

The Voter

A Publication of the League of Women Voters of Seattle-King County

OCTOBER 2015

VOL. 57 No. 3

Why Are We Still Upset About Citizens United?

by Janet Winans, LWVWA Citizens United Committee

“[I]ndependent expenditures, including those made by corporations, do not give rise to corruption or the appearance of corruption. And the appearance of influence or access will not cause the electorate to lose faith in this democracy.”

- January 21, 2010, Justice Anthony Kennedy, Majority Opinion

Citizens United v. The Federal Election Commission

“Unlike a politician, who is expected to be appropriately responsive to the preferences of **supporters** [author’s emphasis,] a judge in deciding cases may not follow the preferences of his supporters or provide any special consideration to his campaign donors.”

- April 29, 2015 Chief Justice John Roberts, Majority Opinion

Williams-Yulee v. The Florida Bar

“The essential freedoms remain: private ownership, private profit, labor unions, collective bargaining, consumer choice, and a market economy in which competition largely determines price, quality and variety of the goods and services provided the consumer.”

- 1971 Soon to be Supreme Court Justice Lewis Powell

Confidential Memorandum: Attack of American Free Enterprise System

This month’s forum is intended to confront the contradictions in values between the quotes at left and our mission statement: “The League of Women Voters, a nonpartisan political organization, encourages the informed and active participation of citizens in government, works to increase understanding of major public policy issues, and influences public policy through education and advocacy.”

The subject is Money in Politics, one of two LWVUS studies being presented to members around the country. The studies were generated in response to the 2010 United States Supreme Court decision, *Citizens United v. the Federal Election Commission*. Our panel of committee members will discuss the effects of *Citizens United* on Washington State. For example: the initiative on labeling GMOs in foods. We will also introduce “Impact on Washington State of *Citizens United* Tool Kit” that we have developed. We believe it can provide an important resource to you, offering a larger perspective of just what *Citizens United* and the successive Supreme Court decisions have changed in our political and electoral processes as you look at it through the lens of its impact on Washington State. See time and location on back cover.

Ballots are coming! - in mid October.
Be sure to read about what’s on your ballot at:

VOTE411.ORG
ELECTION INFORMATION YOU NEED

Contents

President's Message	3
Calendar	4
Forum Schedule.....	5
Board Briefs.....	5
Committees.....	6
Action	7
Voter Service.....	8
Membership News.....	9
Features	
Transportation Committee Report.....	11
Committee Report	12
Book Review	14
Program	
Money In Politics	15
Unit Meetings.....	33
Board and Committee Contacts	35

Contact Information

President: Amanda Clark
The Voter Editor: Katie Dudley

League of Women Voters
of Seattle-King County
1620 18th Avenue, Suite 101
Seattle, WA 98122

Phone: 206-329-4848
info@seattlelwv.org
www.seattlelwv.org

Office Hours:
Weekdays, 9:30 a.m. – 3:30 p.m.

League of Women Voters of Washington
1402 Third Avenue, Suite 430
Seattle, WA 98101
206-622-8961
lwvwa@lwvwa.org
www.lwvwa.org

League of Women Voters of the United States
202-429-1965
lwv@lwv.org
www.lwv.org

Postal Regulations

The Voter is published monthly
except June and August by the League of
Women Voters of Seattle - King County,
1620 18th Ave, #101, Seattle, WA 98122.

Periodicals postage paid at
Seattle, WA.

Postmaster:
Send address changes to *The Voter*:

1620 18th Ave, Suite 101
Seattle, WA 98122
The Voter (ISSN 0888-8841)

Connecting with the Leadership

Elections, elections, elections! This is always the League's busiest time, and this year, election fever seems hotter than ever - and the League is busier than ever. Our September Forum was on ballot issues, with pro and con speakers for I-122, Honest Elections Seattle; Seattle Proposition 1, the Move Seattle transportation levy; and King County Proposition 1, Best Starts for Kids. All the speakers, pro and con, made their points well.

We are not holding a forum for Seattle City Council candidates this year. There are so many open races (nine!) that the logistics of organizing such a forum are too complicated. There are forums in some of the districts, and Town Hall is sponsoring several as well at different venues around town - check the calendar on our website for the latest details. Some of our units, including Mercer Island, West Seattle and South Seattle, have also organized forums.

The Education Committee is holding a forum for Seattle School Board candidates on Thursday, October 8, at the Seattle First Baptist Church, where our regular forums are.

We are also working on less visible but equally important voter services: we are registering as many new voters as we can. Connie Hellyer, our Voter Registration Coordinator, is a dynamo when it comes to registering voters. By the time you read this registration may be closed for this year's election, but registration is really a year-round job. If you want to help Connie and have some fun at the same time, please let her know.

Ballot summaries are late this year, but we are working hard to get them done. Our volunteer speakers will be busy this month, speaking to a number of groups on the meaning of the ballot issues and the pros and cons of each. As a volunteer activity, this can be fun and rewarding, particularly if you like public speaking. If you'd

like to join the Speaker's Bureau, please get in touch with Amelia Woolley.

Holding forums, making ballot issue endorsements, speaking before civic groups—this is the time of year we are most in the public eye, and it is a great time to recruit new members and re-energize our longtime members. Sometimes, new members or guests don't understand how the League operates, which may make them uncomfortable and reluctant to attend more meetings. Thanks to the Issaquah unit, here are some ideas for recruiting new members and keeping people interested. Not all the ideas are new, but they're worth repeating anyway:

- Have some informal coffees or lunches just for fun or to get acquainted, without specific goals.
- If your neighborhood has Welcome Wagon, have them include League information in their handouts (TRYs, Voter, membership packet, for example).
- Make an effort to contact someone who only came once: call her, offer to pick her up for an event, invite her individually to come to a gathering.
- Send regular emails. Be persistent, but don't nag. Eventually the person may come to a meeting and like what she finds. Sometimes, they may ask you to not send email - in that case, move on to the next.

If the unit leader has too much on her plate, perhaps another person can be the social secretary, or a committee can rotate the duties. New members can bring new ideas and re-energize the group.

On another note: We are now members of Amazon Smile. Amazon Smile is just like the regular Amazon—same way of shopping, same prod-

October

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
				1 Forum: Money in Politics 7:00 p.m.	2	3 Board Meeting 9:00 a.m.
4	5 Intern't'l Relat. Comm. 12:45 p.m. *Mt. Baker Ballot Issues Forum 7:00 p.m.	6	7 *John Burbank of EOI Tax Talk 7:00 p.m.	8 *Seattle School Board Candidate Forum 7:00 p.m.	9	10
11	12	13	14 *Mercer Island Candidates Forum 7:00 p.m.	15 Climate Change Comm. 10:00 a.m.	16	17
18	19	20 Transportation Comm. 10:00 a.m.	21	22 Education Comm. 11:00 a.m.	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31 Econ & Tax Comm. 11:30 a.m.
November 1	2	3	4	5	6	7 Board Meeting 9:00 a.m.

Units meet during shaded period

*For details on these events, please see the calendar on the website - www.seattlelww.org/calendar

OCTOBER

Forum: Money in Politics
Thursday, October 1
7:00 p.m.
Seattle First Baptist Church

Board Meeting
Saturday, October 3
9:00 a.m.
League Office

International Relations
Committee
Monday, October 5
12:45 p.m.
League Office

The Voter Deadline
Monday, October 5

Climate Change Committee
Thursday, October 15
10:00 a.m.
League Office

Transportation Committee
Tuesday, October 20
10:00 a.m.
League Office

Education Committee
Thursday, October 22
10:00 a.m.
League Office

Econ. & Tax. Committee
Saturday, October 31
11:30 a.m.
909 E. Newton #D-9, Seattle

NOVEMBER

The Voter Deadline
Monday, November 2

Forum: Money in Politics
Thursday, November 5
7:00 p.m.
Seattle First Baptist Church

Board Meeting
Saturday, November 7
9:00 a.m.
League Office

Forum Schedule

<p>Sept 10 - General Election</p> <p>Oct 1 - Money in Politics</p> <p>Nov 5 - Constitutional Amend. Study</p> <p>Jan 7 - Program Planning</p> <p>Feb 4 - Media's Role in Gov't</p> <p>Mar 3 - Carbon Pricing</p> <p>Apr 7 - Capital Punishment</p>

The League of Women Voters of Seattle-King County (LWVS-KC) presents a public forum most months between September and May, generally on the first Thursday of the month at 7:00 p.m. Most forums are held at the Seattle First Baptist Church, but occasionally they are scheduled at other locations and times. The tentative schedule of forums for 2015 appears at left; check *The Voter* each month or the LWVS-KC website, seattlelwv.org, for up-to-date information. Past forums are frequently televised and can be accessed from the resources page of the website.

Leadership continued:

ucts. The difference is that Amazon Smile donates 0.5% of the total cost of your purchases to the charity or nonprofit of your choice. That may not seem like a lot, but it all adds up. Our branch of the League is listed as League of Women Voters of Seattle Education Fund.

It's easy to sign up. Search for Amazon Smile and follow the directions. You will need a password and you will be asked to choose your charity, but from then on all your purchases will be through Amazon Smile – think of this as a small but helpful way that you can contribute to the league while doing your online shopping!



Amanda Clark
President

Diversity Policy

The League of Women Voters of Seattle-King County (LWVS-KC), in both its values and practices, affirms its beliefs and commitment to diversity and pluralism, which means there shall be no barriers to participation in any activity of the League on the basis of gender, race, creed, age, sexual orientation, national origin or disability.

LWVS-KC recognizes that diverse perspectives are important and necessary for responsible and representative decision-making. LWVS-KC subscribes to the belief that diversity and pluralism are fundamental to the values it upholds and that this inclusiveness enhances the organization's ability to respond more effectively to changing conditions and needs.

LWVS-KC affirms its commitment to reflecting the diversity of Americans in its membership, board, staff and programs.

Committees

Climate Change Committee

DATE: Thursday, October 15

TIME: 10:00 a.m.

PLACE: League Office

Economics and Taxation Committee

DATE: Saturday, October 31

TIME: 11:30 a.m.

PLACE: 909 E. Newton #D-9, Seattle

Education Committee

DATE: Thursday, October 22

TIME: 10:00 a.m.

PLACE: League Office

International Relations Committee

DATE: Monday, October 5

TIME: 12:45 – 2:45 p.m.

PLACE: League Office

Transportation Committee

DATE: Tuesday, October 20

TIME: 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

PLACE: League Office

Subject: Transportation Funding - what taxes are used and how are they allocated.

We encourage participation in our committees by all interested members. It's a great opportunity to meet and talk to community leaders, stakeholder organizations, and experts where you can have direct input on local issues that affect you.

Don't see a committee that covers your issue? Call the office and let us know. Sometimes people are working more informally without regularly scheduled meetings. If so, we may be able to help connect you with them or help you start your own.

Mission Statement

The League of Women Voters of Seattle-King County, a nonpartisan political organization, encourages informed and active participation in government, works to increase understanding of major public policy issues and influences public policy through education and advocacy.

Action

The Boards of the Leagues of Women Voters of Seattle-King County and Washington reviewed the measures on the ballot this fall. We have taken a position on four of them; see below. Other measures were not addressed as they fell under the following criteria: i. small number of voters covered or affected; ii. no League members or active unit in area affected; iii. too many measures; iv. time demands; and/or v. the lack of relevant LWV positions.

Oppose	State I-1366	Would reduce the state sales tax from 6.5% to 5.5% unless the legislature refers a constitutional amendment to the ballot requiring a 2/3 majority vote for all tax increases. We continue to oppose increasing the majority vote requirement for taxes. Moreover, this is an illegal attempt to amend the constitution via initiative - which is outside the scope of what may be done by an initiative.
Support	King County Best Starts for Kids Levy	Would provide intervention and prevention services for at-risk children and families. It would also restore some cuts made to public health programs, and would help build healthy communities. Currently, 75% of the county budget is spent on law enforcement and the courts. It is time to spend more money on support programs that can provide better alternatives and outcomes.
Oppose	Move Seattle Levy	Would provide funds for maintenance and repair and for improved safety conditions, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. It would also provide funds for congestion relief and for freight mobility. Unfortunately, there is a lack of transparency and accountability in how levy proceeds will be allocated.
Support	Seattle I-122	Would provide optional public financing for Seattle mayoral, council and city attorney candidates. Would also lower individual contribution caps and ban contributions from companies with large city contracts or which spend significant funds lobbying the city. The League has long supported public financing as the best long-term solution to the corrupting effects of money in politics.

For additional information about our endorsements, please see our website: www.seattlelwv.org.

Voter Service

2015 General Election Important Dates

Monday, October 5

Last day to register to vote via mail and online.

Last day to update/change address for current Washington registrations.

Tuesday, October 13

Ballots mailed. If you do not receive yours by October 17, contact the elections department at 206-296-8683 or 800-325-6165.

Monday, October 26

Last day for in-person registration (new to Washington only).

Tuesday, November 3

General Election – ballots must be postmarked or placed in an election drop box on or before this date.

2015 General Election Ballot Measures – Preliminary List

Statewide:

- Initiative 1366 - Decreases the sales tax rate unless the legislature refers a constitutional amendment requiring a two-thirds vote for tax increases to the ballot.
- Initiative 1401 – Toughens penalties for trafficking in rare animal species.
- 4 Advisory Votes - Oil spill prevention taxes, medical marijuana patient database fee, whether to repeal or maintain a gas tax increase of 11.9 cents, and whether to repeal or maintain the legislature's removal of tax preferences for certain manufacturers.
Advisory Votes do not enact or repeal legislation; they are mandated by a previous initiative requiring all state tax increases (including the renewal of taxes that are expiring) to be voted on.

King County:

- Charter Amendment 1 - To create a civilian office of law enforcement oversight and citizen advisory committee
- Proposition 1 – “Best Starts For Kids” - Providing prevention-oriented services early in childhood through age 24.

Seattle:

- Proposition 1 – “Move Seattle” transportation funding levy
- Initiative 122 – “Honest Elections Seattle” to provide publicly-financed elections and limit lobbying.

Additional measures include: Advisory votes on the sale of fireworks in Kent and Maple Valley and marijuana-related businesses in Federal Way; Normandy Park is voting on their property tax rate and Enumclaw has a transportation measure on the ballot; several fire water district measures as well as two parks and a water district have measures on the ballot.

Information about candidates and the issues is available on the League's Vote411.org website.



Getting Connected Membership News

WELCOME TO NEW MEMBERS:

Lynn McGlocklin grew up in the lower Yakima Valley on the Yakama Indian reservation. Although Lynn is not a Native American, her instincts are to protect the interests of Native Americans, seeing how their rights have been trampled upon.

For the last 48 years, Lynn and her husband lived in the Enatai area of South Bellevue where they raised their family. Her husband, Gary A. McGlocklin, was a professor at Bellevue Community College. He was head of the English Department and worked his last five years as Instructional Dean there. He survived for 25 years with Parkinson's Disease, the last ten of those years, retired. A deep brain stimulator implant gave him additional years of life with real quality, until his death in September 2014.

Lynn retired after 30 years as a pediatric nurse practitioner. She had also been a childbirth educator and community health nurse. Her interest in politics has shaped her choice of activities.

She volunteered with Washington Citizens' Action Network doorbelling and registering voters; with Washington Housewives for the ERA; and with Zero Population Growth. She is active in the United Church of Christ. Lynn says she reads incessantly and knitting helped her through her husband's illness; her children and grandchildren were also absolutely supportive. The League of Women Voters has always been an inspiration and source of information for her.

In addition, the following new members have joined in the last few months but we did not get a bio for them. Ruth Bernstein, Emily Bingham, Cheri Cornell, Elizabeth Gerrish, Margaret Laliberte, Elizabeth Larson, Faith Liikala, Phyllis Van Orden, Sheree Wen, and Marcia Zervis.

If we omitted you but you'd like to have a bio in a future *Voter*, please let us know. Welcome to League!

Dear Members,

October is probably one of our busiest months and when our work is most visible in the in the community, which makes it a great time to recruit new members! Please be sure to have membership brochures at all your events and ask people to join, sometimes people don't know that they can become a member too. You can also use the form on the following page. Help us grow the League and continue its mission by bringing in more passionate and interested people like yourselves.

Join the League!

Take part in informed discussions of the issues facing our communities. Members automatically receive the VOTER, either in print or electronically, for the latest updates on current studies and action, monthly forums, committee activities, voter registration, and other volunteer opportunities. In addition, members receive action alerts about legislation in Olympia and Washington, D.C., as well as publications from the state League.

League membership is open to men and women.

Name: _____

Address: _____

City/State/Zip: _____

Phone: _____ Email: _____

Dues and contributions:

- \$75 one year individual membership
- \$115 one year household membership
- \$40 low income
- \$35 student
- Enclosed is a contribution of \$ _____

Please make your check payable to LWVS-KC and return with this form or go online to www.seattlelwv.org/membership.

Membership dues and contributions are not tax deductible; however, eligible tax deductible contributions may be made to the LWVS-KC Education Fund.

- This is a gift membership from: _____

Thank you for supporting the work of the LWV!

Please return this form to:
 League of Women Voters of Seattle-King County
 1620 18th Avenue, Suite 100
 Seattle, WA 98122-7007



Celebrating 95 years of educating voters, improving elections, and making democracy work!

Features

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

by Janet Winans

Speakers: Chair, City Council Transportation Committee Tom Rasmussen; Elliot Helmbrecht, Campaign Manager, Let's Move Seattle; Andrew Glass-Hastings, Senior Transportation Advisor in the Mayor's Office; and Abigail Doerr, Legislative Aid to Councilmember Sally Bagshaw.

Subject: 2015 Proposition 1, Move Seattle Property Tax levy

Issues presented to the speakers by the LWV committee:

- The breadth of the levy in cost, time and choice of projects
- Infrastructural projects not covered by levy
- Transparency and accountability
- Regressive aspects of property tax
- The increasing total of levies
- Accountability for tallying all the projects and their funding
- Transparent asset management system
- The use of bonding for infrastructural projects

Andrew Glass-Hastings and Elliot Helmbrecht both served on the Bridging the Gap (BtG) levy project, so they brought historical knowledge of the development of the program and of the projects that have been accomplished.

Planning for the Move Seattle Levy included extensive public surveys to determine necessary projects. The team believes that the levy addresses each of the primary public demands:

- Safety, Maintenance, and Repair
- Congestion Relief
- Freight Mobility

Each category is allocated specific projects, goals and funding amounts.

Should Proposition 1 fail, the teams will go back to the drawing board and attempt to understand what aspects of the proposition voters rejected as they work to redo the proposals for the necessary funding. Such a delay will have its own costs.

BtG was directed at addressing the then-current issue of serious backlog in maintenance and repair. All of the listed projects were completed. Move Seattle includes such current projects as well as the major focus to create a much more livable city. It is a vision for the future, not just an effort to keep up with the present.

BtG assessed 0.36/\$1000 value property tax and collected \$365 million. Move Seattle will assess 0.62/\$1000 and is projected to collect \$930 million. The new levy will be at least twice as large as the retiring BtG levy.

The team addressed the issue of why, once again, it is the homeowner who is taxed for these projects instead of other entities. Tom Rasmussen said that property tax levies are essential to maintaining government services because of initiatives proposed by Tim Eyman and passed by voters. They ended the Motor Vehicle Excise Tax (MVET), and require any increase above 1% in property tax assessment to be approved by voters. Because automobile and housing prices rise with inflation, those taxes were sources that provided funds at about the rate of inflation. There are other sources of funding, for instance, commercial parking fees, impact fees, and sales tax, but those taxes are earmarked for matters other than maintaining and repairing roads and bridges. The sales tax is very volatile and responds to current economic conditions – when the market crashed in 2008, the recession resulted in a 30% decline in base taxes between 2008 and 2011.

Major construction projects such as the Magnolia Bridge are not included in the current levy

proposal because such projects should be and will be paid for by long term general obligation bonding against the predictable funds that come from the commercial parking tax and such things as tolls and over a longer period than the nine-year life of the levy.

The team recognizes that the property tax is a burden. However, transportation is the second-greatest cost after housing to the public. This levy for the future intends to decrease dependence on households for multiple cars, thus reducing the costs of car ownership to voters while providing acceptable and reliable alternate means of transportation and improved quality of life.

The Move Seattle projects are organized into particular categories:

- Repair and maintenance
- Congestion relief and safety
- Freight mobility

Many of the agencies and citizens' groups that focus on these issues were at the table as the initiative was planned and will continue to monitor the promises made. During the BtG administration, the Citizens Oversight Committee made numerous demands on the Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) to provide graphic models in order to monitor progress. Those methods of asset management will continue, allowing the public to watch almost-daily progress online at the SDOT web site. In addition to the costs of construction, the Asset Management Program includes lifetime costs as the asset is maintained.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING

by Rosalie McCreary

Editor's Note: this article is a continuation of the discussion in the March 2015 issue of the Voter.

Limitations on time and space as well as the International Relations Committee's choice for the Human Trafficking discussion material presented in the March *Voter* concentrated on current national, state and local information. Given the opportunity, the committee has chosen to present the international historical picture.

The Foreign Policy Association's 2014/15 Great Decisions article on Human Trafficking by Joseph Chamie admirably lays out a history of international cooperation among nations on this subject. In 1904, twelve countries ratified the International Agreement for the suppression of the White Slave Traffic. A coordinating authority for all information relating to the procurement of women and girls for immoral purposes was established. A 1910 protocol strengthened mechanisms and cooperation. In 1923 John D. Rockefeller financed the American Bureau of Social Hygiene, an early attempt to investigate and publicize human trafficking in 28 countries. Its final report, containing information from approximately 5,000 informants, is said today to be the first formal study of trafficking of women and children by an official organization.

In 1919, the League of Nations began the role of coordinating and addressing trafficking. In 1926, the League of Nations adopted a milestone Convention to Suppress the Slave Trade and Slavery, codifying definitions, rules and articles aimed at suppression of slavery. A 1930 convention concerning forced or compulsory labor banned debt bondage, serfdom, child servitude, and early servile marriage.

In 1945, the United Nations adopted and carried these actions forward, and in 1948, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights explicitly banned slavery, stating, "No one shall be held in slavery or servitude; slavery and the slave trade shall be prohibited in all their forms; (Article 4).

“Everyone has the right to work, to free choice of employment, to just and favorable conditions of work and to protection against unemployment” (Article 23(1)). “Marriage shall be entered into only with the free and full consent of the intending spouses” (Article 16(2)).

The United Nations continued to work on these issues in 1956 with further conventions, and in 2000, the Palermo Protocol was established and was implemented in 2003, with 164 countries having ratified it and 130 countries having enacted legislation criminalizing human trafficking. The Palermo Protocol is a global, legally binding instrument on human trafficking with the first agreed-upon definition of human trafficking. This definition includes “...exploitation of the prostitution of others or other forms of sexual exploitation, forced labor or services, slavery or practices similar to slavery, servitude or the removal of organs ... recruitment, transportation, transfer, harbouring or receipt of a child for the purpose of exploitation...” Another section lays out methods such as recruitment, transportation, transfer, harbouring or receipt of persons... threat or use of force, coercion, abduction, fraud, deception, abuse of power or vulnerability, or giving of payments or benefits to a person in control of the victim.

In 2010, the UN General Assembly renewed their commitment to the Palermo Protocol and adopted the United Nations Global Plan of Action to Combat Trafficking in Persons, committing nations to a multidisciplinary and integrated approach to end trafficking, with a strategy that respects human rights and nondiscrimination in the broader context of development, peace and security. The plan includes the “4 Ps”: 1) Prevention of trafficking in persons; 2) Protection and assistance to the victims of trafficking in persons; 3) Prosecution of crimes of trafficking in persons; and 4) Partnerships strengthening against trafficking in persons. The Plan established the UN Voluntary Trust Fund for Victims of Trafficking in Persons, especially women and children. The Plan requests the UN Secretary-General to strengthen the capacity of

the UN Office on Drugs and Crime to collect information and report biennially on patterns of trafficking in persons at the national, regional and international levels and share best practices and lessons learned from various initiatives and mechanisms.

The large migrations of humans across borders taking place right now is not human trafficking. These migrating individuals choose to leave one country for another for a variety of reasons. However, migrants sometimes encounter situations that do bring them into the trafficked category. Traffickers may take advantage of migrants’ lack of language in the new country and their helplessness and poverty to put them in situations of slavery of one kind or another, depending on their age and sex.

The issue of Human Trafficking is vast and troublesome, and in spite of the modern history of international and national entities working to end trafficking, it is an ongoing issue that requires constant monitoring and attention.

BOOK REVIEW by Vicky Downs

THE WOMAN BEHIND THE NEW DEAL: THE LIFE OF FRANCES PERKINS, FDR'S SECRETARY OF LABOR AND HIS MORAL CONSCIENCE

By Kristin Downey

Pulitzer Prize winning author Kristen Downey focuses on the first woman to become a cabinet secretary, Frances Perkins. Franklin Delano Roosevelt named Perkins the Secretary of Labor soon after Roosevelt took office as President in 1933. Madame Secretary knew exactly what she wanted to achieve: “a fundamental and radical restructuring of American society.”

Though a shy woman by nature, Perkins had developed leadership skills at Mount Holyoke College, where she was elected president of her senior class. She became a trusted volunteer and part-time worker in Jane Addams' Hull House, where she “immediately set about reinventing herself. She changed her name [from Fannie to Frances], her faith [from Congregational to Episcopalian], her political persuasion [to progressive] and impressed everyone with her energy and growing political savvy.”

Watching young women jump to their deaths in the 1911 Triangle Shirtwaist Factory fire was “without doubt [a] turning point [and it] reoriented her life.” Perkins wanted to write laws to help make factory workers safer. She knew that reform was necessary and that “venal politicians can sometimes be more useful than upstanding reformers” to achieve change.

Perkins did not have the usual attributes of powerful women: she was not classically beautiful, nor was she married to a powerful man. In fact, her mother counseled her to always wear a tri-cornered hat with the point over her brow in order to look ‘acceptable.’ She married government reformer Paul Wilson, but within a few years, he was diagnosed with Bipolar Disorder, lost his job, and needed expensive psychiatric care. Because of this, Frances needed to work.

Fortunately, Perkins had attributes that helped her succeed. When she watched people, she could figure out what made them tick. She

learned that “the way men were able to accept women in politics was to associate them with motherhood,” since all men seemed to respect their mothers. From that time on, Perkins wore only matronly clothes.

Perkins worked effectively to develop laws to protect factory workers, and came to the attention of New York Governor Al Smith, and later, to Governor Franklin Roosevelt. Smith and Roosevelt appreciated Perkins' deep understanding of the needs of laboring people. While FDR was a brilliant politician, Perkins realized that he knew almost nothing about poor people. During the Great Depression, she explained to the Governor why many men could not find work; she told him a wrenching story to make it vivid and then listed the specific items that needed to be in any legislation that would alleviate the problem. FDR trusted Perkins and usually did what she recommended.

Frances could make herself inconspicuous and let others take credit for her ideas, as long as it helped achieve her goals. To avoid jealousies among the hierarchically sensitive Cabinet wives, she arranged to have herself treated as a “wife” on state occasions. She also invited the wives to come visit her so she could tell them what was going on during Cabinet meetings, and no doubt made her own goals clear at the same time.

“It is a great historic irony that Frances is now virtually unknown,” since she is the woman responsible for Social Security, unemployment benefits, the forty-hour workweek and much more.

This book convinced me that Frances Perkins' photo should be on the twenty dollar bill, to become better known. After all, she did more for all of us than Andrew Jackson ever did.

Opinions in this review are personal and do not necessarily represent those of the League.

Program

LWVUS National Review:

Money in Politics



Members of the LWVUS MIP Committee:

Barbara Zia, Chair (LWVUS Board), Jeanne Brown (CA), Amy Fitzgerald (TN), Xandra Kayden (CA). Jeanne Logsdon (NM), Corlette Moore McCoy (MA), Susan Murnane (OH), George Schuhmann (KY), Lonni Skrentner, (MN) and Launa Zimmaro (MA).

Editor's note: The following articles are taken from the national League (LWVUS) materials prepared for the Money in Politics Review, which is asking the membership to consider: (1) the rights of individuals and organizations, under the First Amendment, to express their political views through independent expenditures and the finance of election campaign activities; and (2) how those rights, if any, should be protected and reconciled with the interests set out in the current League positions. There are many additional articles and resources which can be found on the LWVUS website and we encourage you to supplement your study with those materials. We are only reprinting a few due to limitations of space.

SHIFTS IN SUPREME COURT OPINION ABOUT MONEY IN POLITICS

Before 1970, campaign finance regulation was weak and ineffective, and the Supreme Court infrequently heard cases on it. The Federal Corrupt Practices Act of 1925 was the campaign finance reform act in effect when Congress enacted the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (FECA), but it was easily evaded and rarely enforced. It prohibited campaign contributions by corporations, and it required quarterly disclosure of contributions in excess of \$100 to multi-state candidate committees. In 1934, in *Burroughs v. US*, the Supreme Court sustained it against a claim that it violated Article 2 section 1 of the Constitution, which limited congressional authority over the appointment of presidential electors. The Court argued: "To say that Congress is without power to pass appropriate legislation to safeguard [presidential elections] from the improper use of money to influence the result is to deny to the nation in a vital particular the power of self-protection."¹ Justice White cited *Burroughs* in his dissent in *Buckley v. Valeo*.

The only other Supreme Court cases to consider campaign finance reform before 1970 involved the Taft Hartley Act, which also prohibited labor unions from making campaign contributions or expenditures. The Court avoided First Amendment issues in all of the cases. In 1948, in *US v. CIO*, the Court dismissed an indictment against union officials for advocating the election of a congressional candidate in a union publication directed at union members holding that the article was not a campaign expenditure within the meaning of the act.² On the other hand, in *US v. Automobile Workers*, the Court upheld an indictment charging union officials with making

prohibited campaign expenditures by unions when the expenditures paid for a commercial radio broadcast.³ FECA specifically authorized and regulated the "communication costs" both corporations and labor unions incurred in advising their members, officers, employees, and shareholders about candidates for electoral office.⁴

In 1972, in *Pipefitters v. US*, the Court reversed a conviction of union officers because of erroneous jury instructions.⁵ The indictment had charged that a PAC comprised solely of voluntary contributions made illegal campaign expenditures because the PAC was managed by union officials as part of the union's general business administration. The decision came down after enactment of the FECA in 1971, which specifically authorized union and corporate PACs.

Campaign finance reform was under consideration in Congress for many years. FECA was enacted in 1971, and its limitations became obvious during the 1972 presidential campaign. Consequently, the act was amended so extensively in 1974 that FECA as amended is generally considered the beginning of the modern campaign finance regime. FECA as amended in 1974 limited contributions and expenditures, imposed spending caps, created the Federal Elections Commission, and established the Presidential Public Financing System. Supreme Court decisions on FECA disclosed inconsistent rationales and shifting majorities.

Money and Speech

Enactment of FECA corresponded with a conservative resurgence, and in 1971 the American Enterprise Institute published a pamphlet by Yale law professor Ralph K. Winter that chal-

lenged campaign finance regulation as an infringement of free speech.⁶ Immediately after enactment of the 1974 amendments, Winter filed an expedited action seeking a declaratory judgment that most parts of FECA unconstitutionally infringed free speech rights guaranteed by the First Amendment. In addition to conservative Republican senator William Buckley, plaintiffs included the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) and liberal Democratic senator Eugene McCarthy. The ACLU argued for an absolutist interpretation of the First Amendment. McCarthy argued that he could not have successfully campaigned against President Lyndon Johnson and continuation of the Vietnam War in 1968 if campaign finance reform had been in existence; as an insurgent, he was dependent on a small number of big money supporters.⁷

First Amendment analysis typically asks three questions: is there a compelling governmental interest that justifies some limitation; is the limitation the least restrictive means of protecting that governmental interest; and does the limitation apply too broadly, to situations where the governmental interest is not in play?⁸ In *Buckley v. Valeo* (1975), the DC district court sitting en banc upheld FECA by a 6-2 majority, with a minor exception, on the grounds that “there is a ‘compelling governmental interest, both as to need and public perception of need, that justifies any incidental impact on First Amendment freedoms’ that results from the statutory limitations.” The DC district court also said: “when ‘speech’ and ‘non-speech elements are combined in the same course of conduct, a sufficiently important governmental interest in regulating the non-speech element can justify incidental limitations on First Amendment freedoms.”⁹

In 1976, the Supreme Court on appeal upheld FECA’s limitations on contributions, public financing, and disclosure provisions in *Buckley*. The contributions limitations were sustained on the grounds that preventing “corruption or the appearance of corruption” is a fundamental governmental interest that justifies some lim-

itations on First Amendment freedoms. However, the Court largely adopted Winter’s First Amendment analysis and struck down limitations on self-funding, finding no link between the spending of money by candidates themselves and “quid pro quo” corruption. It also struck down the regulation of uncoordinated independent expenditures because there is no “gift” to the candidate and therefore no “quid pro quo,” which effectively made independent expenditures constitutionally protected as a matter of law. The Court’s majority rejected the DC district court’s reliance on a lower standard of review when speech and non-speech elements are combined, saying: “Some forms of communication made possible by the giving and spending of money involve speech alone, some involve conduct primarily, and some involve a combination of the two. Yet this Court has never suggested that the dependence of a communication on the expenditure of money operates itself to introduce a non-speech element or to reduce the exacting scrutiny required by the First Amendment”¹⁰ The decision has come to stand for the notion that “money is speech.”

Corporations and the First Amendment

FECA continued the ban on campaign contributions by corporations and labor unions, including “express advocacy” expenditures, but contained an exception for media corporations.¹¹ News stories, commentaries, and editorials made in the regular course of a media corporation’s business are not express advocacy under FECA.

In 1986, in *FEC v. Massachusetts Citizens for Life* (MCFL), the Supreme Court created another exception for expenditures by nonprofit, non-stock corporations created for the purpose of political advocacy that do not engage in business activities. The Court noted that the justification for limiting corporate campaign contributions to separate PACS—concern over the “corrosive influence of concentrated corporate wealth” on the “marketplace of political ideas”—did not apply to corporations like MCFL. Where-

as corporate wealth accrued in the economic marketplace bears no relationship to popular acceptance of the political ideas promoted by a for-profit corporation, MCFL accepted no contributions from business corporations or unions and its resources directly reflected popular support for its ideas. Chief Justice Rehnquist and Justices White, Blackmun, and Stevens dissented, agreeing with precedents holding that the special benefits of the corporate structure compelled special regulation of corporations in the campaign finance area. They argued that one of the reasons for campaign finance regulation of corporations, the need to protect minority interests from coerced political speech, exists in MCFL as much as in for-profit corporations and should require that campaign spending occur through PACs as in all other corporations.¹²

The Supreme Court had previously undermined prohibitions against corporate spending in political campaigns in *1st National Bank of Boston v. Bellotti* (1978). Banks wanted to make expenditures advocating against a proposed constitutional amendment authorizing a state income tax despite a Massachusetts statute that prohibited corporate spending in referenda elections not “materially affecting any of the property, business, or assets of the corporation.” The Court overturned the statute, saying: “The proper question...is not whether corporations “have” First Amendment rights, and, if so, whether they are coextensive with those of natural persons. Instead, the question must be whether [the statute] abridges expression that the First Amendment was meant to protect.” In *Bellotti*, the Court expressly refrained from deciding whether for-profit corporations had a right to participate in the election of a candidate to public office.¹³

“Corruption” Justifying the Regulation of Speech

In 1990, the Supreme Court upheld a Michigan ban on corporate campaign expenditures in *Austin v. Michigan Chamber of Commerce* relying on a distortion rationale. The Michigan

Chamber of Commerce was a nonprofit corporation funded by annual dues from its members, most of which were for-profit business corporations. It maintained a well-funded PAC, but it wanted to make independent expenditures with its treasury funds, which was prohibited under Michigan law. The Court distinguished the Chamber of Commerce from MCFL because MCFL was more similar to a voluntary political association than a business firm, while the Chamber of Commerce was an association of for-profit business corporations.

In *Austin*, the Court relied on MCFL to argue that for-profit corporate campaign expenditures created a “different type of corruption in the political arena: the corrosive and distorting effect of immense aggregations of wealth that are accumulated with the help of the corporate form that have little or no correlation to the public’s support for the corporation’s political ideas... They reflect instead the economically motivated decisions of investors and customers.” The unfairness inherent in corporate campaign expenditures is compounded because business corporations receive significant economic benefits that other kinds of associations do not, “such as limited liability, perpetual life, and favorable treatment of the accumulation and distribution of assets – that enhance their ability to attract capital and deploy their resources in ways that maximize the return on their shareholders investments.” The Court found that the prohibition on corporate expenditures was narrowly tailored to further the government’s compelling state interest in preventing corruption because business corporations’ political speech was not banned but merely channeled into PACs.¹⁴

Austin was decided by a 6-3 majority. The three justices in minority were by far the youngest members of the Court and included Justices Scalia and Kennedy. Justice Stevens was in the majority. By 2009 all of the other members of the Court had been replaced. In 2010, *Citizens United v. FEC* explicitly overruled *Austin*.

In 2002 Congress passed a new, more comprehensive Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act (BCRA), also known as McCain-Feingold. The act regulated contributions to and the sources of expenditures by political parties for purposes other than the election of candidates to national office (soft money) and barred independent “electioneering communications” made shortly before elections.¹⁵ Senator Mitch McConnell immediately challenged the act in court, but in 2003, in *McConnell v. FEC* (2003), the Supreme Court upheld the key provisions of the BCRA in strong language. Justices Stevens and O’Connor spoke for the Court, recognizing “the Government’s interest in combating the appearance or perception of corruption engendered by large campaign contributions.” Furthermore, they said: “[i]n speaking of ‘improper influence’ and ‘opportunities for abuse’ in addition to ‘quid pro quo arrangements,’ we [have] recognized a concern not confined to bribery of public officials, but extending to the broader threat from politicians too compliant with the wishes of large contributors,” and “[t]ake away Congress’ authority to regulate the appearance of undue influence and ‘the cynical assumption that large donors call the tune could jeopardize the willingness of voters to take part in democratic governance.’”¹⁶

In 2005, President George Bush appointed John Roberts Chief Justice upon the death of Chief Justice William Rehnquist, and in 2006 Justice Samuel Alito replaced retiring Justice Sandra Day O’Connor. The change in personnel altered the ideological balance of the Court and created a new conservative majority hostile to campaign finance reform. In *Wisconsin Right to Life v. FEC* (2007), the Court found in a 5-4 opinion that the BCRA was unconstitutional to the extent that it prohibited as “electioneering communications” issue ads by Wisconsin Right to Life, a 501(c)(4) corporation that named candidates and were broadcast during the relevant period prior to an election.¹⁷

In *Citizens United v. FEC* (2010), the same 5-4 majority found that corporate funded express

advocacy was also protected speech under the First Amendment. Acknowledging that the government has a compelling interest in preventing corruption or the appearance of corruption, the majority stated that corruption could be found only in the case of a quid pro quo exchange and that cannot occur with an independent expenditure because there is no gift to the candidate. Furthermore, the Court specifically held that the government may only regulate the political speech of corporations by disclosure and disclaimer requirements; “it may not suppress that speech altogether...First Amendment protection extends to corporations.” In dissent, Justice Stevens argued that this was a radical departure from established law, noting that although corporations “make enormous contributions to our society, they are not actually members of it.” Stevens argued that the limitations on “electioneering communications” at issue were mere “time, place and manner restrictions.”¹⁸

In *McCutcheon v. FEC* (2014), the same 5-4 majority of the Court struck down the aggregate contribution limitations of BRCA so long as a donor kept contributions to individual candidates within the act’s limits. Reaffirming its view that the only permissible ground for limiting speech in the form of campaign contributions is quid pro quo corruption, the majority expressed confidence that limits on individual contributions were sufficient to protect against the danger of bribing an individual candidate or appearing to do so.¹⁹

The current 5-4 conservative majority on the Supreme Court has also rejected any argument that Congress may regulate campaign finance in order to ensure a level playing field for candidates and political interests. In *Davis v. FEC* (2008), they struck down the so-called Millionaire’s Amendment to BRCA, which raised contributions for candidates who faced self-funded opponents if the opponents’ self-funding exceeded a certain limit, on the grounds that it burdened the self-funded candidate’s speech.²⁰ In *Arizona Free Enterprise Club’s Freedom Club*

PAC v. Bennett (2011), they reaffirmed the constitutionality of public funding of political campaigns, but struck down an Arizona program that gave publicly funded candidates additional funds if expenditures by their privately funded opponent and independent expenditures on behalf of that opponent exceeded a certain level.²¹

Conclusion

Current Supreme Court precedents allow Congress to limit contributions to candidates because they may lead to quid pro quo corruption; and express advocacy for or against particular candidates and independent expenditures which are coordinated with candidate campaigns are considered functionally equivalent to direct contributions. Supreme Court precedents also allow disclaimer and disclosure rules. The opinions that have done the most damage to the campaign finance regulatory scheme have struck down the regulation of uncoordinated independent expenditures by corporations, especially non-profit corporations.

The court's decisions have revolved around three questions:

First, how does the First Amendment apply to the action in question?

Second, is the speaker entitled to First Amendment protection, and what level of scrutiny ought to apply to the regulation of the speech?

Third, what compelling government interests are implicated by campaign finance?

¹*Burroughs v. US*, 290 U.S. 534 (1934) at 545.

²*US v. CIO*, 335 US 106 (1948).

³*US v. Automobile Workers*, 352 U.S. 567 (1957).

⁴FECA defines "communication costs" as expenditures incurred by labor unions, other membership organizations, and corporations in connection with educating their members, shareholders, executives, administrative staff, and families on election issues.

⁵*Pipefitters v. US*, 407 U.S. 385.

⁶Ralph K. Winter, "Money, Politics and the First Amendment," in Howard R. Penniman and Ralph K Winter,

Campaign Finances: Two Views of the Political and Constitutional (Washington, D.C.: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1971); Ralph K. Winter, Jr., *Campaign Financing and Political Freedom* (Washington, D.C.: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1973).

⁷For in depth discussion of the history of campaign finance reform, including *Buckley v. Valeo*, see Robert E. Mutch, *Buying the Vote: A History of Campaign Finance Reform* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014). Mutch argues that the stark difference between the district court's decision and the Supreme Court's decision in *Buckley v. Valeo* reveals the abruptness of the ideological shift in judicial thinking.

⁸Lloyd Leonard, "The First Amendment" (Appendix B in *Money in Politics: Developing a Common Understanding to the Issues*, LWVUS, 2014).

⁹*Buckley v. Valeo*, 519 F.2d 821 (DCDC 1975).

¹⁰*Buckley v. Valeo*, 424 U.S. 1 (1976).

¹¹FECA defines express advocacy as political communications that explicitly advocate for the defeat or election of a clearly identified federal candidate.

¹²*FEC v. Massachusetts Citizens for Life*, 479 US 238 (1986), 257-59, 267-69..

¹³*Ist National Bank of Boston v. Bellotti*, 435 US 765 (1978), 768, 776, 787 fn 26. For an analysis of the history of corporate personhood in politics, see Leo e. Strine, Jr. and Nicholas Walter, "Originalist or Original: The Difficulties of Reconciling Citizens United with Corporate Law History," Discussion Paper 2015-2 or the Harvard Law School Program on Corporate Governance (2015), available from The Harvard John M. Olin Discussion Paper Series, http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2481061.

¹⁴*Austin v. Michigan Chamber of Commerce*, 494 US 652 (1990), 659-60. For additional discussion see Mutch, *Buying the Vote*, 157-61.

¹⁵FECA defines electioneering communications as broadcast, cable or satellite transmissions that refer to a clearly identified candidate, targeted to the relevant electorate and made within 30 days before a primary election or 60 days before a general election.

¹⁶*McConnell v. FEC*, 540 US 93 (2003), 143-44.

Wisconsin Right to Life v. FEC, 551 US 449 (2007).

¹⁸*Citizens United v. FEC*, 558 US 310 (2010), 318, 342. 394, 419.

¹⁹*McCutcheon v. FEC*, _US_; 134 S.Ct. 1434 (2014).

²⁰*Davis v. FEC*, 554 US 724 (2008).

²¹*Arizona Free Enterprise Club's Freedom Club PAC v. Bennett*, _US_, 131 S.Ct, 2806 (2011).

CORRUPTION AND RATIONALES FOR REGULATING CAMPAIGN FINANCE

Concern about political corruption has been a fundamental justification for campaign finance regulation for over 100 years. But it is relevant to point out that more than a century earlier, the Founders were very much concerned about limiting corruption when they debated about the best structure for a representative democracy. One study of how frequently the word, “corruption,” was mentioned in discourse among the Founders identified more than 300 instances, of which 6 referred to bribery. Over half of the cases involved institutional-level corruption of various kinds.¹ According to Zephyr Teachout, the Founders used the term “corruption” to mean “excessive private interests influencing the exercise of public power;”² ranging from when the political system operates to benefit private interests over the public interest to when a legislator accepts a bribe.

Historical evidence of different types of corruption is documented in the work of scholars across a wide spectrum.³ Legislation to ban direct corporate contributions to candidates (Tillman Act, 1907) and a number of laws to limit individual contributions to campaigns from the 1970s to the early 2000s attest to the significant concerns of voters and legislators about the power of money to influence elections and subsequent government policies and activities.

Various approaches to defining corruption and types or categories of corruption have been offered in Court decisions and analyzed in legal scholarship. For example, Teachout identified five types of corruption: criminal bribery, inequality, drowned voices, a dispirited public, and lack of integrity.⁴ Thomas Burke characterized three types: quid pro quo, monetary influence, and distortion.⁵ Yasmin Dawood consolidated the various arguments about corruption and campaign finance into two categories, those related to abuse of power and those related to violations of political equality, but she recognized that both types of rationales can be applied to

various corrupt activities.⁶

Corruption Defined in 1976-2010 Supreme Court Decisions

The nature of what constitutes corruption has been addressed in a number of Supreme Court decisions since *Buckley v. Valeo* (1976), which set out the quid pro quo standard to define corruption. The concept was broadened in Court decisions from the 1980s until 2010, as noted below, to incorporate concerns about corruption that distorted the political process through undue influence on and undue access to officeholders, resulting in failure to address issues of public concern. Attention to the broader definitions of corruption also focused on issues of trust in the system of representative democracy and political equality.

Quid Pro Quo Corruption

Quid pro quo corruption continues to be an obvious justification for restricting campaign contributions. “*Quid pro quo*” (in Latin, “this for that”) refers to an exchange between a candidate and donor in which the candidate receives a personal gain (a contribution for election or re-election to office) from the “sale” of public power (a vote or other action that benefits the donor).⁷ This is often framed as a conflict of interest because an officeholder has a duty to act in the best interests of constituents, which overrides any agreement to follow the preferences of a donor. The Supreme Court specifically mentioned *quid pro quo* corruption as well as the appearance of *quid pro quo* in the *Buckley v. Valeo* (1976) decision, which supported restrictions on direct campaign contributions but not on campaign expenditures.

It is worth noting here that no one disagrees that bribery as direct payment or in the guise of a campaign contribution is corruption, and such direct exchanges should not be permitted. Bribery violates a number of criminal statutes and is typically prosecuted when discovered.

Distortion of the Political Process

A broader interpretation of corruption that has been accepted in support of the regulation of campaign contributions in past Supreme Court cases is distortion of the political process. Starting with the ideal that public policies should reflect the public interest and that officeholders should represent the interests of their constituents and the broad national interest, distortion is understood as favoring the interests of large campaign contributors and independent spenders when they conflict with the public interest or the best interests of constituents. The Court found that distortion can occur through processes of undue influence on candidates and officeholders by large donors in the 1986 *FEC v. Massachusetts Citizens for Life* and 1990 *Austin v. Michigan Chamber of Commerce* decisions.⁸

In *McConnell v. FEC* (2003), the Court expanded the concept of undue influence to include undue access to officeholders by wealthy contributors as a legitimate threat to democratic political processes. The *McConnell* case was particularly notable in its documentation of evidence that wealthy donors did receive special access to influence officeholders. Over 100,000 pages of evidence included testimony from more than 200 current and former legislators, lobbyists, and business executives about the pernicious effects of large campaign donations. For example, the decision states that “[T]he record in the present case is replete with...examples of national party committees peddling access to federal candidates and officeholders in exchange for large soft-money donations...So pervasive is this practice that the six national party committees actually furnish their own menus of opportunities for access to would-be soft-money donors, with increased prices reflecting an increased level of access.”⁹ Further, “[I]mplicit (and, as the record shows, sometimes explicit) in the sale of access is the suggestion that money buys influence. It is no surprise then that purchasers of such access unabashedly admit that they are seeking to purchase just such influence. It is not unwarranted for Congress to conclude that the

selling of access gives rise to the appearance of corruption.”¹⁰

With the Supreme Court’s decision in *Citizens United v. FEC* (2010), which allowed for-profit and non-profit corporations to spend unlimited amounts so long as they were independent from candidates, distortion took on another meaning. With new Super PACS and others spending millions in a single election, the distortion of the election process itself became a significant concern. Many worried that unlimited independent spending was taking over – drowning out the voices of citizens and taking control of an election away from the candidates themselves.

Political Equality

Political equality is a fundamental value in American democracy and has been used as the basic foundation for concerns about undue influence and undue access. Richard Hasen has argued that citizens have the equal right to expect that their legislative representatives will be responsive to their needs and interests and not just those of large donors. Therefore, campaign contributions may be regulated if they are found to diminish these rights.¹¹ Arguments based exclusively upon political equality have not been supported by the Supreme Court in campaign finance cases, although they have been used as a secondary consideration, as in the *McConnell* case noted above.¹² In fact, even though contribution limits were upheld on other grounds, the Court explicitly rejected fairness as the compelling justification for contribution limits in the regularly cited quote in the *Buckley v. Valeo* decision: “[T]he concept that government may restrict the speech of some elements of our society in order to enhance the relative voice of others is wholly foreign to the First Amendment.”¹³ However, political equality continues to be offered by legal scholars and by others who claim that unlimited money in campaigns is just “not fair” to citizens who do not have the financial resources to make large contributions or expenditures.¹⁴

Narrowing Corruption Back to *Quid Pro Quo*

The current Supreme Court in its 5-4 decision in *Citizens United v. FEC* (2010) retreated to the *quid pro quo* definition of corruption as the only justification for restricting campaign contributions by corporations, unions, and other interest groups. The majority in the *Citizens United* decision rejected distortion as a compelling state interest to justify limits on the First Amendment by dismissing it as a problem that needed to be solved. What is “undue” influence and access cannot be determined by clear-cut guidelines because elections and political participation are inherently about influence and access, according to the Court’s majority.

The Court reaffirmed its position in the *McCutcheon v. FEC* (2014) decision, which stated that aggregate limits on an individual person’s campaign contributions also violated the First Amendment guarantee of free speech. The majority 5-4 opinion cited the *Citizens United* decision’s position that “[I]ngratiation and access...are not corruption...” They embody a central feature of democracy – that constituents support candidates who share their beliefs and interests, and candidates who are elected can be expected to be responsive to those concerns. Any regulation must instead target what we have called ‘quid pro quo’ corruption or its appearance.”¹⁵ The majority opinion further stated that “[S]pending large sums of money in connection with elections, but not in connection with an effort to control the exercise of an officeholder’s official duties, does not give rise to such quid pro quo corruption. Nor does the possibility that an individual who spends large sums may garner ‘influence over or access to’ elected officials or political parties.”¹⁶

On the other hand, in the 2014 *Williams-Yulee v. Florida Bar* decision, a different 5-4 majority¹⁷ indicated that judicial elections may have restrictions on campaign contributions because judges are held to a higher standard of independent judgment in deciding cases than elected officials who are expected to be responsive to their

supporters, including donors.

Arguments to Support Limits on Campaign Finance Since 2010

In response to *Citizens United* and subsequent decisions that narrowed the definition of corruption to *quid pro quo* bribery, three legal scholars (Lawrence Lessig, Robert C. Post, and Nicholas Stephanopoulos) have recently offered somewhat similar arguments for the compelling government interest in limiting money in campaigns. Their arguments are based upon criticisms of the current system of campaign financing and its negative consequences on officeholders, voters, and the general public. These scholars argue that the pernicious effects of unlimited campaign contributions and spending are powerful enough to overcome First Amendment free speech concerns.

Dependence Corruption

Lessig has popularized a new term, “dependence corruption,” to describe the corrupting influence of the current system of reciprocity between donors and officeholders through lobbyists as intermediaries.¹⁸ These are not corrupt individuals who are crassly engaging in bribery, but rather participants in a system of “dependence” wherein the officeholders need the funds to continue in office and the donors’ desire public policies favorable to their interests, whether ideological or economic. According to Lessig, lobbyists serve as the middlemen who distribute donor funds and communicate the preferences of donors to candidates. In an increasing number of cases, officeholders are motivated to become lobbyists once their public service is over. The compelling state interest in regulating campaign contributions is to limit, if not eliminate, the system of dependence between officeholders, lobbyists, and large donors.

Electoral Integrity

Robert Post’s argument identifies “electoral integrity” as the core value to be preserved by fostering public trust in democracy and confidence in elected officials.¹⁹ These fundamental

characteristics of representative democracy are weakened by unlimited money in elections. Post goes back to the *Buckley v. Valeo* (1976) decision as wrongly decided. His reasoning can be related to arguments about the appearance of *quid pro quo* corruption that would create distrust in the integrity of public officials and large donors, whether wealthy individuals, corporations, or interest groups. If voters believe that large campaign contributions shift an officeholder's votes away from supporting their interests, voters are less likely to vote and otherwise participate in the political process. To Post, preserving electoral integrity is a precursor principle that must exist in order for the First Amendment to flourish and thus provides the compelling state interest in regulating campaign finance.

Misalignment and Responsiveness to Large Donors

The third and final argument recently presented by Stephanopoulos makes the case against unlimited contributions because they create significant differences between elected officials and the constituencies they are elected to represent.²⁰ He asserts that government policies ought to reflect voters' preferences, but this relationship will not prevail if concentrated contributions skew candidates and elected representatives toward the interests of large donors and away from the interests of the voters in their districts. He distinguishes misalignment from other arguments for limiting contributions by individuals who are ideologically motivated toward extreme positions, but believes that contributions by political parties and by Political Action Committees are more likely to reflect centrist political philosophies and thus relate more closely to the median voter. Therefore, these contributing entities should have less regulation.²¹ This rationale has some similarities to Lessig's and Post's approaches but offers an additional analysis of differences among various types of donors in their propensity for misalignment.

C. Post, 2014. *Citizens Divided: Campaign Finance Reform and the Constitution*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

²Zephyr Teachout, 2014. *Corruption in America: From Benjamin Franklin's Snuff Box to Citizens United*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, p. 38.

³See, for example, Teachout, op. cit.; Robert E. Mutch, 2014. *Buying the Vote: A History of Campaign Finance Reform*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

⁴Zephyr Teachout, 2009. "The Anti-Corruption Principle." *Cornell Law Review* 94, 341.

⁵Thomas F. Burke, 1997. "The Concept of Corruption in Campaign Finance Law." *Constitutional Commentary* 14, 127.

⁶Yasmin Dawood, 2014. "Classifying Corruption." *Duke Journal of Constitutional Law and Public Policy* 9, 103.

⁷Id.

⁸The *Austin vs. Michigan Chamber of Commerce* decision, 494 U.S. 377 (1990), supported state prohibition of corporate funds being used as independent expenditures to support or oppose candidates for state office. It includes the frequently quoted statement that the state does have a compelling interest in controlling "the corrosive and distorting effects of immense aggregations of wealth that are accumulated with the help of the corporate form and that have little or no correlation to the public's support for the corporation's political ideas" (p. 659-660)

⁹*McConnell v. FEC*, 540 U.S. 93 (2003), pg. 41-42.

¹⁰Id., (44-45).

¹¹Richard L. Hasen, 2003. *The Supreme Court and Election Law: Judging Equality from Baker v. Carr to Bush v. Gore*. New York: New York University Press.

¹²See also Ch. 3, "Campaign Finance," pp. 71-76, in John Paul Stevens, 2014. *Six Amendments: How and Why We Should Change the Constitution*. New York. Little, Brown and Company.

¹³*Buckley v. Valeo*, 424 U.S.1, 48-49 (1976).

¹⁴For example, Cass R. Sunstein, 1994. "Political Equality and Unintended Consequences." *Columbia Law Journal* 94, 1390; Mark C. Alexander, 2005. "Money in Political Campaigns and Modern Vote Dilution." *Law & Inequality* 23, 239.

¹⁵*McCutcheon v. FEC*, 572 U.S. ____ (2), (2014).

¹⁶Id., (19).

¹⁷The majority in the *Citizens United* and *McCutcheon* cases was comprised of Chief Justice Roberts and judges Alito, Kennedy, Scalia, and Thomas. The majority in the *Williams-Yulee v. Florida Bar* case included Chief Justice Roberts and judges Breyer, Ginsberg, Kagan, and Sotomayor.

¹⁸Lawrence Lessig, 2011. *Republic Lost: How Money Corrupts Congress and a Plan to Stop It*. New York: Hatchette Publishing.

¹⁹Robert C. Post, 2014. *Citizens Divided: Campaign Finance Reform and the Constitution*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

²⁰Trevor Potter provided a similar argument in a recent

¹Lawrence Lessig, "Out-Posting Post," p. 101. In Robert

speech at the Safra Center for Ethics at Harvard University, entitled “The Changing Conception of Corruption.” See text at <http://www.campaignlegalcenter.org/news/blog/court-s-changing-conception-corruption>, accessed 5/11/2015.

²¹Nicholas O. Stephanopoulos, 2015. “Aligning Campaign Finance Law.” *Virginia Law Review* forthcoming.

LWV UPDATE ON CAMPAIGN FINANCE POSITION

For the 2014-2016 biennium, the LWVUS Board recommended and the June 2014 LWVUS Convention adopted a multi-part program including, “A review and update of the League position on campaign finance in light of forty years of changes since the Watergate reforms, in order to enhance member understanding of the new schemes and structures used to influence elections and erode protections against corruption in our political process, and to review possible responses to counter them in the current environment.”

After Convention 2014, we worked diligently to develop solid operational details for the committee. Our efforts led us to conclude that a gap exists in the LWV campaign finance position with regard to the First Amendment.

Adopted in 1974, the League’s campaign finance position focuses only on the financing of election campaigns as it relates to the democratic process, i.e., opportunities for undue influence, opportunities to ensure equity among candidates, protection of the public right to know and to fully participate. In 1976, the United States Supreme Court approached the question of financing of election campaigns from the point of view of what the money actually funds and the interests of donors, candidates and independent spenders in preserving their ability to express political views through the activities being financed.

The activities that the U.S. Supreme Court focused on largely involve free speech. Election campaigns develop messages for publication, from speeches and debates to paid advertising in various media. Money is required to coordinate the messaging and pay for the advertising. Under the Court’s approach, a system of campaign finance protects the rights of the individual candidate to disseminate her message as well as the rights of her donors to express their own views through her message -- and also protects the rights of other political actors who may wish to make election expenditures independent of the candidates or to advocate in support or opposition to particular public policy issues. To the Court, this campaign speech (as opposed to campaign finance) is central to American democracy and is what the First Amendment was designed to protect.

The League position, with its more collective approach, does not answer the question of whether all or some political activity constitutes free speech protected under the First Amendment. Because it does not address that question, the position does not balance the First Amendment interests of candidates, donors, independent spenders, and issue advocates against the interest in equitable competition among candidates for office, preventing undue influence, and enhancing voter participation.

For almost 40 years, the Supreme Court’s approach and the League’s approach intersected in one important aspect. Over that time, the Court recognized the risk that campaign contributions are corrupting or appear corrupting, especially if those contributions are very large or come from the general funds of corporations or unions. Historically, the League has been able to argue successfully through litigation and through legislative action that contribution limits and the exclusion of corporations from participating directly in the political process should be upheld. The position has also allowed us to support enforcement mechanisms and other reforms.

That changed with the *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission* decision. The Court drastically extended its views on free speech to allow unlimited independent spending in candidate elections by corporations and unions and entirely discounted any danger from any undue influence other than quid pro quo (“something for something”) corruption. That radically transformed the election landscape.

Proposed constitutional amendments in response to *Citizens United* and subsequent cases have focused on reversing the Court’s rulings that corporations have full political speech rights and that funding a political campaign is protected speech, and give Congress and the states the authority to regulate “the raising and spending of money by candidates and others to influence elections,” which the Court has deemed protected speech.

The League is pursuing a strategic, multi-dimensional approach at the federal and state levels to overcome or limit the Court’s decision in *Citizens United*. To date, the League has not supported or opposed particular legislation to amend the Constitution. Even putting aside the considerable practical barriers to ratifying an amendment as well as unintended consequences of the various proposed amendments, we believe that our current campaign finance position does not address First Amendment considerations.

To update the League position on campaign finance to include the First Amendment requires member understanding and agreement on these issues. The Money in Politics Committee has thus been tasked with undertaking member study and consensus, in addition to educating members and the public broadly about money in politics issues.

The League’s Position

Statement of Position on Campaign Finance, as Announced by National Board, January 1974 and Revised March 1982:

“The League of Women Voters of the United States believes that the methods of financing political campaigns should ensure the public’s right to know, combat corruption and undue influence, enable candidates to compete more equitably for public office and allow maximum citizen participation in the political process. *This position is applicable to all federal campaigns for public office — presidential and congressional, primaries as well as general elections. It also may be applied to state and local campaigns.*”

The League’s position on Campaign Finance reflects continuing concern for open and honest elections and for maximum citizen participation in the political process. The League’s campaign finance reform strategy has two tracks: 1) achieve incremental reforms where possible in the short term, and 2) build support for public financing as the best long-term solution.

To varying degrees, current law reflects some League goals: full and timely disclosure of campaign contributions and expenditures; one central committee to coordinate, control and report financial transactions for each candidate, party or other committee; an independent body to monitor and enforce the law; and the encouragement of broad-based contributions from citizens.

LWV Action on Money in Politics

Year in and year out since 1974, the League has fought for comprehensive campaign finance reform to address the abuses in the existing system, supporting bills that curbed special-interest contributions and provided public financing for candidates who accepted voluntary spending limits. The League has called for limits to PAC and large contributor donations, for closing the soft-money loophole. It also strongly supports a strong and effective Federal Election Commission.

The League continues to look for ways to limit the size and type of contributions from all sources as a means of combating undue influ-

ence in the election process. League action on this issue is built on a careful assessment of all proposed changes in campaign finance law. The League continues to assess proposals that allow challenger and incumbent candidates to compete more equitably. The League favors shortening the time period between primaries and general elections.

The League continues its support for comprehensive reform through multiple channels: lobbying, testimony, grassroots action, and work with the media. Members push for voluntary spending limits; public benefits, such as reduced-cost broadcasting and postal services, for participating candidates; aggregate limits on the total amounts candidates could receive in PAC and large individual contributions; and closing the loopholes that allow huge amounts of special-interest money to influence the system.

The League has also worked at the state level, which has contributed to real progress. Public financing, the “Clean Money Option,” has been adopted in several states, including Connecticut, Arizona, and Maine; other state reform efforts have made progress in Massachusetts and Vermont. Reform measures were on the 2000 ballot in Missouri and Oregon but fell short.

The League expended incredible effort in the five-year campaign for the McCain-Feingold-Shays-Meehan bill, which reached fruition when President Bush signed the legislation into law. The bill, known as the *Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act (BCRA)*, closed the most significant loopholes in campaign finance regulation – the “soft money” loophole that allowed unlimited corporate, union, and individual contributions, and the “sham” issue ad loophole that allowed undisclosed contributions to campaign advertising advocating particular candidates. The League was instrumental in developing this approach and pushing it – at the grassroots and in Congress – to final enactment.

In more recent Congresses, the League has lob-

bied actively for the passage of the “Disclose Act” which would close the disclosure loopholes that are allowing outside groups to make secret contributions in federal elections

The League has also used litigation strategies to advance and protect campaign finance reform by filing amicus curiae briefs, which are documents supporting one side or another in a court case without actually being party to the case, or joining in those of others. The League filed amicus briefs in both the *Citizens United v. FEC* and *McCutcheon v. FEC* cases in support of minority views on the Court.

Of course, litigation has recently overturned significant aspects of what has been achieved over the years with the *Citizens United v. FEC* case. The impact of *Citizens United* has dramatically changed the political landscape, and the League’s current work is directed towards finding feasible ways to correct the massive problems created by the decision. Further inroads were made by the *McCutcheon v. FEC* decision.

Why Money in Politics Matters to the League of Women Voters

Money in politics matters because the goal of campaigning is to convince voters, either for or against a candidate or issue. Thus, campaigning is ultimately about communication. In our modern age, this includes speech and money. It is very important that one continually keeps combining campaign, communication, free speech, and money in their thinking.

Purpose of a Campaign Finance System

A campaign finance system is intended to control and limit the money spent on election campaigns. Why do that? The first reason is to protect the right of voters to know who is spending money to influence their vote. The second reason is to prevent corruption. The only corruption that the current U.S. Supreme Court acknowledges is quid pro quo which, in the context of political campaign finance, refers to

an explicit agreement by a candidate or elected official to perform a specific act in exchange for something of value. But reformers believe that money in politics should be controlled because it may allow undue access or influence. Third, reformers want to control money out of a belief that unlimited spending gives an unfair advantage to candidates and spenders. Finally, there is a concern that the rise in spending corrupts representative government by downplaying the role of the voters and allowing for unfair competition, possibly leading to lower voter turnout.

Conclusion

Whatever else it may or may not have done, the United States Supreme Court's decisions in the 2010 *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission* and 2014 *McCutcheon, et al. v. FEC*

cases galvanized the campaign finance reform movement. Any education and discussion of these issues must attempt to be comprehensive, which means complex. The task of the Money in Politics Committee is to make the issues understandable to the members of LWV and all citizens. Work done by the 2012-2014 LWVUS Campaign Finance Task Force and LWV of Massachusetts Campaign Finance Study Committee (presented at the LWVUS Convention in June 2014) contributed immensely to this project.

For a more complete and detailed history of the League's activities in the area of campaign finance reform, consult "Representative Government" in Impact on Issues. Access at <http://lww.org/content/impact-issues>.



HISTORY OF CAMPAIGN FINANCE CHART

Campaign Finance Regulation, 1907-2014

Date and “Actor”	Regulation	Decision
Congress – 1907 Tillman Act	Bans contributions from national banks and corporations.	
Congress – 1910 Publicity Act	Requires post-election disclosure of contributions and expenditures by some party committees.	
Congress – 1911 Amendments to Publicity Act	Mandates disclosure for House and Senate campaigns and caps the amount they can spend.	
Congress – 1925 Federal Corrupt Practices Act	Passed in response to the Teapot Dome scandal, requiring quarterly disclosure reports by all multicandidate political committees and raising spending limits.	
Congress – 1939 Hatch Act	Extends prohibitions on political activity by federal civil service employees.	
Congress – 1940 Amendments to Hatch Act	Imposes the first contribution caps: \$5,000 per year on individual contributions to federal candidates and national party committees.	
Congress – 1947 Taft Hartley Act	Prohibits labor unions from making campaign contributions drawn from their general treasuries and also prohibits corporations and unions from making direct expenditures in connection with either primary or general campaigns for public office.	
Congress – 1971 Federal Elections Campaign Act (FECA)	Restricts campaign expenditures on media, limits candidate self-funding, and requires strict public disclosure of financial activity.	

Date and “Actor”	Regulation	Decision
1972 -74 Watergate Scandals	Major political scandals in the US during the 1970’s that began with a break-in of DNC headquarters and the resulting conspiracy and cover up that led to a constitutional crisis and the resignation of President Richard Nixon.	
Congress – 1974 FECA Amendments	Limits contributions to campaigns by individuals, parties, and political committees; imposes spending limits on presidential and congressional campaigns; strengthens disclosure requirements; and creates the Federal Election Commission to oversee compliance. The Amendments also create an opt-in public financing program for presidential campaigns.	
SCOTUS – 1976 <i>Buckley v. Valeo</i>		Upholds the disclosure requirements, voluntary presidential public financing, and contribution limitations. The Court determines that campaign expenditures require heightened First Amendment protection and strikes down the expenditure limits. The Court also finds that the method of appointing the FEC is constitutionally flawed, although the agency is quickly reconstituted through acceptable means.
SCOTUS – 1978 <i>First National Bank of Boston v. Bellotti</i>		Overturns prohibitions on corporate expenditures in issue elections (i.e. non-candidate campaigns such as initiative and referendums) as infringement of 1 st Amendment.
SCOTUS – 1990 <i>Austin v. Michigan Chamber of Commerce</i>		Upholds restrictions on corporate support or opposition to candidates based on the idea that “corporate wealth can unfairly influence elections.”

Date and “Actor”	Regulation	Decision
Congress – 2001 Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act (BCRA)	<p>Bans “soft money” in campaign financing by closing the soft money loophole which allowed corporations, unions and individuals to make huge campaign contributions to political parties.</p> <p>Bans “sham” issue ads which were campaign ads masquerading as lobbying on an issue.</p> <p>Prohibits corporations and unions from using general treasury funds to make electioneering communications within 30 days of a primary or 60 days of general election.</p> <p>Raises contribution limits for those running against a wealthy self-funded candidate.</p>	
SCOTUS – 2003 <i>McConnell v. Federal Election Commission</i>		<p>Upholds much of BRCA including that government has a legitimate interest in preventing both “actual corruption and the appearance of corruption that might result from those contributions.”</p> <p>Upholds limits on and regulation of electioneering communications.</p>
SCOTUS – 2007 <i>Wisconsin Right to Life v. Federal Election Commission</i>		<p>Overturns limits on electioneering communications by specific types of organizations.</p>
SCOTUS – 2008 <i>Davis v. Federal Election Commission</i>		<p>Overturns higher contribution limits for those opposing wealthy self-funded candidates, who are free to spend their own money without limit.</p>

Date and “Actor”	Regulation	Decision
SCOTUS – 2010 <i>Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission</i>		<p>Upholds disclosure requirements in elections.</p> <p>Affirms a corporation’s (all forms of corporations – including non-profit organizations, trade associations and for-profit multi-national corporations -- as well as labor unions) right to spend unlimited money independently in elections; the ban on direct corporate contributions to candidates remains.</p> <p>Overturns limits on issue ads in BCRA while upholding disclosure of issue ad spending.</p>
Various courts based on <i>Citizens United</i> decision		<p>Creates legal framework for Super PAC.</p> <p>Allows traditional PAC to merge with Super PAC – though PAC has contribution limits it can contribute directly to candidate.</p> <p>Creates a Hybrid PAC.</p>
SCOTUS – 2011 <i>McComish v. Bennett</i>		Overturns AZ law which granted additional public funds to a candidate being outspent by privately financed opponent or independent groups.
SCOTUS – 2014 <i>McCutcheon v. Federal Election Commission</i>		Overturns federal aggregate limits on campaign contributions to candidates, political parties and political committees.

With thanks to the Massachusetts and California Leagues for information contained in this chart.

Unit Meetings

(Unit times and locations subject to change; please verify with unit leader.)

Meetings are open to all.

Unit Leader email	Phone	Time	Location
-------------------	-------	------	----------

Monday, October 5

SOUTH SEATTLE - Marian Wolfe and Vivian Montoya

hedgwolfe@aol.com	206-763-9430	7:15 p.m.	Ballot Issues Forum
montoyaviv@gmail.com	206-695-2620		Mt. Baker Community Club 2811 Mt Rainier Dr S, Seattle

Thursday, October 8

MERCER ISLAND – Cynthia Howe

howe.john@comcast.net	206-236-0593	9:30 a.m.	Emmanuel Episcopal Church 4400 86th Ave SE, Mercer Island
-----------------------	--------------	-----------	--

ISSAQUAH – Margaret Austin

margaret.austin@comcast.net	425-392-5760	10:00 a.m.	Echo Room, Issaquah City Hall 130 East Sunset Way, Issaquah
-----------------------------	--------------	------------	--

UNIVERSITY HOUSE/WALLINGFORD

	206-329-4848	10:00 a.m.	University House, Auditorium 4400 Stone Way N, Seattle
--	--------------	------------	---

SOUTHEAST KING COUNTY/ENUMCLAW - Cathy Dormaier

clcathy@skynetbb.com	360-802-6799	11:30 a.m.	Frankie's Pizza 117 Roosevelt Ave, Enumclaw
----------------------	--------------	------------	--

NORTH CENTRAL – Jan Orlando

orlanre@aol.com	206-524-0936	2:00 p.m.	Hostess: Contact Unit Leader
-----------------	--------------	-----------	------------------------------

Monday, October 12

FIRST HILL – Adele Reynolds

adelereynolds@netscape.net	206-621-4867	10:00 a.m.	Horizon House, Forum & Social Room 900 University St., Seattle
----------------------------	--------------	------------	---

CAPITOL HILL/MONTLAKE –

	206-329-4848	7:15 p.m.	Hostess: Linnea Hirst 1602 E McGraw St., Seattle 206-322-3076
--	--------------	-----------	---

(Unit times and locations subject to change; please verify with unit leader.)

Unit Leader email	Phone	Time	Location
-------------------	-------	------	----------

Tuesday, October 13

BELLEVUE/KIRKLAND/REDMOND – Bonnie Rimawi

bonnierim@aol.com	425-820-7127	12:00 p.m.	Bellevue Library, Room 6 1111 110th Ave NE, Bellevue
-------------------	--------------	------------	---

WEST SEATTLE – Ethel Williams/Pat Lane

etheljw1@q.com	206-932-7887	1:00 p.m.	Daystar Retirement Village
plain11@juno.com	206-932-1578		2615 SW Barton, Seattle

Wednesday, October 14

NORTHEAST SEATTLE (formerly View Ridge) – Kay Beck

kbeck25@comcast.net	206-523-3127	12:45 p.m.	Brig Bldg. (6344) in Magnuson Park 7400 Sand Point Way NE, Seattle
---------------------	--------------	------------	---

Directions: Go into the Park through North entrance at 74th and drive EAST toward water. At the STOP sign, turn LEFT to park in front of the Brig, or RIGHT, for more parking. There will be a speaker.

QUEEN ANNE/MAGNOLIA/BALLARD EVENING - Kathy Pugh and Marlis Worthington

ckp1966@comcast.net	503-580-1240	7:30 p.m.	Hostess: Contact Unit Leaders
marliswrt@hotmail.com	206-283-7147		

Saturday, October 17

BALLARD/MAGNOLIA/QUEEN ANNE DAY – Alice Peterson

peterson-alice-jack@msn.com	206-524-5530	10:00 a.m.	Hosts: Kim & Joan Peterson 6537 Dibble Ave. NW, Seattle 206-789-7447
-----------------------------	--------------	------------	--

Wednesday, October 21

NORTH KING COUNTY – Toni Potter/Marjorie Hawkes

antoniapotter@comcast.net	206-365-8949	9:15 a.m.	Third Place Commons Mtg Room
mshawkesis@gmail.com	425-582-2481		17171 Bothell Way NE, Lake Forest Pk.

SOUTHWEST KING COUNTY – Mary Ehlers and Kathy Jorgensen

maryehlers@comcast.net	253-941-1930	7:00 p.m.	Foundation House
kjorgensen@juno.com	253-859-8349		32290 1st Ave S, Federal Way

Board & Committee Contacts

Executive Committee

2015-17	<i>President</i>	Amanda Clark	206-329-4848	president@seattlelwv.org
2015-16	<i>1st VP</i>	Ginna Owens	206-215-1408	ginnao@earthlink.net
2015-17	<i>2nd VP</i>	Janet Winans	206-550-6483	janetwinans@earthlink.net
2015-17	<i>Secretary</i>	Dora Taylor	206-329-4848	dora.taylor@seattlelwv.org
2014-16	<i>Treasurer</i>	Cindy Piennett	206-329-4848	cindypiennett@gmail.com

Directors

2014-16		Paneen Davidson	206-329-4848	paneenie@gmail.com
2015-17	<i>Voter Editor</i>	Katie Dudley	206-329-4848	votereditor@seattlelwv.org
2014-16	<i>Action</i>	Pat Griffith	206-285-2452	pgseattle@q.com
2014-16		Julie Anne Kempf	206-329-4848	julie@kempf.com
2015-17	<i>Membership</i>	Zara Kublin	206-329-4848	zara@seattlelwv.org
2014-16	<i>Voter Services</i>	Amelia Woolley	206-329-4848	voterservice@seattlelwv.org

Note: All board members listed above are also members of the Education Fund Board

Education Fund Officers

2015-17	<i>President</i>	Amanda Clark	206-329-4848	president@seattlelwv.org
2014-15	<i>1st VP</i>	Ginna Owens	206-329-4848	ginnao@earthlink.net
2014-15	<i>2nd VP</i>	Janet Winans	206-329-4848	janetwinans@earthlink.net
2015-17	<i>Secretary</i>	Dora Taylor	206-329-4848	dora.taylor@icloud.com
2014-15	<i>Treasurer</i>	TBD	206-329-4848	eftreasurer@seattlelwv.org

Nominating Committee

2015-16	<i>Chair</i>	Ellen Barton	206-329-4848	eeb0825@yahoo.com
2015-16		Carol Goldenberg	206-329-4848	carolsamgo1@gmail.com
2015-16		Susan Jones	206-329-4848	susan@monckjones.com

Note: Two board members will be appointed to serve on the nominating committee.

Off Board Positions

Campaign Finance	Jean Carlson	206-774-6649	carlson.jean@gmail.com
CIS Coordinator	Cynthia Howe	206-236-0593	howe.john@comcast.net

Committees

<i>Climate Change</i>	Judy Bevington		gbeving@eskimo.com
<i>Climate Change</i>	Raelene Gold		raelene@seanet.com
<i>Economics & Taxation</i>	Laura Weese		laura899@earthlink.net
<i>Education</i>	Joanna Cullen	206-329-8514	jfoxcullen@gmail.com
<i>International Relations</i>	Carol Goldenberg		carolsamgo1@gmail.com
<i>Social Justice</i>	Jayne Freitag	425-223-5827	mjafreitag@comcast.net
<i>Transportation</i>	Janet Winans	206-550-6483	janetwinans@earthlink.net
<i>Waterfront</i>	Nancy & Charles Bagley	206-282-1578	candnbagley@comcast.net

The League of Women Voters of Seattle-King County
1620 18th Ave, Suite 101
Seattle WA 98122

Periodicals Postage
Paid at Seattle, WA

Moving? Let us know!

Call the League office at (206) 329-4848 or
email info@seattlelwv.org

LWV SEATTLE-KING COUNTY:

Money in Politics - Washington's Experience

Thursday, October 1

6:30 p.m. - Doors open

7:00 p.m. - Forum begins

Seattle First Baptist Church

1111 Harvard Ave (at Seneca)

Seattle, WA

Accessible entrance on Harvard

This forum is free and open to the public.

Forum Info:

A presentation and discussion of the effects of Money in Politics in Washington and the changes since the Supreme Court decision in *Citizens United*.