



COMMISSIONER ELLEN L. WEINTRAUB
FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

Seattle City Council
Seattle, WA 98104

via e-mail only to council@seattle.gov, vy.nguyen@seattle.gov

January 6, 2020

Councilmembers:

I write to urge you to support Council Bill No. 119731, the proposed ordinance that aims to help protect Seattle's municipal elections from foreign influence. As I am sure you are well aware, elections at all levels in the United States are under sustained direct attack from our foreign adversaries. Leading cities such as Seattle are wise to protect their elections from such intrusions and to set an example for others to follow.

The Seattle City Council is widely renowned for its leadership on campaign-finance reform issues. Seattle's Democracy Voucher program is one of the most exciting reforms in this field to emerge anywhere in the country in the past few years.

While Council Bill No. 119731 will build upon your leading-edge reputation for campaign-finance reform, it nonetheless fits comfortably within existing federal statutory law and Supreme Court precedent.

What you are considering here is the sort of reform that may *only* succeed at the local and state levels at the moment, as ideological opposition to campaign-finance law enforcement has effectively paralyzed both the Federal Election Commission and Congress. Fortunately, state and local governments across the country are stepping into the breach and leading the way with innovative solutions to campaign-finance problems.

Council Bill No. 119731 is consistent with an approach I laid out in an op-ed for *The New York Times* (attached) that described a new way to read the *Citizens United* decision together with the foreign-national political-spending ban.

In a nutshell, I noted that since the *Citizens United* majority protected the First Amendment rights of corporations as "associations of citizens," and held that a corporation's right to participate in elections flows from the collected rights of its individual shareholders to participate, it follows that the *limits* on the rights of a corporation's shareholders must *also* flow to the corporation.

And one of the most important campaign-finance limits we have is that foreign nationals are absolutely barred from spending directly or indirectly in U.S. elections at *any* political level – federal, state, or city. It thus defies logic to allow groups of foreign nationals, or foreign nationals in combination with American citizens, to fund political spending through corporations. One cannot have a right collectively that one does not have individually. Accordingly, your proposed ordinance seeks to ensure that only those corporations owned and influenced by people who have the right to participate in your elections are doing so.

The heart of your proposed ordinance’s definition of a “foreign-influenced corporation” is one percent ownership by one foreign owner, or five percent ownership by more than one foreign owner. This might feel like a very tight standard, but I would ask you to keep in mind that you are not working your way down from a 100 percent or 50 percent foreign ownership standard – you are working your way *up* from the *zero* foreign-influence standard that a strict reading of federal law would suggest.

The risks addressed by this measure are not theoretical. Last year, reporters used FEC filings to uncover \$1.3 million in illegal foreign donations to a super PAC routed through APIC, an American subsidiary of a foreign corporation. As a result, the Commission negotiated the largest aggregate penalty in one matter in the post-*Citizens United* era. Had APIC been required to sign the certifications required by the measure before you, their illegal behavior may well have been deterred.

Again, I am delighted that the Seattle City Council is moving forward to address this key campaign-finance issue at a moment when the federal government is unable to do so. By passing this ordinance, you will be doing not just Seattle but also Washington and your country a great service. You will set an example that can be followed by others at the local, state, and, *hopefully* someday, federal levels.

If you have any further questions about how the terms of this proposed ordinance mesh with federal campaign-finance law (or any other questions), please feel free get in touch with me. I am available at commissionerweintraub@fec.gov and (202) 694-1035.

Sincerely,



Ellen L. Weintraub
Commissioner, Federal Election Commission

The New York Times | <http://nyti.ms/1qhmpKB>

The Opinion Pages | OP-ED CONTRIBUTOR

Taking On Citizens United

By ELLEN L. WEINTRAUB MARCH 30, 2016

SOMETHING is very wrong with the way we fund our elections. This has become especially clear since Citizens United, the 2010 Supreme Court decision that struck down campaign spending limits on corporations, ruling they were intrusions on free speech.

The majority opinion in *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission* was clear: The First Amendment rights of corporations may not be abridged simply because they are corporations. But while corporations may be deemed to have some of the legal rights of people, the court has never held that corporations have any of the political rights of citizens.

This key distinction, read in harmony with existing law, provides ways to blunt the impact of the decision that gave corporations the right to spend unlimited sums of money on federal elections.

The effect of that decision has been pronounced: The Washington Post reported this month that through the end of January, 680 corporations had given nearly \$68 million to “super PACs” in this election cycle — 12 percent of the \$549 million raised by such groups. This figure does not include the untold amounts of “dark money” contributions to other groups that are not disclosed by the donor or the recipient.

Throughout *Citizens United*, the court described corporations as “associations of citizens”: “If the First Amendment has any force,” Justice Anthony M. Kennedy wrote, “it prohibits Congress from fining or jailing citizens, or associations of citizens, for simply engaging in political speech.” In other words, when it comes to political speech, which the court equated with political contributions and expenditures, the rights that citizens hold are not lost when they gather in corporate form.

Foreign nationals are another matter. They are forbidden by law from directly or indirectly making political contributions or financing certain election-related advertising known as independent expenditures and electioneering communications. Government contractors are also barred from making contributions.

Thus, when the court spoke of “associations of citizens” that have the right to participate in American elections, it can only have meant associations of American citizens who are allowed to contribute.

But many American corporations have shareholders who are foreigners or government contractors. These corporations are not associations of citizens who are allowed to contribute. They are an inseparable mix of citizens and noncitizens, or of citizens and federal contractors.

Since the court held that a corporation’s right to participate in elections flows from the collected rights of its individual shareholders to participate, it follows that limits on those individuals’ rights must also flow to the corporation.

You cannot have a right collectively that you do not have individually. Individual foreigners are barred from spending to sway elections; it defies logic to allow groups of foreigners, or foreigners in combination with American citizens, to fund political spending through corporations. If that were true, foreigners could easily evade the restriction by simply setting up shell corporations through which to funnel their contributions.

Arguably, then, for a corporation to make political contributions or expenditures legally, it may not have any shareholders who are foreigners or federal contractors. Corporations with easily identifiable shareholders could meet this

standard, but most publicly traded corporations probably could not.

This may sound like an extreme result, but it underscores how urgently policy makers need to examine these issues with an eye toward drawing acceptable lines. Perhaps we could require corporations that spend in federal elections to verify that the share of their foreign ownership is less than 20 percent, or some other threshold. The Federal Communications Commission, for example, bars companies that are more than 20 percent owned by foreign nationals from owning a broadcast license. At the moment, without a clarifying rule, the only standard that follows the law is a zero-tolerance standard.

If one thing is clear this election season, it is that many voters feel that their voices are not being heard. We should make sure that the voices of citizens are not being drowned out by corporate money. American billionaires already have an outsize influence on our elections. Let's not cede yet more power to foreign elites.

To that end, at the next public meeting of the Federal Election Commission, I will move to direct the commission's lawyers to provide us with options on how best to instruct corporate political spenders of their obligations under both Citizens United and statutory law. The American people deserve assurances from American corporations that they are not using the money of foreign shareholders to influence our elections.

Regardless of whether the perpetually deadlocked F.E.C. takes action, lawyers may wish to think twice before signing off on corporate political giving or spending that they cannot guarantee comes entirely from legal sources.

States can also take action, since Citizens United and federal law barring foreign money apply with equal force at the state level. States can require entities accepting political contributions from corporations in state and local races to make sure that those corporations are indeed associations of American citizens — and enforce the ban on foreign political spending against those that are not.

Polls show that overwhelming majorities of Americans reject the conclusions of Citizens United and want to see it overturned. But in the meantime, federal and state policy makers and authorities can at least ensure that corporations are not being

used as a front to allow foreign money to seep into our elections.

Ellen L. Weintraub is a member of the Federal Election Commission.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on Facebook and Twitter, and sign up for the Opinion Today newsletter.

A version of this op-ed appears in print on March 30, 2016, on page A21 of the New York edition with the headline: Taking On Citizens United.

© 2016 The New York Times Company