



FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

OCT 27 2011

Rebecca S. Kratz  
Freedom From Religion Foundation  
PO Box 750  
Madison, WI 53701

RE: MUR 6137  
Informed Catholic Citizens

Dear Ms. Kratz:

This is in reference to the complaint you filed with the Federal Election Commission on November 25, 2008, concerning Informed Catholic Citizens. Based on that complaint, on January 19, 2011, the Commission found that there was reason to believe Informed Catholic Citizens violated 2 U.S.C. §§ 434(c), 434(g), and 441d(a), and that there was no reason to believe Informed Catholic Citizens violated 2 U.S.C. § 441b(a), provisions of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended ("the Act") and instituted an investigation of this matter. Also on that date, the Commission was equally divided on whether to find reason to believe that Informed Catholic Citizens violated 2 U.S.C. §§ 433 and 434. The Factual and Legal Analysis, which more fully explains the basis for the Commission's reason to believe and no reason to believe determinations, is enclosed. On October 18, 2011, the Commission closed the file in this matter. At the same time, the Commission cautioned Informed Catholic Citizens to take steps to ensure that its conduct is in compliance with the Act and the Commission regulations. A Statement of Reasons explaining the Commission's decision to close the file will be issued.

Documents related to the case will be placed on the public record within 30 days. See Statement of Policy Regarding Disclosure of Closed Enforcement and Related Files, 68 Fed. Reg. 70426 (Dec. 18, 2003) and Statement of Policy Regarding Placing First General Counsel's Reports on the Public Record, 74 Fed. Reg. 66132 (Dec. 14, 2009).

11044304492

The Act allows a complainant to seek judicial review of the Commission's dismissal of this action. See 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a)(8). If you have any questions, please contact me at (202) 694-1650.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "April J. Sands", written in a cursive style.

April J. Sands  
Attorney

Enclosure  
Factual and Legal Analysis

11044304493

1 **FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION**

2 **FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS**

3  
4  
5 **RESPONDENTS:** Informed Catholic Citizens

MUR 6137

6  
7  
8 **I. GENERATION OF MATTER**

9  
10 This matter was generated by a complaint filed with the Federal Election Commission by  
11 Rebecca Kratz. See 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a)(1).

12 **II. FACTUAL SUMMARY**

13 This matter concerns allegations that Informed Catholic Citizens ("ICC"), a Colorado-  
14 based 501(c)(4) organization, violated various provisions of the Federal Election Campaign Act  
15 of 1971, as amended ("the Act"). Specifically, the complaint alleges that ICC made prohibited  
16 corporate expenditures for a series of recorded telephone calls that constituted express advocacy,  
17 and may have been required to report the cost of the calls as independent expenditures. In its  
18 response, ICC argues that the calls did not contain express advocacy, and therefore the group  
19 was not required to report any independent expenditures. Response at 3.

20 The complaint identifies two recorded phone calls ICC made to citizens in Colorado in  
21 late October 2008.<sup>1</sup> Complaint at 1. The scripts for the calls, provided in ICC's response, are as  
22 follows:

23 **"Carmody Call"**

24  
25 Hello, this is Fr. Bill Carmody, Pastor of Holy Family parish in Colorado Springs. I'm  
26 calling on behalf of Informed Catholic Citizens about the importance of your vote in this  
27 election.

28  
29 Regardless of the spinning that some politicians have done, the Catholic Church's  
30 opposition to the evil of abortion has always been the same and is crystal clear.  
31

---

<sup>1</sup> ICC's Response states that the calls were delivered to members of the public in November 2008, just before the election. See Response Exhibit A.

Why is it important in this election? John McCain has a record of supporting life, but in the words of Denver Archbishop Charles Chaput, Barack Obama "is the most committed abortion-rights presidential candidate of either major party" in 35 years, and the Democratic Party Platform adopted in Denver is "clearly anti-life."

There are many important issues to consider, but as Archbishop Chaput says, "every other human right depends on the right to life."

If you have not already voted, I pray that you will search your conscience carefully and consider all the information you deem important. And, then vote like life depended on it – because it does.

This message is paid for by Informed Catholic Citizens.

"Beauprez Call"

Hello, this is Bob Beauprez. And, no, I'm not one of those politicians calling to tell you how to vote. You'll figure that out on your own.

I know that there are a whole host of issues you'll consider when deciding for whom to vote, including who best represents your values. What's difficult is finding really honest information about the candidates and the issues most important to you – like the five non-negotiables: sanctity of human life, euthanasia, homosexual marriage, embryonic stem-cell research, and human cloning.

I recently learned through the Solidarity Institute at ecatholicuhub.net that Bob Schaffer is in agreement with Catholic doctrine on all five of these issues while Mark Udall is opposed to every single one.

We're the Informed Catholic Citizens, and our only objective is to make sure you have all the information you need to decide who you'll be voting for in this election. Thank you for listening.

### **III. ANALYSIS**

The Commission: (1) finds no reason to believe that ICC violated 2 U.S.C. § 441b; (2) finds reason to believe that ICC violated 2 U.S.C. § 434(c) by failing to disclose its independent expenditure; (3) finds reason to believe that ICC violated 2 U.S.C. § 434(g) by failing to file a 24-hour notice of its independent expenditure; and (4) finds reason to believe that ICC violated 2 U.S.C. § 441d(a) by failing to include the required disclaimer.

**A. Corporate Expenditures**

In *Citizens United v. FEC*, the Supreme Court struck down as unconstitutional the Act's prohibition on corporate financing of independent expenditures. See 130 S.Ct. 876, 913 (2010).

Thus, it is permissible for corporations to use general treasury funds for this purpose.

Accordingly, the Commission finds no reason to believe that Informed Catholic Citizens violated 2 U.S.C. § 441b by making a prohibited corporate expenditure in connection with the recorded telephone calls.

**B. Independent Expenditure Reporting**

Under the Act, every person other than a political committee who makes independent expenditures in excess of \$250 must file a report that discloses information on its expenditures and identify each person who made a contribution in excess of \$200 for the purpose of furthering an independent expenditure. See 2 U.S.C. § 434(c). The Act defines an independent expenditure as any expenditure that expressly advocates the election or defeat of a clearly identified candidate and is not made in concert with a candidate, a political party committee, or their respective agents. 2 U.S.C. § 431(17).

Under the Commission's regulations, a communication contains express advocacy when it uses phrases, campaign slogans, or individual words "which in context can have no other reasonable meaning than to encourage the election or defeat of one or more clearly identified candidate(s), such as posters, bumper stickers, advertisements, etc. which say 'Nixon's the One,' 'Carter '76,' 'Reagan/Bush' or 'Mondale!'" 11 C.F.R. § 100.22(a). The Supreme Court has held that express advocacy also encompasses communications that contain "in effect an explicit directive" to vote for or against a candidate. *MCFL*, 479 U.S. at 249. The fact that a message is "marginally less direct than 'Vote for Smith' does not change its essential nature." *Id.* ICC

11044304496

1 argues that "express advocacy" must be read narrowly in accordance with the approach in  
2 *Buckley v. Valeo*, 424 U.S. 1 (1976). Response at 3.

3 The Carmody Call contains express advocacy under 11 C.F.R. § 100.22(a) consistent  
4 with Supreme Court and Commission precedent. This call is similar to the newsletter at issue in  
5 *MCFL* and the "Conscience" pamphlet in MUR 5634 (Sierra Club). In *MCFL*, the Supreme  
6 Court found that a newsletter which listed candidates for state and federal office and identified  
7 their issue positions as supporting or opposing issues such as abortion, along with the phrases  
8 "EVERYTHING YOU NEED TO KNOW TO VOTE PRO-LIFE," "VOTE PRO-LIFE," and the  
9 disclaimer "This special election edition does not represent an endorsement of any particular  
10 candidate," constituted express advocacy. *MCFL*, 479 U.S. at 238. The Court reasoned that the  
11 newsletter "cannot be regarded as a mere discussion of public issues that by their nature raise the  
12 names of certain politicians. Rather, it provides an explicit directive: vote for these (named)  
13 candidates." *Id.*

14 In MUR 5634, the Commission found that the "Conscience" pamphlet, which compared  
15 President Bush's and Senator Kerry's environmental records and contained the phrases "LET  
16 YOUR CONSCIENCE BE YOUR GUIDE" and "LET YOUR VOTE BE YOUR VOICE"  
17 contained express advocacy under section 100.22(a) because it provided "in effect" an explicit  
18 directive to vote for the candidates whose positions were in accord with the organization. See  
19 MUR 5634 Factual and Legal Analysis at 4. The Commission found probable cause to believe  
20 that the Sierra Club violated 2 U.S.C. § 441b(a) based on the "Conscience" pamphlet and entered  
21 into a conciliation agreement with the organization. See Certifications dated July 19, 2006 and  
22 November 13, 2006. In the same matter, the Office of General Counsel recommended, and the  
23 Commission found, no reason to believe that the Sierra Club violated the Act in connection with

11044304497

1 three other pamphlets. Two of the pamphlets did not contain express advocacy because a  
2 reasonable interpretation was that readers were simply being directed to contact current federal  
3 officeholders. MUR 5634 First General Counsel's Report at 5. A fourth pamphlet, "Dirt,"  
4 which contained narratives comparing the environmental records of Present Bush and Senator  
5 Kerry, did not contain express advocacy because it was consistent with the Commission's voter  
6 guide regulations and encouraged readers to obtain additional information about the candidates  
7 from other sources before deciding for whom to vote. *Id.* at 8.

8 The Carmody Call uses the word "vote" three times, starting in the first sentence after the  
9 greeting. The Carmody Call is express advocacy under section 100.22(a) because it sets out  
10 John McCain's and Barack Obama's respective positions on the subject of abortion and then  
11 directs listeners to "vote like life depended on it – because it does," which has no other  
12 reasonable meaning than to encourage the election of John McCain and the defeat of Barack  
13 Obama. This conclusion is consistent with the Supreme Court's decision in *MCFL* in that the  
14 Carmody Call's call to action to "vote like life depended on it – because it does" is an  
15 unambiguous reference to John McCain's "record of supporting life," providing "in effect" an  
16 explicit directive to vote for John McCain and against Barack Obama. The Carmody Call's call  
17 to action is also similar to that in the MUR 5634 "Conscience" pamphlet, "LET YOUR VOTE  
18 BE YOUR VOICE."

19 Although the available information does not indicate the cost or dissemination of the  
20 Carmody Call, a press account cited in the Complaint regarding the Beauprez Call stated that  
21 ICC "blanket[ed] the state with recorded phone calls." Mike Riley, Beauprez Robo-Calls Target  
22 Udall on Values, *Denver Post*, October 23, 2008. ICC's response did not provide any  
23 information regarding the cost or dissemination of the calls. The fact that the Carmody Call

11044304498

1 concerned the Presidential election also suggests that a large number of calls were made, and  
2 past matters involving robocalls often involved costs well over \$1,000. See MUR 6125  
3 (McClintock) (Campaign in California's 4<sup>th</sup> Congressional District spent \$7,799 for robocalls in  
4 2008); MUR 5819 (U.S. Chamber of Commerce) (Chamber of Commerce spent \$2,474 for  
5 approximately 50,000 calls regarding the 2006 Senate race in Hawaii); MUR 5588 (Arizona  
6 Republican Party) (State party committee spent \$41,626 for state-wide calls regarding the 2004  
7 Presidential election).

8 In sum, it appears that at least one of the ICC recorded calls – the Carmody Call –  
9 contained express advocacy under 11 C.F.R. § 100.22(a).<sup>2</sup> See also 11 C.F.R. § 100.22(b)  
10 (express advocacy includes communications that contain an “electoral portion” that is  
11 “unmistakable, unambiguous, and suggestive of only one meaning” and about which “reasonable  
12 minds could not differ as to whether it encourages actions to elect or defeat” a candidate).  
13 Because the Carmody Call contained express advocacy and ICC likely spent over \$250 on the  
14 call, ICC was subject to the independent expenditure reporting requirements of section 434(c) of  
15 the Act. Accordingly, the Commission finds reason to believe that ICC violated 2 U.S.C.  
16 § 434(c).

<sup>2</sup> The Beauprez Call presents a closer judgment. There are several characteristics of the Beauprez Call that bring it close to the definition of express advocacy under 11 C.F.R. § 100.22(b): the call references voting three times and was made in close proximity to the election; it references the Catholic Church's positions on five policy issues and then states that “Bob Schaffer is in agreement with Catholic doctrine on all five of these issues while Mark Udall is opposed to every single one;” and it indicates that the ICC's goal is to inform listeners to aid in their voting decision. This can be viewed as a directive to vote for the candidate in agreement with Catholic Doctrine, Bob Schaffer. However, because the Beauprez Call contains a comparison of the candidates' views on policy issues, reasonable minds could view the call as educating listeners about the positions of the candidates, similar to the MUR 5634 “Dirt” pamphlet, which the Commission concluded was more akin to a voter guide under 11 C.F.R. § 114.4(c)(5)(i).



**C. 24-Hour Independent Expenditure Reporting**

Under the Act, a person that makes independent expenditures aggregating \$1,000 or more after the 20<sup>th</sup> day, but more than 24 hours, before the date of an election must file a report describing the expenditures within 24 hours. 2 U.S.C. § 434(g)(1).

ICC's activity appears to date from November 2008; therefore, it is likely that the calls were made within 20 days of the election. It is also likely that ICC spent over \$1,000 in connection with the Carmody Call. Accordingly, the Commission finds reason to believe that Informed Catholic Citizens violated 2 U.S.C. § 434(g) by failing to report the cost of the call as an independent expenditure.

**D. Required Disclaimers**

The Act requires that persons making disbursements for communications containing express advocacy provide a disclaimer as specified in the statute and regulations. 2 U.S.C. § 441d. More specifically, communications that are not authorized by a candidate are required to clearly state the name and permanent street address, telephone number or World Wide Web address of the person who paid for the communication and state that the communication was not authorized by any candidate or the candidate's committee. 2 U.S.C. § 441d(a)(3).

The Carmody Call required a disclaimer because it contained express advocacy. It appears that the Carmody Call was sufficiently widespread to have constituted 500 calls of an identical or substantially similar nature. *See supra* p. 5-6. The Carmody Call did not contain the full required disclaimer, as it did not clearly state the address, telephone number, or website address of ICC and did not state that the communication was not authorized by any candidate or candidate's committee. Accordingly, the Commission finds reason to believe that Informed

11044304500

- 1 Catholic Citizens violated 2 U.S.C. § 441d(a) by failing to include the required disclaimer on a**
- 2 communication containing express advocacy.**

11044304501



FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION  
Washington DC 20463

THIS IS THE END OF MUR # 6137

DATE SCANNED 11-17-11

SCANNER NO. 2

SCAN OPERATOR JMW

11044304502