

CONSOLIDATED OPPOSITION BRIEF FOR PLAINTIFFS

MASTER TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. TITLE I

| | | | |
|----|-------------------------------|----------------|------|
| A. | McConnell Omnibus | McConnell | 1-31 |
| B. | Republican National Committee | RNC | 1-48 |
| C. | California Political Parties | CDP/CRP | 1-24 |
| D. | Thompson | Thompson | 1-7 |
| E. | Madison Center | Madison Center | 1 |

II. TITLE II

| | | | |
|----|------------------------------|----------------|-------|
| A. | McConnell Omnibus | McConnell | 32-57 |
| B. | National Rifle Association | NRA | 1-25 |
| C. | ACLU | ACLU | 1-10 |
| D. | Chamber of Commerce | Chamber/NAM | 1-10 |
| E. | AFL-CIO | AFL-CIO | 1-10 |
| F. | California Political Parties | CDP/CRP | 25 |
| G. | Madison Center | Madison Center | 2-12 |

III. TITLE III

| | | | |
|----|-------------------------------|-----------|-------|
| A. | McConnell Omnibus | McConnell | 58-61 |
| B. | Republican National Committee | RNC | 49-50 |
| C. | Thompson | Thompson | 8-10 |

IV. TITLE V

| | | | |
|----|-------------------|-----------|-------|
| A. | McConnell Omnibus | McConnell | 62-63 |
|----|-------------------|-----------|-------|

Total pages: 215 (205 allocated to the McConnell Group by order of October 15, 2002;
10 to the Thompson plaintiffs by order of October 29, 2002)

McCONNELL OMNIBUS BRIEF TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| I. TITLE I OF BCRA IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL..... | 3 |
| A. Title I Violates Article I, Section 4, And The Tenth Amendment Of The Constitution..... | 4 |
| B. Title I Violates The First Amendment Rights Of Free Speech And Free Association And The Fifth Amendment Right Of Equal Protection. | 14 |
| 1. Title I Burdens Significant Speech And Associational Rights. | 14 |
| 2. Title I Should Be Subject To Strict Scrutiny. | 17 |
| 3. Title I Is Not Sufficiently Tailored To Prevent Actual Corruption Or The Appearance Of Corruption..... | 19 |
| 4. Title I Violates Core First And Fifth Amendment Rights By Discriminating Against Political Parties..... | 29 |
| II. TITLE II OF BCRA IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL..... | 32 |
| A. BCRA's Electioneering Communications Provisions Are Invalid..... | 32 |
| 1. BCRA's Electioneering Provisions Flatly Contradict <i>Buckley</i> And Its Progeny..... | 32 |
| (a) <i>Buckley</i> Condemns Both The Principal And Fallback Definitions Of "Electioneering Communications." | 32 |
| (i) <i>Buckley</i> Announced A Substantive Rule Of First Amendment Law That Controls Here..... | 33 |
| (ii) The Supreme Court Confirmed In <i>MCFL</i> That The Government May Not Regulate Political Speech Beyond Express Advocacy. | 38 |
| (iii) The Uniform Rulings Of The Federal Courts Make It Abundantly Clear That Only Express Advocacy May Be Regulated. | 39 |
| (b) The Electioneering Communications Provisions Of BCRA Unconstitutionally Apply To All Corporations, In Clear Contravention of <i>MCFL</i> | 41 |

| | | |
|------|---|----|
| 2. | Wholly Apart From <i>Buckley</i> And Its Progeny, BCRA's Electioneering Communications Provisions Must Be Invalidated..... | 42 |
| | (a) The Definition of "Electioneering Communications" Is Patently Overbroad..... | 42 |
| | (b) BCRA's "Fallback" Definition of Electioneering Communications Is Unconstitutionally Vague..... | 48 |
| | (c) BCRA Violates the First Amendment And The Equal Protection Component Of The Due Process Clause Of The Fifth Amendment By Discriminating Against Broadcast, Cable, And Satellite Media..... | 50 |
| B. | BCRA's Coordination Provisions Are Unconstitutional..... | 52 |
| C. | By Requiring Political Parties To Choose Between Independent And Coordinated Expenditures, Section 213 Of BCRA Violates The First Amendment..... | 55 |
| III. | TITLE III OF BCRA IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL..... | 58 |
| A. | By Conditioning The Cost Of Advertisements On Their Viewpoint, Section 305 Of BCRA Violates The First Amendment..... | 58 |
| B. | By Barring All Minors From Making Any Contributions To Candidates Or Political Party Committees, Section 318 Of BCRA Violates The First Amendment Right Of Free Speech And The Fifth Amendment Right Of Equal Protection..... | 59 |
| IV. | TITLE V OF BCRA IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL..... | 62 |
| A. | By Imposing Onerous Recordkeeping And Disclosure Obligations On Broadcasters, Section 504 Of BCRA Is Unconstitutional..... | 62 |

RNC TABLE OF CONTENTS

RNC Page

FACTUAL BACKGROUND1

TITLE I ARGUMENT15

I. TITLE I EXCEEDS CONGRESS’ DELEGATED LAWMAKING POWER AND VIOLATES FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF FEDERALISM.....17

 A. Defendants Fail to Show that Section 323(a) Is Within Congress’ Purview.....18

 B. Defendants Fail to Show that Section 323(b) Is Within Congress’ Purview.....20

II. TITLE I SPLINTERS THE VARIOUS ELEMENTS OF THE POLITICAL PARTY APPARATUS AND THEREBY INFRINGES THE FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHT OF ASSOCIATION.22

 A. Title I’s Associational Restrictions Are Subject to Strict Scrutiny.....22

 B. Title I’s Associational Restrictions Cannot Satisfy Any Form of Heightened Scrutiny.....24

 1. Defendants’ Claim that Congress’ “Prophylactic” Regulation in Title I Is Entitled to “Deference” Is Unfounded.25

 2. Defendants Have Not Demonstrated Any Overriding Government Interest.....26

 3. Far from Being Even Minimally Tailored, Title I’s Restrictions Are Grossly Overbroad.29

 4. Title I Is Fatally Underinclusive and Will Be Wholly Ineffective In Accomplishing Congress’ Asserted Purpose.31

III. TITLE I BROADLY PROHIBITS POLITICAL PARTIES, THEIR AGENTS, AND FEDERAL CANDIDATES AND OFFICEHOLDERS FROM “SOLICIT[ING]” FUNDS FOR POLITICAL CAUSES AND THEREBY INFRINGES THE FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHT OF FREE SPEECH.34

 A. Title I’s Solicitation Restrictions Are Subject to Strict Scrutiny.....34

 B. Title I’s Solicitation Restrictions Cannot Satisfy Any Form of Heightened Scrutiny.35

IV. *BUCKLEY* AND ITS PROGENY CANNOT SALVAGE TITLE I.....35

| | | |
|----|--|----|
| A. | <i>Buckley</i> Cannot Justify Section 323(a)'s Blanket Ban on National Party "Soft Money." | 35 |
| B. | <i>Buckley</i> Cannot Justify Section 323(b)'s Spending Restrictions on State Parties..... | 39 |
| C. | Title I Undermines Effective Political Advocacy..... | 40 |
| V. | TITLE I SUBJECTS POLITICAL PARTIES TO UNIQUE DISABILITIES NOT IMPOSED ON SPECIAL INTEREST GROUPS AND THEREBY VIOLATES THE EQUAL PROTECTION COMPONENTS OF THE FIRST AND FIFTH AMENDMENTS. | 41 |
| A. | Title I Subjects Political Parties to Onerous Burdens Not Imposed on Special Interest Groups..... | 41 |
| B. | Title I's Differential Treatment of Political Parties and Special Interest Groups Is Subject to Strict Scrutiny..... | 44 |
| C. | Title I's Differential Treatment of Political Parties and Special Interest Groups Cannot Satisfy Any Form of Heightened Scrutiny. | 44 |
| 1. | By Subjecting Political Parties to Unique Speech Disabilities Not Imposed on Interest Groups, Title I Runs Counter to Both Precedent and Logic..... | 44 |
| 2. | Title I's Differential Treatment of Parties and Special Interest Groups Will Make Matters Worse, Not Better. | 47 |
| | TITLE I CONCLUSION AND REMEDY | 48 |
| | RNC TITLE III OPPOSITION..... | 49 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE I

| | | |
|------|---|------------|
| I. | INTRODUCTION OF CALIFORNIA PARTY PLAINTIFFS | CDP/CRP 1 |
| II. | DEFENDANTS HAVE MISCHARACTERIZED BOTH THE "PROBLEM" AND THE IMPACT OF BCRA UPON STATE AND LOCAL POLITICAL PARTIES | CDP/CRP 4 |
| A. | Defendants Have Not Demonstrated A State Soft Money Problem | CDP/CRP 4 |
| B. | Defendants Inaccurately Minimize The Impact Upon State Elections | CDP/CRP 6 |
| III. | CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY FOR BCRA'S EXTENSIVE INTRUSION UPON STATE ELECTIONS HAS NOT BEEN DEMONSTRATED | CDP/CRP 11 |
| A. | The Elections Clause Does Not Authorize BCRA's Interference With State Sovereignty | CDP/CRP 11 |
| B. | BCRA's "Soft Money" Provisions Are Not Sufficiently Tailored | CDP/CRP 14 |
| C. | BCRA Will Reduce The Ability of The State and Local Parties To Effectively Participate in The Political Process | CDP/CRP 18 |
| IV. | DEFENDANTS HAVE FAILED TO SHOW ANY MEANINGFUL EFFORT TO TAILOR OTHER PROVISIONS OF BCRA | CDP/CRP 20 |
| A. | BCRA Prohibitions on Transfers and Joint Fundraising Cannot Stand | CDP/CRP 20 |
| B. | BCRA's Prohibitions on Fundraising By Officers and Candidates Are Constitutionally Infirm | CDP/CRP 21 |
| C. | BCRA's Prohibitions on Contributions to, and Solicitations For, Tax Exempt Organizations Are Unconstitutional | CDP/CRP 23 |

TITLE II

| | | |
|----|---|------------|
| I. | THE "CHOICES" FORCED ON POLITICAL PARTIES UNDER SECTION 213 ARE UNCONSTITUTIONAL | CDP/CRP 25 |
|----|---|------------|

**THOMPSON PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION BRIEF
CONTENTS**

Thompson Plaintiffs' Opposition Brief: Title I Issues Thompson 1

 ARGUMENT I. Section 323(e)(1) et seq. of the BCRA Violates the Equal
 Protection Clause of the 5th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution in
 that it Causes Invidious Discrimination Against All Economically
 Challenged Candidates and Voters. Thompson 1

 ARGUMENT II. The BCRA is Violative of Plaintiffs' First Amendment Rights of
 Speech and AssociationThompson 7

Title III Issues..... Thompson 8

 ARGUMENT Section 318 of the BCRA, Prohibiting Certain Political Contribu-
 tions and Donations by Minors Age Seventeen and Younger is
 Unconstitutional..... Thompson 8

 A. The Restriction Does Not Serve the Important Governmental
 Interest in Preventing the Use of Children to Evade FECA's
 Contribution Limits. Thompson 9

 B. The Prohibition of Certain Contributions by Children is not
 Carefully Drawn to Prevent Circumstances of the Statutory
 Dollar Limits by Other Individuals. Thompson 10

PRESENTATION BY THE MADISON CENTER PLAINTIFFS Madison Center 1

Madison Center Plaintiffs' Opposition Brief: Title I Issues Madison Center 1

I. As Applied to the Libertarian Party, BCRA Is Not Narrowly Tailored to a Compelling Interest in Preventing Actual or Apparent Corruption. Madison Center 1

Madison Center Plaintiffs' Opposition Brief: Title II Issues Madison Center 2

I. "Reformers" Advocate as Other Groups, But Swear It Is Not Corrupting. . . . Madison Center 2

II. Defendants' "Corruption" Would Even Justify Banning Elections Madison Center 9

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| TABLE OF AUTHORITIES | ii |
| INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| I. BCRA BANS POLITICAL SPEECH | 2 |
| II. BCRA’S BAN ON “ELECTIONEERING COMMUNICATIONS” CANNOT BE JUSTIFIED AS PREVENTING CORRUPTION..... | 6 |
| A. Gratitude Is Not Corruption. | 8 |
| B. Title II Cannot Be Justified as Essential To Prevent Circumvention of Title I | 13 |
| C. The Corruption Rationale Identified in <i>Austin</i> Cannot Justify Title II. | 15 |
| III. BCRA’S CRIMINAL PENALTIES SWEEP FAR TOO BROADLY..... | 17 |
| A. BCRA Targets The Wrong Speakers..... | 18 |
| B. BCRA Criminalizes The Wrong Types Of Speech..... | 19 |
| C. Defendants’ Empirical Analysis Is Fatally Flawed..... | 23 |
| CONCLUSION..... | 25 |

**OPPOSITION BRIEF OF THE
AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| TABLE OF AUTHORITIES..... | ii |
| INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT..... | 1 |
| ARGUMENT..... | 2 |
| THE FIRST AMENDMENT’S CORE PROTECTIONS FOR ISSUE-OREINTED ADVOCACY PRECLUDES ENFORCEMENT OF THE BCRA’S BROADCAST BAN AND DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENT AGAINST NONPARTISAN GROUPS LIKE THE ACLU..... | 2 |
| A. The Express Advocacy Doctrine..... | 4 |
| B. The Major Purpose Test..... | 5 |
| C. The Perils of Reporting and Disclosure..... | 9 |
| CONCLUSION..... | 10 |

CHAMBER PLAINTIFFS' TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. DEFENDANTS' DISCUSSION OF THE SUBJECTIVE INTENT OF SOME SPEAKERS IS BOTH LEGALLY IRRELEVANT AND FACTUALLY INACCURATE..... 1

A. A Speaker's Subjective Intent Is Irrelevant And Impossible To Reliably Determine..... 1

B. Defendants Exaggerate Their Evidence Of Electoral Intent..... 2

II. BUCKLEY'S "ROADMAP" REQUIRES THAT BCRA'S COORDINATION PROVISIONS BE STRUCK DOWN AS OVERBROAD AND VAGUE..... 5

A. Defendants Confirm That "Coordination" Is Broad And Vague..... 5

B. Buckley's "Roadmap" To The First Amendment Demands That Restrictions On Core Activities Be Narrowly Drawn Using Bright Lines, Even At The Expense Of Achieving Less Than Complete Coverage..... 6

C. Plaintiffs Have Standing Because BCRA's Coordination Provisions Today Are Chilling And Deterring Plaintiffs' Core First Amendment Activity 7

D. Plaintiffs' Challenges To BCRA's Self-Enforcing Provisions Are Ripe Without Regard To Speculation About Possible Future Regulations..... 9

AFL-CIO PLAINTIFFS'
TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Authorities -ii-

I. DEFENDANTS MISREPRESENT THE SCOPE AND PURPOSE OF
THE AFL-CIO BROADCAST ADVERTISING PROGRAM IN
ORDER TO MINIMIZE HOW BCRA CENSORS PROTECTED SPEECH 1

II. A LABOR ORGANIZATION’S OR CORPORATION’S HARD MONEY
SEPARATE POLITICAL COMMITTEE DOES NOT PROVIDE A
CONSTITUTIONALLY SUFFICIENT ALTERNATIVE MEANS TO MAKE
“ELECTIONEERING COMMUNICATIONS” 8