winning the 2026 Colorado governorship (primary + general)**

1. **Victor Marx (ministry leader, U.S. Marine veteran, Colorado Springs-based)** — Highest chance (~15–20% overall; ~60%+ implied probability of winning primary)
  - Dominant frontrunner in prediction markets (Polymarket ~61%, other markets similar as of late March 2026).
  - Leads fundraising by a wide margin (~\$1 million raised as of late January 2026, with continued strong grassroots/small-donor support; far ahead of the field).
  - Record petition drive (over 28,500 signatures submitted in March 2026, qualifying everywhere via grassroots volunteers). Strong performance in county caucus straw polls and delegate events.
  - Positions as a non-politician “outsider” focused on faith, family, anti-trafficking, veterans, and “common-sense” conservative priorities; appeals to the party base and has high-profile endorsements (e.g., Rep. Lauren Boebert). Large social-media following aids mobilization.
  - Colorado Pols assigns him a 20% general-election chance (↑ arrow, noting the CO GOP’s preference for his style). While his profile may energize the base, it could limit broader independent appeal in a blue state.
2. **Barbara Kirkmeyer (state senator, former Weld County commissioner)** — Second-highest chance (~10–15% overall; ~30% implied primary probability)
  - Clear #2 in fundraising (~\$380k+ total) and the most “establishment”/experienced candidate with legislative and executive-branch background; participated in multiple debates and positions herself as the credible, pragmatic choice who can work across aisles and appeal to women/swing voters.
  - Qualified via petitions and has institutional party ties, but momentum has stalled (“running in place” per analysts). Colorado Pols gives her a 20% general-election chance (↓ arrow).
  - Stronger general-election profile on paper (more moderate/legislative experience could help with independents), but trailing Marx badly in grassroots energy, signatures, and market odds.
3. **Scott Bottoms (state representative, Colorado Springs)** — Distant third (~3–5% overall)
  - Third among Republicans in fundraising (~\$130k total) and has some visibility as a sitting legislator.

- Participates in the race but lacks the momentum, signatures, or base enthusiasm of the top two; described by analysts as seeking attention with provocative statements. Colorado Pols assigns ~5% general-election chance.
  - Limited name recognition and resources outside core conservative circles make both primary and general paths uphill.
4. **Jason Mikesell (Teller County Sheriff) and other remaining candidates (e.g., Robert Moore, minor contenders like Bob Brinkerhoff, etc.)** — Negligible chance (<1–2% each)
- Mikesell has participated in debates and brings law-enforcement credentials but extremely low fundraising (e.g., only ~\$6k in late 2025) and minimal broader momentum; Pols rates him at 1% (↓).
  - Robert Moore raised modestly earlier (~\$200k) but has faded from frontrunner coverage. All other candidates (dozens initially) have near-zero resources, visibility, or delegate/petition strength and are effectively non-viable.
  - Joe Oltmann (podcaster) has dropped out of the governor race to run for state GOP chair.

**Bottom line:** Victor Marx is the clear favorite to win the Republican nomination and therefore has the highest (still modest) chance of becoming governor. The race could shift with the April 2026 state assembly or final pre-primary fundraising, but current indicators strongly favor him over the field. For the latest, check official sources like the Colorado Secretary of State's TRACER system or candidate websites. The ultimate general-election outcome will depend heavily on the Democratic nominee and national political environment.

## Please compare and contrast in detail the proposed policies and plans put forward by Victor Marx, Michael Bennet, and Phil Weiser.

---

**Victor Marx (Republican), Michael Bennet (Democrat), and Phil Weiser (Democrat) offer sharply contrasting visions for Colorado's 2026 gubernatorial race.** Marx, the GOP frontrunner and a non-politician/ministry leader, emphasizes "common-sense" conservative reforms centered on security, accountability, parental rights, and energy independence. Bennet (U.S. Senator) and Weiser (current Attorney General) are competing in the Democratic primary; their platforms align closely as center-left approaches focused on affordability, opportunity/innovation, climate action, and defending against federal (Trump-era) overreach, with nuanced differences in emphasis and mechanisms.

Both Democrats prioritize expanding housing supply, workforce development, clean energy transitions, education access, and public safety with prevention elements, while Marx stresses

enforcement, audits, tax relief, and traditional values. Below is a detailed side-by-side comparison across major policy areas, drawn directly from their campaign materials as of late March 2026.

## Housing and Affordability/Cost of Living

- **Marx:** Slash permitting red tape and roll back cost-inflating mandates to accelerate homebuilding; protect homeowners from backdoor fees/taxes (strict TABOR compliance); targeted tax relief and insurance reforms to lower premiums and make Colorado affordable for working families again.
- **Bennet:** Most ambitious housing plan in the country; goal of ensuring no Coloradan spends more than 30% of income on housing. 30% increase in state-supported housing projects; strong support for first-time homebuyers; preserve existing affordable units; streamline state resources/processes; reduce construction costs and homelessness. He would personally act as “housing czar,” partnering with local governments and private sector to build near workplaces for all income levels.
- **Weiser:** Increase attainable owner-occupied homes by 40,000 (closing half the 80,000-unit gap) and cut costs for 100,000 renters by 50% by 2035. Speed permitting to national best-in-class levels via local partnerships and fast-track processes; lower fees for homes under \$600k and rentals; appoint Chief Housing Officer for streamlined state efforts; expand down-payment assistance (especially for essential workers like teachers/nurses/first responders); protect renters from unfair practices, algorithmic collusion, and corporate landlords; promote modular housing and trades apprenticeships; rural-focused solutions (e.g., expand COPERR and Prop 123).

**Contrast:** Marx focuses on deregulation and tax relief. Both Democrats emphasize massive supply increases and direct subsidies/assistance, with Bennet highlighting personal executive leadership and Weiser adding renter protections and innovation (modular housing, Chief Housing Officer).

## Education and Parental Rights/Childcare

- **Marx:** Guarantee parental access to curriculum and policies (“Parents’ Right to Know” framework with online publication and pre-review); expand school choice (public, charter, online, homeschool, private) with funding that follows the student; age-appropriate K–6 standards; redirect lottery funds to trade/vocational schools; raise teacher pay by cutting administrative bloat.
- **Bennet:** Build a 21st-century public education and workforce system so every student graduates with skills for high-paying jobs (IT, health care, biotech, aerospace, manufacturing, etc.), regardless of college path; collaborate with businesses/higher ed for training pipelines. Supports making childcare free for all families (phased/step-by-step approach).
- **Weiser:** Oppose privatization/vouchers; support public schools with livable teacher wages, down-payment assistance, and loan forgiveness/housing partnerships; expand Universal Preschool to

full-week funding (currently limited hours); improve K–12 outcomes via an Education Think Tank (skills, civics, AI literacy); enhance school safety (Office of School Safety, Safe2Tell); multiple postsecondary pathways with stacked credentials; protect Colorado Promise. For early childhood/childcare: unify services, streamline regulations, create Childcare Solutions Fund (public-private), address deserts and waitlists.

**Contrast:** Marx prioritizes parental control and choice. Democrats focus on strengthening/expanding public systems, universal preschool/childcare access, and workforce alignment; Weiser explicitly rejects vouchers while adding teacher housing aid and innovation think tank.

## Economy, Jobs, Taxes, and Workforce

- **Marx:** Phased, responsible income-tax cuts tied to surpluses/performance budgeting; close “fees” loopholes bypassing TABOR; eliminate ESG mandates on businesses; expand apprenticeships and trade/energy/tech pipelines; cut red tape for family farms/small business.
- **Bennet:** Reduce red tape for small businesses; attract private investment; close skills gap via business/higher-ed partnerships; invest in rural economies and infrastructure (broadband, transportation); make Colorado the best place to work/live with broad-based growth.
- **Weiser:** Appoint Chief Innovation Officer and launch Business Navigator; cut outdated regulations; expand capital access (grants/microloans); Colorado Earn-and-Learn Promise (apprenticeships/work-based learning); launch ColoradoCorps (paid service-to-career program in teaching, law enforcement, nursing, firefighting, counseling with credentials/training); Pay-It-Forward Fund (zero-interest loans/stipends for high-ROI programs); publish job outcome data; address AI workforce impacts.

**Contrast:** Marx emphasizes tax cuts and deregulation. Democrats stress innovation, workforce pipelines, and public-private partnerships; Weiser’s ColoradoCorps is a signature service/earn-and-learn initiative not highlighted by Bennet.

## Energy, Environment, Climate, Water, and Rural Issues

- **Marx:** All-of-the-above strategy (renewables + oil/gas/hydro/nuclear); protect water rights under Colorado River Compact/prior appropriation; expand rural broadband and wildfire mitigation on working lands; cut red tape for farms; stop water speculation; strengthen Western water negotiations.
- **Bennet:** Cap-and-invest (“Colorado Clean Air, Affordable Energy Program”): enforceable declining emissions cap across sectors to hit 2050 net-zero targets; market-based flexibility with revenue reinvested to lower utility bills, fund clean tech, resilience, and community benefits; responsible transition while keeping energy affordable/reliable; protect Colorado River interests and manage water for towns/agriculture; support forest/watershed health and outdoor economy.

- **Weiser:** Accelerate renewables (solar/wind/storage/geothermal) with Development Authority and just transition/retraining; EV incentives/charging; lower heat pump costs; Chief Resilience Officer for climate impacts (wildfires, drought); wildfire prevention/funding; defend water rights/compacts; stop "buy-and-dry" schemes; rural Director of Rural Affairs, broadband completion, local food systems, and rural-friendly programs.

**Contrast:** Marx supports fossil fuels/nuclear alongside renewables for reliability. Both Democrats prioritize aggressive clean energy/climate action (cap-and-invest for Bennet; geothermal/EV acceleration for Weiser) with strong water/wildfire/rural protections; Weiser adds explicit rural cabinet-level focus.

## Public Safety, Immigration, Law & Order, and Cybersecurity

- **Marx:** End sanctuary policies and mandate full ICE/DHS cooperation (honor detainers); target border-linked crime/trafficking with strike forces; limit state benefits to citizens/legal residents; back police with zero tolerance for violent crime/repeat offenders/drug traffickers; create Colorado Cyber Defense Center with audits/zero-trust standards; restrict adversarial foreign ownership of land/water/critical assets.
- **Bennet:** Provide resources/training/oversight for law enforcement to ensure community safety; broader focus on economic opportunity and infrastructure as crime reducers (no detailed immigration or cyber proposals highlighted in core platform).
- **Weiser:** Comprehensive public safety plan: recruit/retain officers with better training/mental health support; enforce gun safety laws (waiting periods, red flag, storage); co-responders for mental health/addiction; data-driven Office of Safe Communities; opioid prevention/treatment/harm reduction; bail based on risk; youth diversion/mentoring. (As AG, strong rule-of-law defender; no emphasis on ending sanctuary policies.)

**Contrast:** Marx takes a strict enforcement/anti-sanctuary/immigration-security stance with cyber/foreign ownership focus. Democrats emphasize prevention, mental health integration, and gun safety (Weiser more detailed here); both support law enforcement but without Marx's border/ICE priorities.

## Government Accountability, Transparency, and Federal Relations

- **Marx:** Immediate full audits of every state agency (financial/performance/compliance) with public results and budget consequences; real-time transparency dashboard; stronger whistleblower protections; annual performance reports.
- **Bennet/Weiser (shared emphasis):** Defend Colorado against Trump administration overreach (lawsuits, protect funding/voting/repro rights/LGBTQ+ rights/public lands/National Guard); Weiser adds innovation team/Chief Innovation Officer, 48-hour citizen response mandate, regulatory

review, merit-based hiring, and TABOR reform push for responsible investment; both stress partnerships with locals/tribes and efficient government.

**Contrast:** Marx prioritizes internal audits/transparency to cut waste. Democrats focus outward on resisting federal challenges while pursuing internal innovation/efficiency (Weiser more granular on executive orders and performance management).

## Veterans, Seniors, Health/Mental Health, and Other

- **Marx:** Expand veteran mental health/long-term care/job transitions/housing; freeze senior property taxes; strengthen elder fraud protections.
- **Bennet/Weiser:** Make Colorado best for veterans (health/mental care, housing, jobs, equipped National Guard); universal/affordable health care access with mental health focus; Weiser adds Health Care Stabilization Task Force (vs. federal cuts), ColoradoCorps for health workforce, youth mentorship/outdoor programs to combat social media impacts; both support reproductive rights and behavioral health expansion.

Overall, **Marx's platform is distinctly conservative and enforcement-oriented**, appealing to the GOP base with security, accountability, and limited-government themes. **Bennet and Weiser's platforms are largely aligned progressive/Democratic visions** emphasizing supply-side affordability fixes, innovation-driven growth, climate leadership, and social investments—differing mainly in style (Bennet's housing ambition and Senate experience vs. Weiser's AG-proven rule-of-law focus and ColoradoCorps/Opportunity Agenda). The Democratic primary winner would face Marx in the general, where these policy contrasts would sharpen further in a state that has not elected a Republican governor since 2002. Platforms can evolve; check [victor2026.com](http://victor2026.com), [michaelbennet.com](http://michaelbennet.com), and [philforcolorado.com](http://philforcolorado.com) for the latest.

**For each of the previously compared policies and plans, please create a chart that estimates the cost to taxpayers of the proposal, the constitutionality (state and federal) of the proposal, and the likelihood that the proposal can achieve its stated goals.**

---

**Below is a detailed comparison of the proposed policies and plans for Victor Marx (R), Michael Bennet (D), and Phil Weiser (D) across the seven major policy areas previously analyzed.** For each area, I provide a markdown chart (table) with estimates for:

- **Est. Cost to Taxpayers:** Qualitative scale (Low = minimal/new spending offset by cuts/efficiencies/savings or revenue-neutral; Medium = \$100–500M+ annual range or reallocations with some new programs; High = major new spending/subsidies likely exceeding \$500M without clear offsets) based on campaign materials, analogous state programs, and available analyses. Campaigns rarely provide precise fiscal notes; estimates reflect typical implementation scales in Colorado’s ~\$40–45B state budget context, with Marx emphasizing cuts/audits and Democrats focusing on targeted investments.
- **Constitutionality (State/Federal):** Rated as High (clear authority, low legal risk), Medium (potential challenges/litigation), or Low (likely conflicts/preemption issues), with brief rationale grounded in Colorado Constitution, U.S. Constitution (e.g., Supremacy Clause, anti-commandeering), and relevant precedents/lawsuits.
- **Likelihood of Achieving Stated Goals:** High (strong evidence from similar policies), Medium (partial/mixed results, implementation hurdles), or Low (ambitious but unproven or market/political barriers), with supporting reasoning.

These are reasoned estimates as of late March 2026—no official fiscal notes or court rulings exist yet for these campaign proposals. Actual outcomes would depend on legislative approval, implementation, economic conditions, and federal changes.

## 1. Housing and Affordability/Cost of Living

Candidate	Proposal Summary	Est. Cost to Taxpayers	Constitutionality (State / Federal)	Likelihood of Achieving Goals
Victor Marx	Slash permitting red tape, roll back mandates, strict TABOR compliance on fees/taxes, targeted relief.	Low (deregulation + efficiencies; net savings claimed via waste cuts).	High / High (standard executive/legislative powers; TABOR-compliant).	Medium (deregulation can boost supply but takes years; market forces limit speed).
Michael Bennet	30% surge in state-supported projects; first-time buyer aid; streamline	Medium-High (new state-supported projects + subsidies; priority funding	High / High (housing authority well-established).	Medium (ambitious supply goal; similar efforts elsewhere show partial success

Candidate	Proposal Summary	Est. Cost to Taxpayers	Constitutionality (State / Federal)	Likelihood of Achieving Goals
	processes; act as "housing czar" for <30% income goal.	needed but no exact figure).		but face NIMBY/local barriers).
Phil Weiser	40k attainable homes + 50% renter cost cut by 2035; speed permitting; Chief Housing Officer; down-payment aid; modular housing.	Medium (partnerships + targeted aid; some new assistance programs).	High / High (standard state housing powers).	Medium (specific targets actionable via executive action; renter protections proven in some cities but supply still key).

## 2. Education and Parental Rights/Childcare

Candidate	Proposal Summary	Est. Cost to Taxpayers	Constitutionality (State / Federal)	Likelihood of Achieving Goals
Victor Marx	Parental curriculum access ("Right to Know"); expand school choice (funding follows student); redirect lottery to	Low (reallocations + choice efficiencies; no new taxes).	High / High (parental rights protected; choice programs vary but generally upheld if neutral).	Medium (choice boosts outcomes in some studies; admin cuts face union/political resistance).

Candidate	Proposal Summary	Est. Cost to Taxpayers	Constitutionality (State / Federal)	Likelihood of Achieving Goals
	trades; cut admin bloat for teacher pay.			
Michael Bennet	21st-century public system with job skills pipelines; phased free childcare.	High (childcare expansion + workforce programs).	High / High (education/childcare core state functions).	Medium (workforce alignment has evidence; universal childcare costly and phased but implementation challenges exist).
Phil Weiser	Strengthen public schools (wages, preschool expansion); oppose vouchers; Education Think Tank; Childcare Solutions Fund.	Medium-High (preschool/full-week funding + teacher aid).	High / High (public system focus avoids private-aid issues).	Medium-High (preschool expansions show early gains; anti-voucher stance aligns with CO public-school emphasis).

### 3. Economy, Jobs, Taxes, and Workforce

Candidate	Proposal Summary	Est. Cost to Taxpayers	Constitutionality (State / Federal)	Likelihood of Achieving Goals
Victor Marx	Phased income-tax cuts (surplus-tied); close fee loopholes; eliminate ESG mandates; expand apprenticeships.	Low (cuts tied to surpluses; efficiencies fund relief).	High / High (tax policy core state power; ESG elimination straightforward).	Medium (tax cuts can stimulate but depend on revenue; apprenticeships proven in trades).
Michael Bennet	Reduce red tape; attract investment; business/higher-ed skills partnerships.	Low (streamlining + partnerships).	High / High (economic development authority).	Medium-High (red-tape cuts effective; partnerships common success).
Phil Weiser	Chief Innovation Officer; cut outdated regs; ColoradoCorps (paid service-to-career); Pay-It-Forward Fund; job outcome data.	Medium (new officer + loan/stipend programs).	High / High (innovation/workforce programs standard).	Medium-High (service programs like AmeriCorps analogs show retention gains; data transparency aids accountability).

#### 4. Energy, Environment, Climate, Water, and Rural Issues

Candidate	Proposal Summary	Est. Cost to Taxpayers	Constitutionality (State / Federal)	Likelihood of Achieving Goals
Victor Marx	All-of-the-above (renewables +	Low (no new mandates;	High / High (energy/water regulation	Medium (above

Candidate	Proposal Summary	Est. Cost to Taxpayers	Constitutionality (State / Federal)	Likelihood of Achieving Goals
	fossil/nuclear/hydro); protect water rights/compact; rural broadband/wildfire mitigation; stop speculation.	deregulation focus).	standard state powers).	reliable protection interstate negoti
Michael Bennet	Economy-wide cap-and-invest (declining emissions cap); revenue to lower bills/clean tech/resilience.	Low-Medium (revenue-generating via auctions; reinvested to offset consumer costs).	High / High (market-based like CA/others; no federal preemption).	Medium model emissions modes raised costs; goals i
Phil Weiser	Accelerate renewables/EV/heat pumps; Chief Resilience Officer; wildfire prevention; stop "buy-and-dry"; rural affairs director.	Medium (incentives + new officer/programs).	High / High (environmental/resilience core state role).	Medium (renew growth resilient measu direct of risk

### 5. Public Safety, Immigration, Law & Order, and Cybersecurity

Candidate	Proposal Summary	Est. Cost to Taxpayers	Constitutionality (State / Federal)	Likelihood of Achieving Goals
Victor Marx	End sanctuary policies + full ICE cooperation; border crime strike forces; Colorado Cyber Defense Center; restrict adversarial foreign ownership.	Low-Medium (strike forces + new cyber center).	Medium / Medium (ending sanctuary faces Supremacy Clause/8 USC 1373 challenges; counties have	Medium (cooperation reduces crime in some jurisdictions cyber center

Candidate	Proposal Summary	Est. Cost to Taxpayers	Constitutionality (State / Federal)	Likelihood of Achieving Goals
			sued state laws as unconstitutional; cyber/ownership rules generally ok).	effective but new bureaucracy risk).
Michael Bennet	LE resources/training/oversight; economic opportunity as crime reducer.	Low (targeted resources).	High / High (standard safety funding).	Medium (prevention via opportunity has evidence oversight improves trust).
Phil Weiser	Recruit/retain officers + training; gun safety laws; co-responders; opioid harm reduction; risk-based bail; Safe Communities Office.	Medium (new programs + training expansions).	High / High (public safety core powers; gun laws vary but state authority).	Medium-High (data-driven/co-responders models proven in multiple cities; enforcement focused elements effective).

## 6. Government Accountability, Transparency, and Federal Relations

Candidate	Proposal Summary	Est. Cost to Taxpayers	Constitutionality (State / Federal)	Likelihood of Achieving Goals
Victor Marx	Immediate full audits of every agency; real-time spending dashboard; whistleblower protections.	Low (audit costs offset by identified savings/waste cuts).	High / High (executive audit authority standard).	Medium (audits yield savings in other states but face agency resistance; sustained transparency harder).
Michael Bennet / Phil Weiser (shared)	Efficiency/innovation (e.g., Weiser: procurement updates, program evaluation team, TABOR modernization push); defend vs. federal overreach.	Low (internal reviews + partnerships).	High / High (executive management + litigation defense).	Medium-High (program evaluations common for savings; federal defense proven in CO lawsuits).

## 7. Veterans, Seniors, Health/Mental Health, and Other

Candidate	Proposal Summary	Est. Cost to Taxpayers	Constitutionality (State / Federal)	Likelihood of Achieving Goals
Victor Marx	Expand vet mental health/housing/jobs; freeze senior property taxes; elder fraud protections.	Low-Medium (expansions via efficiencies; tax freeze targeted).	High / High (veteran/senior aid standard).	Medium (targeted programs help individuals; systemic housing/mental

Candidate	Proposal Summary	Est. Cost to Taxpayers	Constitutionality (State / Federal)	Likelihood of Achieving Goals
				health issues persist).
Michael Bennet / Phil Weiser (shared emphasis)	Vet health/housing/jobs + equipped Guard; affordable health/mental access; Weiser adds stabilization task force + ColoradoCorps health workforce.	Medium-High (expansions + task forces).	High / High (health/vet services core state role).	Medium (access expansions improve outcomes; workforce pipelines address shortages but federal cuts complicate).

**Summary observations:** Marx’s proposals generally score lower on direct taxpayer costs (via cuts/audits) but face higher legal friction in immigration areas; Democrats’ plans involve more investment/revenue tools with stronger track records in public systems but higher potential costs. Likelihoods are mostly medium across the board due to Colorado’s political realities, budget constraints, and external factors (e.g., federal policy, housing markets). Platforms evolve; for primary details, see candidate sites.

**If you stipulate that Marx, Bennet and Weiser's policy plans all have a medium chance of success, and that all are within constitutional limits, shouldn't the least cost to taxpayers be the dispositive measure for voters?**

No. Even stipulating that all three candidates' proposals (Victor Marx's, Michael Bennet's, and Phil Weiser's) have a **medium likelihood of success** in achieving their stated goals and fall **within constitutional limits** (state and federal), the **least direct cost to taxpayers** is not the dispositive (deciding) measure for voters.

Voters weigh multiple factors beyond raw fiscal cost, including **effectiveness in addressing root problems, long-term economic impacts** (growth, jobs, affordability), **trade-offs in outcomes** (e.g., housing supply vs. targeted subsidies), **alignment with personal values** (limited government,

parental rights, climate action, public services), **risk of unintended consequences**, and **overall quality of life** in Colorado. Cost is important—especially in a state facing a ~\$1.5 billion budget shortfall for FY2026-27 amid ongoing TABOR debates over refunds, spending caps, and "fees" workarounds—but it is rarely the sole or overriding criterion.

## Why cost alone doesn't decide

- **Direct taxpayer cost ≠ total societal or economic impact:** Marx's proposals (heavy on deregulation, red-tape cuts, audits, tax relief tied to surpluses, and all-of-the-above energy) generally score as **Low** cost because they emphasize efficiencies, waste reduction, and market-driven solutions rather than new spending. However, deregulation can generate broader economic gains (e.g., lower housing/ energy prices via increased supply and competition) or risks (e.g., slower environmental gains or uneven benefits). Democratic proposals (Bennet's housing ambition and skills pipelines; Weiser's innovation officer, ColoradoCorps, renewables acceleration, and renter protections) score **Medium to High** due to new programs, subsidies, down-payment aid, preschool expansions, and cap-and-invest mechanisms. These can involve upfront investments or revenue tools (auctions, incentives) that may be partially offset by fees, federal matches, or growth—but they also risk higher utility bills, insurance costs, or opportunity costs if implementation underperforms.
  - Evidence on deregulation vs. investment is mixed: Some studies show permitting cuts and reduced mandates can meaningfully lower housing and energy costs over time by boosting supply and competition. Others find public investments (e.g., in education or resilience) can yield positive returns (benefit-cost ratios >1 in targeted areas like early childhood or workforce training), though large-scale programs often face administrative overhead and mixed real-world results (e.g., cap-and-invest models have delivered emissions reductions in places like California but with debates over consumer costs and revenue volatility).
- **Colorado context amplifies non-cost priorities:** Voters consistently rank **housing affordability, cost of living, health care, education**, and the **state budget/economy** as top concerns. Many report cutting non-essential spending due to these pressures. TABOR (the Taxpayer's Bill of Rights) remains a flashpoint—voters value its limits on spending/tax hikes and refund mechanism, but debates rage over whether to retain surpluses for services or return them. Polls show support for fiscal restraint alongside willingness for targeted investments when framed as solving affordability. A low-cost approach that fails to visibly ease housing shortages or energy reliability may lose to a higher-cost one perceived as more proactive.
- **Outcomes matter more than inputs:** Even with medium success odds stipulated, voters ask:
  - Does slashing mandates accelerate homebuilding faster than subsidies + a "housing czar" or Chief Housing Officer?

- Do parental choice + admin cuts improve education outcomes more (or less) than expanded public preschool and workforce pipelines?
- Does all-of-the-above energy deliver cheaper/reliable power vs. aggressive renewables with resilience officers?
- Immigration enforcement/cyber defenses (Marx) vs. prevention + gun safety (Weiser/Bennet) affect safety and costs differently.
- Audits/transparency (Marx) vs. innovation/efficiency teams (Democrats) deliver different accountability.

Medium success for a low-cost policy might still underdeliver on visible problems (e.g., persistent housing shortages driving up rents), while medium success for a higher-cost policy could produce tangible benefits (e.g., more attainable units or trained workers) that voters value enough to accept the expense.

- **Values and risk tolerance differ:** Conservatives often prioritize limited government, individual responsibility, and avoiding new bureaucracies (favoring Marx's audit-heavy, tax-relief approach). Progressives emphasize equity, prevention, innovation, and collective investment (favoring Democratic expansions). Independents (key in Colorado) split on TABOR but worry about both waste and underfunding of services. "Least cost" appeals to fiscal hawks but ignores whether the status quo (or alternative) imposes higher hidden costs (e.g., via regulation-driven prices or unmet needs leading to future crises).

## Realistic voter calculus in 2026 Colorado

Colorado's ~\$40-50B total state budget (with General Fund ~\$16-18B) operates under tight constraints, surpluses/shortfalls, and TABOR refunds that fluctuate with revenue. Voters see government growth despite TABOR and debate "fees" vs. taxes. In this environment:

- A purely lowest-cost platform may win base support but struggle in a general election if it appears to ignore pressing affordability signals.
- Higher-investment approaches risk backlash if they exacerbate the budget gap or lead to higher effective costs (e.g., via energy prices or taxes).
- Most voters blend factors: They want lower direct taxes/spending **and** measurable progress on housing, jobs, and safety—not one at the expense of the other.

In short, **no single metric is dispositive**. Rational voting involves expected value (probability of success × benefits – costs), but benefits are subjective and multidimensional. Cost is a key input—especially amid current fiscal pressures—but effectiveness, ideological fit, and perceived real-world results typically dominate. Different voters will rank the candidates differently precisely because they

disagree on these trade-offs, even under your stipulations. For the latest on platforms or polls, candidate sites and nonpartisan trackers remain the best sources.

**The bottom line appears to be a choice between reducing or increasing public sector spending, in order to reduce or increase public sector control of life in Colorado. The logical outcome of this purely political calculus, without regard to cost, is that any society so determined will ultimately end up in communism.**

---

**Your framing captures a core philosophical divide in politics: the size and scope of government, where higher public spending often correlates with greater regulatory reach, redistribution, and influence over economic and personal decisions.** Many classical liberals and fiscal conservatives (drawing from thinkers like Milton Friedman or Friedrich Hayek) argue precisely this—unconstrained growth in the public sector crowds out private initiative, distorts markets, and erodes individual liberty over time. The concern about a slippery slope toward centralized control is longstanding and merits serious consideration.

However, the logical leap that **any society choosing higher public-sector spending and control will "ultimately end up in communism"** does not hold as an inevitable outcome. It is a form of slippery-slope reasoning that overlooks historical evidence, definitional distinctions, and institutional safeguards. Here's a clear-eyed breakdown based on economic history and observable patterns, without regard to any specific candidate or party.

### **Definitions matter: Spending, control, and communism are not the same**

- **Public spending** reflects choices about collective goods (infrastructure, education, safety nets) versus private allocation. It can rise without expanding "control" into ownership of production—e.g., via targeted investments or insurance-style programs.
- **Control** (regulation, mandates, taxation) can increase alongside spending, but democracies routinely dial it back through elections, courts, and constitutional limits.
- **Communism**, per Marxist theory and historical practice, requires the **abolition of private property in the means of production**, a centrally planned economy replacing markets, and (ideally) a classless, stateless society. It is not synonymous with welfare states, high taxes, or even "socialism" in the modern European sense (which retains private enterprise and markets). No major Western democracy has transitioned to this via incremental spending; attempts at full communism (USSR, Maoist China, etc.) collapsed economically or reformed toward markets precisely because central planning failed to calculate prices or incentivize innovation efficiently.

Empirical patterns show high-spending societies stabilizing as **mixed economies** rather than sliding into communism. Nordic countries (Sweden, Norway, Denmark) routinely run public spending at 40–55% of GDP—far above U.S. or Colorado levels—funding universal services while preserving private ownership, competitive markets, strong property rights, and high economic freedom rankings. They reformed away from more socialist experiments in the 1970s–1990s (e.g., Sweden's tax cuts and deregulation) without becoming communist. Post-WWII examples like Israel, India, and the UK adopted heavy state intervention and later pivoted toward markets for growth, rejecting full socialism. Eastern European post-communist states increased social spending under democratic left governments yet remained capitalist democracies with private sectors driving GDP.

Studies on government spending multipliers (e.g., from the St. Louis Fed or Mercatus Center) often find values below 1—meaning \$1 in public outlays displaces more than \$1 in private activity over time via crowding out, higher taxes, or wage pressures—without any mechanism forcing a leap to communism. The reverse (austerity leading to collapse) also lacks evidence in stable democracies.

## Colorado's real-world constraints refute inevitability

Colorado operates under the **Taxpayer's Bill of Rights (TABOR)**, a constitutional amendment since 1992 that caps revenue growth at inflation + population and mandates refunds for surpluses (or voter approval to retain them). Despite Democratic legislative majorities and per-person state spending rising ~31% (inflation- and population-adjusted) over two decades—with the General Fund around \$16–18 billion and total budget ~\$43–50 billion in recent cycles—the state remains a market-driven economy. Private enterprise dominates housing, energy, agriculture, and tech; there is no state ownership of "the means of production." Budget shortfalls (projected ~\$1–1.5 billion for FY2026–27) and TABOR debates highlight ongoing tension, not unchecked expansion. Even with higher spending in areas like Medicaid or education, Coloradans retain private property rights, voluntary exchange, and the ability to vote out policies. This is not communism—it's the messy reality of a federal republic with democratic checks.

## Why the calculus doesn't lead "ultimately" to communism

- **Reversibility is common:** Societies have repeatedly increased spending during crises (wars, depressions, pandemics) then retrenched. The U.S. federal outlays as % of GDP have fluctuated without descending into state ownership of industry.
- **Institutions block the slope:** Constitutions, separation of powers, independent courts, free press, and competitive elections act as brakes. Colorado's TABOR is one such brake; attempts to weaken it via "fees" or ballot measures face voter pushback.
- **Economic incentives prevail:** Markets allocate resources via prices and profit/loss signals far more efficiently than central planning for most goods. Historical communist systems suffered shortages and stagnation exactly because they eliminated those signals—leading to reforms

(China's "socialist market economy" since the 1990s, with private enterprise now the growth engine) or collapse.

- **Values differ, but trade-offs are real:** Voters prioritizing reduced spending see it as preserving liberty and growth. Those favoring targeted increases see it as addressing market failures (e.g., public goods, inequality) while retaining capitalism. Neither path has a deterministic endpoint in communism; outcomes depend on culture, rule of law, and voter vigilance.

In the Colorado governor's race context, the candidates' proposals reflect this divide—deregulation/audits/tax relief on one side versus expanded investments and programs on the other—but all operate within a capitalist, democratic framework with private enterprise intact. Voters ultimately decide the balance, and history shows societies can (and do) adjust course without collapsing into the extremes. The "purely political calculus" you describe is real, but it is constrained by economics, evidence, and human agency—not predestined toward any single ideology.

## **Returning to your detailed chart above that compares Marx, Bennet and Weiser policies and plans, please evaluate each policy/plan for each candidate according to how well it comports with Colorado's economic comparative advantage, and Colorado's cultural natures for urban and rural citizens.**

**Colorado's economic comparative advantages** stem from a diversified, amenity-driven economy: tourism/outdoor recreation (a cornerstone contributing tens of billions in GDP and hundreds of thousands of jobs, leveraging public lands and natural beauty), energy (oil/gas production alongside growing renewables/clean tech), agriculture (a \$47 billion economic engine heavily reliant on water rights under prior appropriation and the Colorado River Compact), advanced manufacturing/aerospace (highest per capita concentration nationally), bioscience/tech/innovation (high-wage urban clusters driving VC and GDP), and quality-of-life factors attracting talent and remote workers.

**Culturally**, urban residents (Front Range metro areas like Denver, Boulder, Colorado Springs—home to ~86% of the population) tend to favor progressive values: innovation, environmental protection, public services/equity investments, diversity, and lifestyle amenities. Rural residents (80% of land area, including Eastern Plains, Western Slope, and mountain communities) prioritize self-reliance, traditional industries (ag/energy), strong property/water rights, law-and-order, and skepticism of Denver-centric regulations that they view as disconnected from their realities.

Below, each of the seven policy areas from the prior chart is evaluated for Victor Marx, Michael Bennet, and Phil Weiser. Ratings use **Strong** (excellent alignment with advantages/culture), **Moderate**

(partial fit or trade-offs), or **Weak** (limited/misaligned with key drivers). These are reasoned assessments based on how the proposals engage Colorado's unique economic strengths and the distinct urban/rural cultural lenses—no proposal perfectly matches everything.

### 1. Housing and Affordability/Cost of Living

Candidate	Economic Comparative Advantage Fit	Urban Cultural Fit	Rural Cultural Fit	Key Rationale
Victor Marx	Moderate	Moderate	Strong	Deregulation and red-tape cuts align with boosting supply to support tourism/tech migration and lower costs economy-wide; TABOR focus resonates rurally (property rights, anti-fee creep) but may under-address urban supply shortages.
Michael Bennet	Strong	Strong	Moderate	Ambitious supply surge + "housing czar" leverages quality-of-life amenities for talent attraction (tech/aerospace/tourism edge); urban progressive preference for executive action and subsidies fits well, though rural areas may see it as top-down.
Phil Weiser	Strong	Strong	Moderate	Targeted attainable homes, renter protections, modular housing, and Chief Housing Officer support workforce housing for innovation/ag sectors; strong urban equity appeal but less emphasis on rural property-rights sensitivities.

## 2. Education and Parental Rights/Childcare

Candidate	Economic Comparative Advantage Fit	Urban Cultural Fit	Rural Cultural Fit	Key Rationale
Victor Marx	Moderate	Weak	Strong	School choice, trade/vocational redirect, and admin cuts support workforce pipelines for aerospace/tech/ag; rural self-reliance and traditional values align strongly, but urban innovation/equity focus sees choice as fragmenting public systems.
Michael Bennet	Strong	Strong	Moderate	Skills pipelines for high-paying jobs (IT/health/biotech) directly bolsters urban tech/aerospace edge and tourism workforce; phased free childcare fits urban progressive emphasis on access and opportunity.
Phil Weiser	Strong	Strong	Moderate	Universal preschool expansion, teacher support, and Education Think Tank (AI/civics/skills) align with bioscience/tech growth and urban values; rural areas value public-school strengthening but may resist anti-voucher stance.

## 3. Economy, Jobs, Taxes, and Workforce

Candidate	Economic Comparative Advantage Fit	Urban Cultural Fit	Rural Cultural Fit	Key Rationale
Victor Marx	Strong	Moderate	Strong	Tax cuts, ESG elimination, apprenticeships, and red-tape reduction fuel private-sector energy/ag/tourism/tech growth; rural self-reliance and property focus match perfectly; urban areas appreciate jobs but prefer more targeted innovation investment.
Michael Bennet	Moderate	Strong	Moderate	Red-tape cuts + business/higher-ed partnerships leverage innovation clusters (aerospace/bioscience); urban progressive growth model fits, but less emphasis on rural energy/ag tax relief.
Phil Weiser	Strong	Strong	Moderate	ColoradoCorps, innovation officer, apprenticeships, and job-data transparency support high-wage tech/energy transitions and rural retention; strong urban innovation appeal with some rural workforce benefits.

#### 4. Energy, Environment, Climate, Water, and Rural Issues

Candidate	Economic Comparative Advantage Fit	Urban Cultural Fit	Rural Cultural Fit	Key Rationale
Victor Marx	Strong	Moderate	Strong	All-of-the-above (fossil + nuclear/renewables), water-

Candidate	Economic Comparative Advantage Fit	Urban Cultural Fit	Rural Cultural Fit	Key Rationale
				rights protection under Compact/prior appropriation, and rural broadband/wildfire mitigation directly safeguard ag/energy/tourism pillars; rural cultural emphasis on property rights and self-reliance is a strong match.
Michael Bennet	Moderate	Strong	Moderate	Cap-and-invest for net-zero with revenue for bills/resilience aligns with clean-tech innovation and urban environmental priorities; supports tourism amenities but risks higher costs for rural energy/ag sectors.
Phil Weiser	Moderate	Strong	Moderate	Renewables acceleration, Chief Resilience Officer, wildfire prevention, and anti-buy-and-dry protections leverage clean-tech growth and rural Director of Rural Affairs; urban climate focus is strong, though rural energy producers may view renewables push skeptically.

### 5. Public Safety, Immigration, Law & Order, and Cybersecurity

Candidate	Economic Comparative Advantage Fit	Urban Cultural Fit	Rural Cultural Fit	Key Rationale
Victor Marx	Strong	Moderate	Strong	ICE cooperation, border crime strike forces, cyber defense center, and foreign-ownership

Candidate	Economic Comparative Advantage Fit	Urban Cultural Fit	Rural Cultural Fit	Key Rationale
				restrictions protect tourism/ag/energy assets and rural communities; law-and-order emphasis resonates rurally.
Michael Bennet	Moderate	Strong	Moderate	LE resources + economic opportunity as crime reducer supports urban safety/innovation without heavy enforcement; fits progressive urban values but less direct tie to rural border/trafficking concerns.
Phil Weiser	Moderate	Strong	Moderate	Officer recruitment, co-responders, gun safety, and Safe Communities Office align with urban prevention/equity; rural areas value enforcement but may see gun/mental-health focus as less protective of self-reliant culture.

## 6. Government Accountability, Transparency, and Federal Relations

Candidate	Economic Comparative Advantage Fit	Urban Cultural Fit	Rural Cultural Fit	Key Rationale
Victor Marx	Strong	Moderate	Strong	Full agency audits, real-time dashboard, and whistleblower protections curb waste, preserving TABOR-driven fiscal restraint vital for all sectors; rural distrust of Denver

Candidate	Economic Comparative Advantage Fit	Urban Cultural Fit	Rural Cultural Fit	Key Rationale
				bureaucracy is a strong cultural fit.
Michael Bennet / Phil Weiser (shared)	Moderate	Strong	Moderate	Efficiency/innovation teams and federal-defense focus support urban partnerships and program evaluation; aligns with progressive governance but rural residents often view it as more bureaucracy rather than restraint.

## 7. Veterans, Seniors, Health/Mental Health, and Other

Candidate	Economic Comparative Advantage Fit	Urban Cultural Fit	Rural Cultural Fit	Key Rationale
Victor Marx	Moderate	Moderate	Strong	Veteran mental health/housing expansions and senior tax freezes support defense/aerospace workforce and rural fixed-income families; cultural emphasis on service and self-reliance fits rural areas well.
Michael Bennet / Phil Weiser (shared)	Strong	Strong	Moderate	Broad health/mental access, veteran programs, and ColoradoCorps workforce pipelines bolster bioscience/health sectors and urban equity; strong progressive appeal for comprehensive services, with

Candidate	Economic Comparative Advantage Fit	Urban Cultural Fit	Rural Cultural Fit	Key Rationale
				rural benefits but less targeted tax relief.

**Overall pattern:** Marx’s proposals generally show stronger alignment with rural cultural priorities and traditional economic pillars (energy, ag, property rights) while maintaining broad economic flexibility. Bennet and Weiser’s platforms align more closely with urban cultural values and innovation-driven advantages (tech/clean energy, public investments). No single candidate’s platform maximizes fit across *all* dimensions—voters’ weighting of urban vs. rural lenses and economic trade-offs (e.g., regulation vs. deregulation) will determine perceived strength. These evaluations reflect the proposals as detailed in campaign materials through late March 2026; real-world implementation would face legislative and budget realities.