The SpeechNow Case and the Real World of Campaign Finance

Stephen R. Weissman

Free Speech For People Issue Report 2016-02

October 2016



INTRODUCTION

In its *SpeechNow.org v. FEC* opinion, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit declared that, after the Supreme Court's ruling in *Citizens United v. FEC*, "independent expenditures [on behalf of candidates] do not corrupt or create the appearance of corruption." It invoked the Court's statement that "the absence of prearrangement and coordination of an expenditure with the candidate or his agent...alleviates the danger that the expenditures will be given as a *quid pro quo* for improper commitments from the candidate." The Court of Appeals then went on to make what it considered a logical deduction: "Given this analysis from *Citizens United*, we must conclude that the government has no anti-corruption interest in limiting *contributions* to an independent expenditure group." (Emphasis added).

In the real political world, however, as this study shows, top donors to super PACs and other independent spenders are not only contributing to these groups. They are simultaneously giving directly to the very candidates who benefit from their contributions to independent spending. The typical two-track donor supports multiple candidates in this fashion. Thus, while independent spending groups are legally restrained from coordinating with their beneficiaries, donors to such groups are legally permitted to financially coordinate with these same candidates within certain contribution limits. When donors amplify their legally limited direct contributions to candidates with unlimited indirect support via independent spending groups, an "anti-corruption interest in limiting contributions to an independent expenditure group" certainly arises. These unlimited donations intensify the dangers of *quid pro quo* corruption and its appearance that contribution limits were established to prevent.

METHODOLOGY OF STUDY

On behalf of Free Speech For People, I asked the Center for Responsive Politics – the highly respected source for federal campaign finance data – to provide information on the topranked 100 individual donors (not including family members) and 50 organizational donors to Super PACs and other independent groups supporting candidates during the 2014 and 2012 election cycles. Among these, I requested that the Center identify donors who contributed directly to a candidate as well as to an independent group spending on behalf of that candidate. After analyzing the data, I asked CRP to provide summary tables for each election cycle. In titling these tables, I adopt CRP's characterization of contributions to independent groups as "outside money" since they are outside the contribution limits imposed by campaign finance law.

FINDINGS

We began the universe of analysis with ranked lists of the top 100 individual donors to all independent spending groups for the 2014 and 2012 election cycles. (For 2014, several tied for 100th rank, so that universe actually included 103.) We found that in each of the cycles, there were 81 donors among the top ranked 100 (or 103) who contributed both directly to candidates and also to independent groups benefiting the same candidates that the donor supported directly. Tables 1 (for 2014) and 2 (for 2012) below list those 81 (out of 100/103) donors who "double-gave" in that fashion; the tables are sorted by donors' rank in giving to independent spending groups overall.

TABLE 1

TOP INDIVIDUAL DONORS OF OUTSIDE MONEY WHO CONTRIBUTED TO CANDIDATES AND TO INDEPENDENT GROUPS SPENDING ON BEHALF OF THE SAME CANDIDATES (2014 ELECTION CYCLE)

Donor	Outside Money Rank	Number of Candidates Aided	Total Direct Contributions to Candidates	Contribs to Indep. Groups Supporting Same Candidates	Indep. Groups Spending on Same Candidates
STEYER, THOMAS F	1	4	\$13,467	\$73,725,000	\$1,536,142
BLOOMBERG, MICHAEL R	2	9	\$59,800	\$21,629,929	\$2,666,603
SINGER, PAUL MR	3	33	\$141,350	\$9,872,324	\$11,676,773
MERCER, ROBERT L MR	4	37	\$143,000	\$8,820,000	\$16,658,810
EYCHANER, FRED	5	16	\$52,000	\$8,000,000	\$3,608,147
SIMONS, JAMES H	6	4	\$15,600	\$2,250,000	\$272,020
RICKETTS, J JOE	7	5	\$16,125	\$5,995,000	\$1,899,444
ADELSON, SHELDON	8	3	\$10,400	\$5,500,000	\$435,086
UIHLEIN, RICHARD E	9	18	\$88,600	\$1,685,000	\$3,654,431
MCNAIR, RON	10	4	\$10,400	\$1,500,000	\$4,177,321
SOROS, GEORGE	11	11	\$47,500	\$2,000,000	\$2,695,016
GRIFFIN, KENNETH MR	13	10	\$41,200	\$2,350,000	\$6,209,867
KLARMAN, SETH A	14	13	\$42,000	\$2,700,000	\$5,583,451
DAVIS JR, KENNETH W MR	15	1	\$2,600	\$2,892,495	\$145,469
MARCUS, GEORGE M	16	1	\$2,600	\$1,500,000	\$48,700
MCMAHON, LINDA MS	17	10	\$49,400	\$2,500,000	\$5,046,160
RICKETTS, MARLENE MS	18	1	\$5,200	\$2,700,000	\$247,499
STEPHENS, WARREN A	19	4	\$13,000	\$540,000	\$2,117,708
CHILDS, JOHN W MR	21	16	\$79,000	\$1,850,000	\$6,475,300
SUSSMAN, S DONALD	22	23	\$62,800	\$2,375,000	\$4,822,221
PERENCHIO, A JERROLD	24	1	\$5,200	\$2,000,000	\$1,175,752
GOLDMAN, AMY DR	25	13	\$32,000	\$1,499,759	\$4,790,172
JAMES, VIRGINIA	26	12	\$41,600	\$1,700,000	\$1,156,458
FIELER, SEAN M	28	2	\$10,400	\$385,946	\$40,652
STRYKER, JON L	30	1	\$2,600	\$400,000	\$1,408,652

EARHART,	ANNE G	31	10	\$40,000	\$800,000	\$4,398,899	
	NATHAN ALLEN	32	7	\$18,200	\$10,000	\$2,137,776	
LOEB, DAN		33	12	\$36,300	\$1,500,000	\$5,028,713	
*	ONALD MR	34	2	\$2,850	\$1,476,621	\$1,842,022	
PARKER, S		35	2	\$15,600	\$600,000	\$177,792	
*	EIN, JOSHUA	37	11	\$61,500	\$1,262,000	\$5,087,655	
	Z, BERNARD L	38	5	\$16,000	\$956,879	\$1,408,701	
MICHAELS		39	5	\$23,400	\$690,000	\$3,277,056	
LEE, BARB	•	40	9	\$45,800	\$570,000	\$3,011,930	
· ·	R, ELIZABETH	41	3	\$10,400	\$1,125,000	\$1,366,093	
ARNOLD, J		42	3	\$10,400	\$825,000	\$1,631,170	
	ON, JULIAN H JR	44	5	\$20,800	\$812,000	\$2,632,340	
DOERR, JO		47	2	\$5,100	\$750,000	\$2,328,543	
	S, DIANE MS	47	5	\$23,400	\$1,000,000	\$3,318,462	
LAND, PAU		52	2	\$10,400	\$950,000	\$1,045,430	
HAYDEN, J		53	26	\$108,000	\$907,255	\$4,635,398	
SIMONS, E		54	3	\$15,600	\$900,000	\$1,358,680	
	EIN, STEPHEN M	55	3	\$8,600	\$450,000	\$2,032,972	
BONDERM		56	9	\$39,300	\$585,000	\$6,754,340	
BRYAN, JC		57	5	\$21,600	\$580,000	\$4,080,138	
-	JR, CHARLES	59	5	\$23,400	\$199,375	\$316,621	
STRYKER,		61	1	\$2,600	\$500,000	\$421,202	
EGERMAN		62	4	\$15,600	\$125,000	\$2,818,075	
RYAN, VIN		63	8	\$30,600	\$745,000	\$2,001,484	
NAU, JOHN		64	3	\$9,582	\$325,000	\$2,369,911	
	RF, WILLIAM E	65	6	\$20,830	\$658,680	\$4,513,375	
BOIES, DA		66	2	\$7,800	\$500,000	\$50,021	
MOSTYN, A		66	1	\$2,600	\$750,000	\$31,409	
ASNESS, C		68	9	\$34,300	\$700,000	\$3,461,527	
KATZ, CAR		69	47	\$205,400	\$685,000	\$3,533,828	
	R, ALIDA R	70	5	\$20,800	\$550,000	\$2,480,596	
DEVOS, RI	CHARD M MR	71	12	\$87,800	\$650,000	\$6,212,727	
SHAW, DA		71	11	\$31,200	\$650,000	\$4,607,891	
ARNOTT, F	ROBERT D MR	73	15	\$83,100	\$645,000	\$2,680,370	
UIHLEIN, L		73	1	\$5,200	\$645,000	\$10,250	
PAUL, PET	ER T	75	2	\$10,400	\$617,000	\$1,192,879	
FIKES, LEE		76	5	\$6,600	\$260,000	\$1,004,286	
GILLIAM, R	NICHARD BAXTER	80	8	\$31,200	\$500,000	\$4,083,111	
MARCUS, I	MARVIN	81	5	\$21,800	\$580,500	\$3,040,424	
HUMPHRE	YS, DAVID C MR	82	5	\$18,200	\$500,000	\$3,127,690	
CURRY, RA	AVENEL B MR III	83	1	\$5,200	\$50,000	\$532,445	
SOROS, AI	NDREA	84	2	\$5,200	\$250,000	\$1,137,392	
BASS, ANN		85	2	\$6,200	\$490,000	\$2,328,543	
HIATT, ARI		86	20	\$59,700	\$432,000	\$4,555,881	
	CK, WINTHROP L	87	2	\$5,200	\$255,000	\$155,845	
	RICHARD T	88	1	\$500	\$500,000	\$15,097	

Median Average direct contribution pe		3	\$10,400	\$500,000	\$1,974,559
Average		8	\$30,120	\$2,474,046	\$2,710,033
SILLERMAN, ROBERT F X	94	14	\$36,400	\$500,000	\$1,974,559
ORR, JAMES	94	2	\$4,600	\$500,000	\$853,914
MURPHY, SYDNEY MRS	94	1	\$5,000	\$500,000	\$102,356
MURPHY, MIKE MR	94	1	\$5,000	\$500,000	\$102,356
MITCHELL, P MRS	94	3	\$10,300	\$500,000	\$2,674,259
KATZENBERG, JEFFREY	94	11	\$44,200	\$500,000	\$3,517,395
CHOUINARD, YVON	94	2	\$10,400	\$500,000	\$534,724
BERGMAN, JAY	93	1	\$2,600	\$5,000	\$53,000
WRIGHT, KAREN A MRS	92	10	\$43,900	\$510,000	\$5,995,364
POWELL JOBS, LAURENE	88	1	\$5,200	\$500,000	\$919,891

Source: Tables provided by the Center for Responsive Politics, October 7, 2016

TABLE 2

TOP INDIVIDUAL DONORS OF OUTSIDE MONEY WHO CONTRIBUTED TO CANDIDATES AND TO INDEPENDENT GROUPS SPENDING ON BEHALF OF THE SAME CANDIDATES (2012 ELECTION CYCLE)

Donor	Outside Money Rank	Number of Candidates Aided	Total Direct Contributions to Candidates	Contribs to Indep. Groups Supporting Same Candidates	Indep. Groups Spending on Same Candidates
ADELSON, SHELDON	1	14	\$53,000	\$36,580,000	\$40,947,078
ADELSON, MIRIAM DR	2	13	\$45,000	\$35,450,000	\$40,957,933
SIMMONS, HAROLD MR	3	6	\$17,500	\$24,510,000	\$34,345,251
PERRY, BOB MR	4	3	\$7,500	\$18,600,000	\$24,445,662
EYCHANER, FRED MR	5	12	\$52,600	\$9,500,000	\$2,738,682
BLOOMBERG, MICHAEL R	6	3	\$6,000	\$10,054,235	\$2,257,263
RICKETTS, J JOE	7	3	\$7,500	\$12,550,000	\$18,933,340
SIMONS, JAMES H	8	2	\$5,000	\$3,000,000	\$1,139,845
MERCER, ROBERT MR	9	11	\$43,500	\$5,209,354	\$27,198,549
THIEL, PETER MR	10	3	\$19,800	\$4,600,000	\$771,245
CHILDS, JOHN W MR	11	2	\$7,500	\$1,125,000	\$1,013,539
ROWLING, ROBERT B	12	3	\$12,500	\$3,600,000	\$21,831,032
GOLDMAN, AMY P DR	13	24	\$66,260	\$2,250,000	\$4,252,577
MOSTYN, STEVE	14	2	\$10,000	\$500,000	\$1,899,907
MCNAIR, ROBERT MR	15	3	\$12,500	\$3,100,000	\$24,445,662
RAMSEY, JOHN MR	16	2	\$5,000	\$3,155,933	\$172,577
KATZENBERG, JEFFREY	17	7	\$24,700	\$150,000	\$3,875,707
ELLISON, LAWRENCE	18	1	\$5,000	\$3,000,000	\$13,919,902
SINGER, PAUL	19	4	\$11,028	\$2,815,316	\$14,312,561
SOROS, GEORGE	20	4	\$17,000	\$775,000	\$1,595,383
FRIESS, FOSTER S	21	23	\$56,000	\$2,445,872	\$29,172,546
GRIFFIN, KENNETH C	22	3	\$11,500	\$2,550,000	\$21,831,032

DORE, WILLIAM J SR	23	2	\$7,500	\$2,495,000	\$6,755,015
STRYKER, JON	24	1	\$5,000	\$500,000	\$5,573
CRAFT, JOSEPH W III	25	4	\$27,500	\$2,250,000	\$22,258,971
ROBERTSON, JULIAN	25	1	\$5,000	\$2,250,000	\$13,919,902
HUNTSMAN, JON M SR	27	1	\$2,500	\$2,222,039	\$2,804,234
JACOBS, IRWIN MARK	28	2	\$7,500	\$100,000	\$425,035
COX CHAMBERS, ANNE	29	1	\$4,975	\$100,000	\$5,573
PERENCHIO, JERRY	29	3	\$12,500	\$2,100,000	\$23,290,072
ROBERTS, RICHARD H DR	31	2	\$10,000	\$1,000,000	\$20,485,838
HANEY, FRANKLIN L	32	1	\$5,000	\$1,000,000	\$287,500
UIHLEIN, RICHARD	33	24	\$84,900	\$1,715,000	\$8,938,093
HIATT, ARNOLD S	34	16	\$46,400	\$1,825,000	\$2,790,716
SHAW, DAVID E	35	6	\$20,000	\$450,000	\$2,629,942
EARHART, ANNE GETTY	36	2	\$7,500	\$250,000	\$8,079
ABRAHAM, S DANIEL	37	4	\$17,500	\$375,000	\$1,300,383
KOVNER, BRUCE	38	2	\$10,000	\$1,500,000	\$20,485,838
ANGELOS, PETER G	40	2	\$7,300	\$575,000	\$902,597
STIEFEL, BARBARA A	40	1	\$5,000	\$250,000	\$6,000
ESHELMAN, FRED	43	1	\$2,500	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000
HERZOG, STANLEY	43	2	\$2,600	\$250,000	\$1,106,725
JAMES, VIRGINIA	46	14	\$47,500	\$1,410,000	\$2,900,907
MCCORMACK, WINTHROP LAFLIN	47	2	\$10,000	\$500,000	\$1,289,810
GEIER, PHILIP H JR	48	3	\$10,000	\$1,350,000	\$20,913,777
SUSSMAN, S DONALD MR	48	5	\$12,250	\$1,250,000	\$155,429
KIMMEL, SIDNEY	50	1	\$5,000	\$250,000	\$64,064
MOSTYN, AMBER A	50	4	\$2,000	\$1,250,000	\$777,882
BOSARGE, WE	52	5	\$11,000	\$1,209,900	\$21,220,468
AHMED, KAREEM	53	3	\$15,000	\$200,000	\$1,295,383
SABAN, HAIM (MEMO)	55	4	\$17,500	\$826,040	\$1,675,800
RYAN, VINCENT J	56	15	\$49,400	\$455,000	\$1,961,952
ARNOTT, ROBERT D MR	57	5	\$22,500	\$1,075,000	\$5,495,359
DAVIS, JAMES S	57	1	\$5,000	\$1,000,000	\$13,919,902
SINQUEFIELD, REX	57	3	\$6,350	\$1,100,000	\$7,183,280
EGERMAN, PAUL	62	3	\$10,600	\$360,000	\$23,625
PICKENS, T BOONE	63	1	\$10,000	\$1,000,000	\$6,565,936
HAYDEN, JL	64	13	\$45,500	\$1,035,000	\$18,968,602
GILLIAM, RICHARD BAXTER	65	2	\$10,000	\$1,000,000	\$20,485,838
STEPHENS, JACKSON T JR	65	5	\$25,000	\$1,025,000	\$2,362,893
BOIES, DAVID L JR	68	1	\$2,500	\$10,000	\$64,064
SOROS, JONATHAN	69	4	\$10,500	\$250,000	\$788,702
BERGMAN, JAY	71	1	\$1,000	\$1,000,000	\$6,565,936
CONARD, EDWARD	71	1	\$5,000	\$1,000,000	\$13,919,902
FAISON, HENRY	71	2	\$3,000	\$1,000,000	\$6,993,875
HUGHES, B WAYNE SR	71	1	\$2,500	\$1,000,000	\$6,565,936
KLEINHEINZ, JOHN	71	1	\$5,000	\$1,000,000	\$13,919,902
· ·			•	* *	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

MARRIOTT, JW JR	71	1	\$4,130	\$1,000,000	\$13,919,902
· ·		ı		, , ,	
MARRIOTT, RICHARD	71	1	\$5,000	\$1,000,000	\$13,919,902
ORTENZIO, ROCCO	71	1	\$2,500	\$1,000,000	\$13,919,902
PAULSON, JOHN	71	1	\$5,000	\$1,000,000	\$13,919,902
RAGON, PHILLIP T	71	3	\$15,000	\$250,000	\$593,073
ST JOHN, EDWARD	71	1	\$5,000	\$1,000,000	\$13,919,902
TROUTT, KENNY MR	71	3	\$7,500	\$700,000	\$10,728,625
WEBSTER, STEVEN	71	1	\$5,000	\$1,000,000	\$13,919,902
SCHWARTZ, BERNARD L	94	3	\$12,500	\$658,884	\$298,073
HAMM, HAROLD	95	1	\$2,500	\$985,000	\$13,919,902
SILBERSTEIN, STEPHEN M	96	11	\$17,166	\$575,000	\$1,686,853
DESJARDINS, DAVID LAWRENCE	97	30	\$56,500	\$350,000	\$4,777,706
FINCH, LAWRENCE	97	1	\$5,000	\$850,000	\$13,919,902
HERRO, DAVID G	97	6	\$19,800	\$785,000	\$20,556,160
Average		5	\$15,979	\$2,974,538	\$9,728,917
Median		2	\$6,350	\$1,000,000	\$7,183,280
Average direct contribution pe	er candidat	e: \$3,318			

Source: Tables provided by the Center for Responsive Politics, October 7, 2016

As noted above, in each of the cycles there were 81 donors among the top ranked 100 donors of outside money who contributed both directly to candidates and to independent groups benefiting the same candidates. For example, Column 2 of Table 1 shows that two donors are ranked 47th among the top 100 outside money donors in the 2014 cycle. Column 1 identifies one of them as Ms. Diane Hendricks. Following her row, Column 3 indicates that she directly contributed to five federal candidates. Column 4 shows that she provided these five with \$23,400 (an average of \$4,680 per candidate). Column 5 notes that she gave \$1,000,000 to independent groups that spent funds on behalf of these five candidates (among others). Column 6 shows that these groups (which also amassed funds from other donors) spent \$3,318,462 on Ms. Hendricks' five candidates.

As Tables 1 and 2 show, the average number of candidates receiving such a combination of direct and indirect assistance was 8 per donor in the 2014 election cycle and 5 per donor in the 2012 one (the median numbers were 3 and 2). Donors' direct contributions to their preferred candidates averaged \$30,970 and \$15,979 respectively. As the box below each table indicates, the average donor directly contributed \$3,999 per favored candidate in 2014 and \$3,318 in 2012. In comparison, the maximum contribution a donor could make to a candidate in 2014 was \$2600 for one election and \$5,200 for two (general and primary); in 2012 it was \$2,500 and \$5,000.

The Tables show that each of these donors also supported their favorite candidates by contributing to independent groups that spent on these same candidates' behalf. In 2014, the donors contributed an average of \$2,474,046 to such groups; in 2012 they supplied an

average of \$2,974,538 (the median contributions were \$300,000 and \$1,000,000 respectively). From their total funds, these independent groups then spent an average of \$2,710,033 in 2014 and \$9,728,917 in 2012 on each donor's basket of preferred candidates.

Tables 3 and 4 below follow the same format as Tables 1 and 2. They chart by rank 31 of the largest 52 and 50 organizational donors to "outside" independent spending groups in each respective election cycle.

TABLE 3

TOP ORGANIZATIONAL DONORS OF OUTSIDE MONEY THAT CONTRIBUTED TO CANDIDATES AND TO INDEPENDENT GROUPS SPENDING ON BEHALF OF THE SAME CANDIDATES (2014 ELECTION CYCLE)

				Contribs to	·
Donor	Outside Money Rank	Number of Candidates Aided	Total Direct Contribs to Candidates	Indep. Groups Supporting Same	Indep. Groups Spending on Same Candidates
				Candidates	
National Education Assn	1	48	\$435,000	\$3,120,800	\$12,665,721
Carpenters & Joiners Union	3	35	\$312,500	\$10,155,980	\$8,243,510
National Assn of Realtors	4	25	\$238,090	\$10,066,929	\$10,340,685
American Fedn of St/Cnty/Munic Employees	6	66	\$595,500	\$7,785,989	\$15,580,010
AFL-CIO	7	35	\$162,499	\$8,272,729	\$5,157,936
Koch Industries	8	9	\$80,000	\$7,000,000	\$7,950,776
United Food & Commercial Workers Union	9	62	\$464,000	\$5,191,752	\$11,658,235
United Steelworkers	10	22	\$162,500	\$693,271	\$3,614,877
Laborers Union	11	57	\$463,500	\$3,193,308	\$9,744,860
American Federation of Teachers	12	49	\$484,000	\$4,683,162	\$9,215,835
American Federation of Govt Employees	13	44	\$290,000	\$3,902,755	\$7,478,579
National Nurses United	14	1	\$500	\$1,863,000	\$53,064
Alliance Resource Partners	15	3	\$25,000	\$2,300,000	\$3,304,286
Plumbers/Pipefitters Union	18	46	\$422,750	\$2,453,000	\$9,428,137
Office & Professional Employees Union	19	23	\$148,500	\$2,671,637	\$5,643,388
Service Employees International Union	21	45	\$417,250	\$1,960,547	\$8,089,126
National Assn of Letter Carriers	23	47	\$385,250	\$2,607,915	\$9,321,566
Intl Brotherhood of Electrical Workers	24	34	\$311,125	\$2,382,500	\$7,957,365
League of Conservation Voters	25	14	\$112,630	\$2,019,641	\$8,069,159
Operating Engineers Union	26	58	\$473,000	\$2,238,395	\$8,709,582
Communications Workers of America	27	38	\$272,500	\$776,467	\$5,398,561

Cooperative of American Physicians	28	2	\$5,000	\$2,040,628	\$91,597
Susan B Anthony List	32	18	\$120,176	\$1,796,178	\$110,550
American Assn for Justice	33	53	\$460,500	\$1,640,000	\$11,177,217
National Air Traffic Controllers Assn	35	49	\$345,000	\$1,372,879	\$8,884,589
Environment America	37	12	\$36,350	\$725,000	\$6,492,468
Teamsters Union	38	40	\$296,000	\$1,230,200	\$7,905,596
United Auto Workers	39	28	\$207,500	\$977,500	\$7,338,742
International Assn of Fire Fighters	45	39	\$348,500	\$791,008	\$7,085,453
Planned Parenthood	46	15	\$138,031	\$979,611	\$2,066,820
Chevron Corp	47	4	\$27,500	\$1,000,000	\$184,722
Average		33	\$265,827	\$3,157,832	\$7,063,323
Median		35	\$290,000	\$2,238,395	\$7,950,776

Average direct contribution per candidate: \$8,071

Source: Tables provided by the Center for Responsive Politics, October 7, 2016

TABLE 4

TOP ORGANIZATIONAL DONORS OF OUTSIDE MONEY THAT CONTRIBUTED TO CANDIDATES AND TO INDEPENDENT GROUPS SPENDILNG ON BEHALF OF THE SAME CANDIDATES (2012 ELECTION CYCLE)

Donor	Outside Money Rank	Number of Candidates Aided	Total Direct Contributions to Candidates	Contribs to Indep. Groups Supporting Same Candidates	Indep. Groups Spending on Same Candidates
United Auto Workers	1	20	\$154,000	\$1,378,000	\$4,365,794
Service Employees International Union	2	68	\$552,500	\$10,256,953	\$7,914,332
National Education Assn	3	3	\$24,000	\$10,031,151	\$141,983
American Fedn of St/Cnty/Munic Employees	6	95	\$871,500	\$6,780,238	\$10,949,499
AFL-CIO	7	52	\$229,000	\$7,871,861	\$3,480,365
Environment America	8	2	\$1,000	\$3,015,213	\$259,705
Carpenters & Joiners Union	9	33	\$267,500	\$4,187,064	\$4,534,953
American Federation of Teachers	10	64	\$675,000	\$4,344,366	\$7,426,330
United Food & Commercial Workers Union	11	73	\$609,000	\$5,042,147	\$8,157,062
Communications Workers of America	12	51	\$332,855	\$428,373	\$5,787,657
Laborers Union	14	44	\$285,500	\$2,349,984	\$5,080,862
Contran Corp	15	2	\$10,000	\$3,025,000	\$6,643,286
National Assn of Letter Carriers	16	52	\$440,500	\$3,523,242	\$5,997,842
Plumbers/Pipefitters Union	17	53	\$474,100	\$1,375,000	\$6,019,117
National Assn of Realtors	19	14	\$144,016	\$3,179,776	\$3,166,173
Intl Brotherhood of Electrical Workers	20	57	\$533,500	\$2,464,999	\$4,531,836

Cooperative of American Physicians	21	8	\$42,000	\$2,783,980	\$593,272
League of Conservation Voters	23	26	\$172,815	\$1,681,443	\$1,217,358
FreedomWorks	24	1	\$2,500	\$2,652,942	\$6,595
National Air Traffic Controllers Assn	29	37	\$217,000	\$1,015,667	\$5,225,958
Operating Engineers Union	30	68	\$615,600	\$2,225,978	\$6,249,270
Alliance Resource Partners	31	3	\$20,000	\$2,100,000	\$8,339,069
American Postal Workers Union	32	55	\$438,540	\$2,003,730	\$7,283,332
Susan B Anthony List	35	31	\$186,068	\$1,872,413	\$131,137
American Assn for Justice	36	35	\$323,000	\$1,554,000	\$6,134,181
Teamsters Union	38	34	\$265,500	\$1,535,100	\$6,025,535
United Steelworkers	40	51	\$393,500	\$1,292,500	\$3,984,610
Painters & Allied Trades Union	45	10	\$80,000	\$67,500	\$242,401
Office & Professional Employees Union	48	38	\$179,500	\$966,739	\$4,417,308
International Assn of Fire Fighters	49	44	\$379,000	\$974,969	\$5,559,370
UNITE HERE	50	24	\$165,766	\$1,020,000	\$2,944,753
Average		37	\$293,057	\$3,000,011	\$4,606,805
Median		37	\$265,500	\$2,225,978	\$5,080,862

Source: Tables provided by the Center for Responsive Politics, October 7, 2016

Average direct contribution per candidate: \$7,914

In each election cycle 31 of the top-ranked 50 donors of outside money contributed both directly to candidates and to independent groups benefiting the same candidates. As the tables show, the average number of candidates receiving such a combination of direct and indirect assistance was 33 per donor in 2014 and 37 in 2012 (median numbers were 35 and 37). Donor organizations' direct contributions to their preferred candidates averaged \$265,827 and \$293,057 respectively. As the box below each Table indicates, the average donor directly contributed \$8,071 per favored candidate in 2014 and \$7,914 in 2012. In comparison, in both cycles the maximum amount an organization could contribute to a candidate, through a regular PAC, was \$5,000 for one election and \$10,000 for two.

The Tables show that each of these donors also supported their favorite candidates by contributing to Super PACs and other independent groups that spent on these same candidates' behalf. These donors contributed an average of \$3,157,832 to such groups in 2014 and \$3,000,011 in 2012 (the medians were \$2,238,395 and \$2,225,978). From their total funds, these independent groups spent an average of \$7,063,323 in 2014 and \$4,606,805 in 2012 on each donor's basket of favored candidates.

Conclusion

In sum, the great majority of top individual and organizational donors to super PACs and other independent spenders were effectively double givers to preferred candidates. They directly funded their campaigns with, on average, contributions of thousands of dollars per candidate – amounts exceeding the legal maximums for donating to one of a candidate's two elections. Simultaneously, they donated, on average, millions of dollars to independent groups spending on behalf of the same basket of candidates, as well as others.

Critics of the *SpeechNow* ruling and its descendants have rightly argued that its analysis ignores the ability of contributors of unlimited funds to independent spending groups to communicate with candidates benefiting from those donations and thereby turns a blind eye to the danger of quid pro quo corruption and its appearance. The present study demonstrates that the majority of top donors to independent groups are doing more than talking to these candidates: they are also directly funding their campaigns at levels approaching the legal maxima.

About the Author

Stephen R. Weissman is a political scientist specializing in American Government who has taught at Fordham University, the University of Texas at Dallas and Howard University. As Legislative Representative for Public Citizen on Campaign Finance Reform (1998-2002) and Associate Director for Policy with the Campaign Finance Institute (2002-2009), he has conducted many studies and published reports, articles and book chapters concerning the campaign finance system. Among these were "BCRA and the 527 Groups," in Michael Malbin ed., *The Election After Reform* (Lanham, M.D.: Rowman and Littlefield, 2006) 79-111 (with Ruth Hassan) and "Nonprofit Interest Groups' Election Activities and Federal Campaign Finance Policy," *The Exempt Organizations Tax Review* (October 2006) 21-38 (with Kara Ryan). Weissman had first-hand experience with Congress as Staff Associate and Staff Director of the House Foreign Affairs Committee's Subcommittee on Africa from 1979-1991.

About Free Speech For People

Free Speech For People works to renew our democracy and our United States Constitution for we the people. Founded on the day of the Supreme Court's *Citizens United* ruling, Free Speech For People envisions a democratic process in which all people have an equal voice and an equal vote. We educate, we organize, we fight in the courts, and we press for a constitutional amendment to reclaim our democracy. To learn more, please visit our website: www.freespeechforpeople.org.