

DELAWARE  
A·R·T  
MUSEUM



April 8, 2004

Ms. Mai T. Dinh  
Acting Assistant General Counsel  
Federal Election Commission  
999 E Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20463

RECEIVED  
FEDERAL ELECTION  
COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF GENERAL  
COUNSEL

2004 APR -9 P 1:24

*Board of Trustees*

Susan M. Stalnecker\*  
*President*  
Mark A. Fortunato\*  
*First Vice President*  
Richard V. Pryor\*  
*Second Vice President*  
John A. Wheeler\*  
*Treasurer*  
Lynn Herrick Sharp\*  
*Secretary*  
John E. Osborn\*  
*Assistant Secretary*  
Victor F. Battaglia, Sr.\*

Jacques A. Amblard  
Sylvia S. Banks  
Carolyn S. Burger  
Gerret van S. Copeland  
Aimee K. Elson  
Thomas A. Graves, Jr.  
L. Sandra Hammonds  
Linda Brinton Harra  
Lynda S. Hodgson  
Ilona E. Holland  
Jan Jessup  
Betty P. Krahmer  
Daniel M. Kristol  
Mark Levitt  
Paula J. Malone  
Joan T. Mobley  
William N. Spiker  
Joanne K. Sundheim  
Brock J. Vinton  
Rodman Ward, Jr.  
Peggy H. Woolard  
*\*Executive Committee*

Stephen T. Bruni  
*Executive Director*

*Emeritus*  
Edward G. Jefferson  
John K. Jenney

*Honorary*  
Mrs. Robert N. Downs III  
Mrs. Helen Farr Sloan

---

800 South Madison Street  
Wilmington, DE 19801  
302.571.9590  
fax 302.571.0220  
www.delart.org

Re: Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on Political Committee Status, 69  
Fed. Reg. 11736 (March 11, 2004)

Dear Ms. Dinh:

The Delaware Art Museum urges the Federal Election Commission (Commission) to exclude 501(c)(3) organizations from the definition of "political committee." This letter outlines the rationale for our recommendation.

The Delaware Art Museum was founded in 1912 to "promote the knowledge and enjoyment of and cultivation in the Fine Arts in the State of Delaware by the establishment of schools and other methods of instruction; by books and other publications and by the establishment of galleries of paintings and sculpture to promote the cultivation of the Fine Arts."

Since its early days, the Delaware Art Museum has expanded its mission to "serve and engage the people of Delaware, the surrounding region and beyond. The Delaware Art Museum is dedicated to developing awareness, understanding and appreciation of the visual arts and their impact on culture, and to enriching lives by collecting, preserving, exhibiting and interpreting the visual arts for a diverse audience."

Genuine issue advocacy must be left free of Commission regulation.

The democratic process depends not only on citizens voting, but on people and nongovernmental organizations being actively engaged and informed about the issues of the day, including pending legislation and acts by public officials. The charitable sector has a long and distinguished history of promoting active citizen engagement. The Constitution protects such advocacy from being burdened by laws and regulations unless a compelling state interest justifies it. At a time in our history with the lowest level of voter participation and citizen activism, government entities such as the Commission should be wary of making any rules that will discourage citizens and non profit organizations from participating in the democratic process.

Advocacy is an essential role of the nonprofit sector. Through advocacy, nonprofits provide a vehicle for civic engagement in the democratic process. We encourage all state associations—and in fact all 501(c)(3) organizations—to get involved in advocacy activities and have recently launched a campaign to encourage them to participate in nonpartisan election activities. The new rules that the Commission is considering may prevent us from fulfilling our advocacy role.

Existing federal law prohibits 501(c)(3) organizations from engaging in partisan political activity. Title 26 of the United States Code, the Internal Revenue Code, explicitly bars 501(c)(3) organizations from participating in, or intervening in (including the publishing or distributing of statements), any political campaign on behalf of (or in opposition to) any candidate for public office. The prohibition is absolute; there is no *de minimis* exception to that rule. Nonprofits are heavily regulated, and rightly so, from engaging in direct partisan political activities. Nonprofit leaders and boards are well aware of this limitation. They are careful not to cross the threshold into unpermitted activities, and we have found them to be overly cautious about kinds and extent of their advocacy efforts.

#### **What is a Political Committee?**

As the Commission struggles to more clearly define a “political committee” and the appropriate activities of such a committee, the definition should not be expanded to incorporate or encroach on the legitimate, nonpartisan activities of 501(c)(3) organizations. Activities in which 501(c)(3) organizations engage are more appropriately characterized as lobbying or nonpartisan voter activation. The advocacy activities of 501(c)(3) organizations allow more people to participate and more voices to be heard, which achieves the ultimate purpose of the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act (BCRA).

As described above and as the Commission recognized in its earlier BCRA rulemaking when it exempted the communications of 501(c)(3) organizations from the definition of “electioneering communication,” federal tax law requires that 501(c)(3) organizations avoid even the slightest hint of support for or opposition to candidates for public office. Thus, any Commission rule that legitimate 501(c)(3) activities might also be an expenditure under BCRA would create inevitable complications for charitable organizations seeking to comply with both tax and election laws. The Commission has already stated that “the purpose of BCRA is not served by discouraging such charitable organizations from participating in what the public considers highly desirable and beneficial

activity,” and we encourage the Commission to remain consistent with its earlier decision.

The proposed rules could deem the following organizations as political committees:

- A 501(c)(3) organization that spends its entire budget registering college students to vote.
- A 501(c)(3) anti-poverty organization that spends \$50,000 in ads this election season criticizing the Administration and Congress for failing to provide adequate funding for the neediest Americans.

If 501(c)(3) organizations are deemed to be political committees, the result would be that we and most of the 501(c)(3) community could no longer conduct advocacy activities unless we raise and spend funds in accordance with the source and contribution limits of the Federal Election Campaign Act (“FECA”). FECA prohibits contributions over \$5000 from individuals and grants and contributions from corporations and foundations, the primary source of funding for most 501(c)(3) organizations. Consequently, 501(c)(3) organizations, often the only voice for the voiceless on all sides of the political spectrum, will be severely hampered in their efforts to conduct worthy efforts.

### **Meaning of “Expenditures”**

The Commission should not redefine “expenditures” to include all communication that “promotes, supports, attacks, or opposes” a candidate for federal office. In doing so, the Commission would be creating a new test, one that far exceeds the broadcast limits contained in BCRA. BCRA does not allow the Commission to extend the definition of “expenditures” to include all communication, including print ads, letters to members, fundraising letters, web sites, and messages from door-to-door canvassers. Moreover, in upholding BCRA, the United States Supreme Court stated that interest groups “remain free to raise soft money to fund voter registration, GOTV activities, mailings, and broadcast advertising.” McConnell v. FEC, 540 U.S. \_\_\_ at \_\_\_ [slip op. at 80]. The Commission cannot limit speech that Congress itself refused to limit.

The NCNA network is actively engaged in educating the public and advocating positions on legislative and policy issues related to our charitable missions. In our advocacy work, it is frequently valuable to refer to current elected federal officeholders who support or oppose our positions. Any rule must define clearly what speech and activities fall within the ambit of “promotes, supports, attacks,

or opposes” a candidate for federal office. The Commission itself has recognized that it is difficult to make such definitions.

Likewise, any rule must distinguish between speech that “promotes, supports, attacks, or opposes” a policy position of an elected official acting in her official capacity and speech that praises or criticizes a candidate for public office, even if already an elected official. Of course, federal law, through the tax code, already prohibits 501(c)(3) organizations to participate in, or intervene in political campaigns on behalf of (or opposition to) candidates for public office. That same law allows for criticism and support of actions of elected officials.

As can be imagined, the scope of activities that may meet this vague test is very broad. For example, they could include:

- A 501(c)(3) state association holds a briefing to educate its members about a proposal to cut the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) and the significant negative impact such cuts will have on millions of low-income working people. Congressman A, a strong proponent of the EITC who is also up for reelection this year, will speak about his views on the proposal. An invitation was sent to his opponent to offer his views, but the invitation was declined. By having Congressman A speak at the briefing, the state association may be considered to promote or support him.
- A 501(c)(3) educational organization encourages its members to oppose a bill sponsored by state senator B that will cut funding for all-day kindergarten in the state. State senator B is a candidate for the U.S. Congress. Such advocacy efforts, even though targeted at a state-level legislative issue, may be seen as opposing or attacking state senator B, a candidate for federal office.

Are these examples of the corruption of the political process that must be stopped? NCNA thinks not, and urges the Commission to protect such speech.

The restrictions would not apply just to commentary on incumbents in Congress or the White House but also to others who are running for federal office. Those running might include state or local officials, business leaders, and others, thus affecting advocacy at the state or local level.

It is inappropriate for the Commission to change the campaign finance rules in the midst of this election cycle.

Ms. Mai T. Dinh

Page 6 of 6

time that all 501(c)(3) organizations have an opportunity to be fully informed and educated about them.


This rulemaking raises legal issues about whether the Commission has the authority to regulate constitutionally protected speech.

Deference should be given to protection of the First Amendment's right of free speech and association. Where ambiguity in the law exists, regulation or restriction of speech not expressly provided for by the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002 or the Federal Election Campaign Act must be imposed by Congress, and not through an administrative rulemaking.

Again, we urge the Commission not apply the rules to the 501(c)(3) community.

Thank you for this opportunity to practice those freedoms that make our country great – voicing our opposition to a proposed action that will have detrimental and disastrous effects on the practice of democracy in our country.

Sincerely,



Stephen T. Bruni  
Executive Director

STB/scl

cc: Senator Joseph R. Biden, Jr.  
Senator Thomas R. Carper  
Representative Michael N. Castle