

AGENDA DOCUMENT NO. 10-63-β



FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
Washington, DC 20463

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, DC 20463
OCT 6 2010

OCT -6 P 5:15

AGENDA ITEM

October 6, 2010

For Meeting of 10-7-10

MEMORANDUM

SUBMITTED LATE

TO: The Commission

FROM: Christopher Hughey *pch*
Acting General Counsel

Rosemary C. Smith *RCS*
Associate General Counsel

Amy L. Rothstein *ALR*
Assistant General Counsel

Peter T. Reynolds *PR*
Attorney

Jessica Selinkoff *(S)*
Attorney

Subject: Draft AO 2010-25 – Revised Draft B

Attached is Revised Draft B of the subject advisory opinion. We have been asked to place this draft on the agenda for October 7, 2010.

Attachment

1 ADVISORY OPINION 2010-25

2

3 Lee E. Goodman, Esq.

4 LeClairRyan

5 1101 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 600

6 Washington, DC 20036

7

8

9 Dear Mr. Goodman:

REVISED DRAFT B

10 We are responding to your advisory opinion request on behalf of RG
11 Entertainment, Ltd. ("RGE"), Star Parker, Star Parker for Congress, Motive
12 Entertainment, Inc., engage4 LLC, and InService America, Inc., concerning the
13 application of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended (the "Act"), to
14 several proposed activities. You ask whether RGE's disbursements to produce,
15 distribute, and advertise the documentary film I WANT YOUR MONEY (the "Film") are
16 expenditures or electioneering communications; whether licensees' payment of the cost
17 of screening the Film are expenditures or electioneering communications; whether RGE's
18 production and distribution of the Film would be a coordinated communication with Ms.
19 Parker; and whether a licensee's payment of the cost of a screening of the Film at which
20 Ms. Parker attends and speaks would be a contribution to Ms. Parker's authorized
21 committee, and whether any licensee's payment to license a promotional screening of the
22 Film would be an independent expenditure if the Film expressly advocates Federal
23 candidates.

24 The Commission concludes that disbursements for the production, distribution,
25 and advertising of the Film are covered by the press exemption from the Act's definitions
26 of "expenditure" and "electioneering communication." The commission also concludes
27 that disbursements for the production, distribution, and advertising of the Film are not

1 “expenditures” because they are for the *bona fide* commercial activity of a commercial
2 entity. Additionally, the Commission concludes that RGE’s production and distribution
3 of the Film would not be a coordinated communication with Ms. Parker. The
4 Commission also concludes that public theatrical exhibitions of the Film are not required
5 to include disclaimers. The Commission further concludes that a licensee’s payment for
6 a screening of the Film at which Ms. Parker attends and speaks would not be an in-kind
7 contribution to Ms. Parker’s authorized committee if Ms. Parker discusses only public
8 policy issues.

9 ***Background***

10 The facts presented in this advisory opinion are based on your letters received on
11 September 9 and 20, 2010, and your email dated September 27, 2010.

12 RGE is a for-profit film company incorporated and located in California. Since
13 2005, RGE has produced, either directly or through wholly owned production
14 subsidiaries, three films: LUCIFER (2007), a short film depicting the struggle between
15 good and evil; SUPER CAPERS (2009), a family and adventure feature film treating themes
16 of heroes versus villains; and the Film, which is a political documentary expected to open
17 in theaters on October 15, 2010, and the subject of this advisory opinion. RGE is also
18 currently producing a feature film, THE WIND IN THE WILLOWS, based on the Kenneth
19 Grahame novel. RGE intends to produce both dramatic films and political documentaries
20 in the future, although no specific additional films or scripts have been prepared at this
21 time.

22 RGE is organized and maintained only for commercial purposes. RGE’s sole
23 business is the production, distribution, and marketing of its films. No political party,

1 political committee, or candidate owns or controls RGE or has funded any of its film
2 productions.

3 Ms. Parker is a candidate for Congress in California's 37th Congressional District.
4 Ms. Parker was interviewed during the production of the Film, and portions of that
5 interview appear in the Film. Her appearances are limited to discussions of public policy.
6 The Film does not refer to Ms. Parker as a candidate or mention her election, campaign,
7 or political party affiliation.

8 The Film is a documentary about economic and fiscal policy, as portrayed
9 through a fictional debate between President Barack Obama and former President Ronald
10 Reagan. The Film features historical and original footage, interviews, and animated
11 depictions of several historical and current public political figures, several of whom are
12 currently candidates for Federal office: Representative Thaddeus McCotter, Speaker of
13 the House of Representatives Nancy Pelosi, Senator Harry Reid, Representative Tom
14 McClintock, and Ms. Star Parker.

15 RGE paid for the production of the Film and retains all ownership rights. RGE
16 states that its sole purpose for producing and distributing the Film is commercial profit.
17 Although investors will invest in the Film's printing and advertising budget, none of the
18 investors is a candidate, political committee, or political party committee.

19 RGE has engaged four companies to market and distribute the Film. Three of
20 them – Motive Entertainment, Inc. ("Motive"), engage4 LLC ("engage4"), and InService
21 America, Inc. ("InService America") (collectively known as "MEISA") – have joined in
22 this advisory opinion request. Motive is a marketing corporation organized and located
23 in California. It has marketed such feature films as THE PASSION OF THE CHRIST, ROCKY

1 BALBOA, THE POLAR EXPRESS, and UNITED 93. Engage4 is a communications and
2 marketing firm located in Virginia that specializes in direct marketing. It is currently
3 marketing feature films and documentaries, including THE BLIND SIDE, THE PERFECT
4 GAME, IN GOD WE TRUST, and A NECESSARY JOURNEY. InService America, a
5 corporation organized and located in Virginia, works with engage4 and provides
6 fulfillment and inventory management services, as well as event management services.
7 InService was involved in the marketing of THE PASSION OF THE CHRIST with Motive.
8 The fourth company, Freestyle Releasing, Inc. ("Freestyle"), is a distribution company
9 located in California.

10 MEISA and Freestyle are for-profit companies engaged in the business of
11 marketing, event management, and film promotion and distribution. None of the
12 financial arrangements between RGE and MEISA or Freestyle provides for any fees or
13 commissions to be paid to any candidate or political committee.

14 The Film is being distributed in three phases. During the first phase (September
15 through mid- to late-October, 2010), MEISA is actively marketing the Film via the
16 Internet, email, press releases, word-of-mouth campaigns, and licensed promotional
17 screenings hosted by individuals and organizations. The requestors represent that these
18 types of "grassroots/grasstops" activities are typical of film marketing campaigns.

19 The promotional screenings in the first phase are designed to generate public
20 interest in the Film and obtain audience feedback that may further inform marketing and
21 promotional decisions by RGE and MEISA before the Film's formal theatrical release.
22 Each individual or organization wishing to host a promotional screening of the Film must
23 pay a fee of approximately \$500 to \$1,000 to cover the costs of theater rental, logistical

1 support, promotional materials, commissions for any subcontractors, and profits. The fee
2 may vary depending upon the venue, location, and timing of the screening. In addition to
3 offering logistical support to screeners, MEISA enters into licensing agreements on
4 RGE's behalf that grant the screener a one-time exhibition right. MEISA then conveys a
5 watermarked DVD to each screener to protect against piracy. Following the screening,
6 the licensee must return the DVD to engage4.

7 MEISA will license the Film to virtually any individual, business, or organization
8 that applies to screen it, including political and candidate committees, although it retains
9 the right to decline an application under certain circumstances.¹ Each screener will
10 determine who to invite to the promotional screening and will retain discretion to sell
11 tickets or allow free attendance. Neither RGE nor MEISA will share in any ticket
12 revenues generated by these promotional screenings.

13 All license and event fees generated from the promotional screenings will be
14 divided between RGE and MEISA. MEISA will pay for their promotional expenses,
15 such as theater rentals, subcontractor costs, and printing and promotional material costs,
16 and keep the excess as profits, in addition to a service fee paid by RGE. No revenues
17 from license or event fees will be shared with any candidate, political committee, or
18 political party committee.

19 The second phase of the Film's distribution will consist of a national theatrical
20 release by Freestyle beginning on October 15, 2010. In this second phase, RGE
21 anticipates that the Film will be shown in at least 500 theaters nationwide. Movie

¹ MEISA reserves the right to decline an application if it has reason to believe that the Film will be used inappropriately or in a manner that might harm the Film's reputation.

1 theaters that show the Film will charge moviegoers the usual and normal charge for
2 tickets and each movie theater will share a percentage of ticket sales with RGE and
3 Freestyle. MEISA may assist Freestyle with group ticket sales as part of the continuing
4 marketing efforts to promote the Film during its formal theatrical release.

5 As part of the second phase, RGE plans to advertise the Film in print media, as
6 well as on television and radio. Television and radio advertisements will consist of a film
7 trailer (the "Trailer") that contains excerpts from the Film, including images and/or audio
8 of President Obama and at least three current candidates (Speaker Pelosi, Representative
9 McCotter, and Representative McClintock).² These advertisements will be broadcast
10 nationally in October (and possibly November) 2010. RGE states that the advertisements
11 will not be coordinated with any candidate or political party committee. RGE and
12 MEISA intend to make advertising decisions based upon financial resources and optimal
13 commercial value for the Film.

14 The third phase of the Film's distribution will begin after its run in theaters in the
15 second phase ends. RGE estimates that the Film's theatrical release will last
16 approximately two to twelve weeks, depending on the Film's success. RGE has not yet
17 determined the timing and details of the third phase, but anticipates that it may include
18 distribution via DVD, pay-per-view, premium channels, broadcast and cable television,
19 and promotional screenings similar to those occurring in the first phase. In any event,
20 the Film will not be broadcast on or before November 2, 2010.

² The Trailer is available for viewing at www.iwantyourmoney.net (last viewed September 27, 2010). The request does not indicate the extent to which the candidates appearing in the Trailer will be identifiable in a radio advertisement for the Film.

1 Ms. Parker has received inquiries from two promotional screeners of the Film
2 regarding her availability to attend and speak at promotional screenings during the first
3 phase of the Film's distribution. One inquiry is from an individual who is hosting an
4 event at a public theater. The audience would consist of members of the public,
5 principally friends of the individual host. The other inquiry is from a corporation that
6 will be paying for the event with corporate funds. The promotional screening would take
7 place in a public theater, and the audience would consist of members of the public invited
8 by the corporation. The audience would not consist solely of the restricted class of the
9 corporation or the corporation's employees and their families. Additionally, Ms. Parker
10 intends to license the Film herself and to host a promotional screening.

11 ***Questions Presented***

- 12
- 13 1. *Are RGE's disbursements to produce, distribute, and advertise the Film exempt*
14 *from the Act's definitions of "expenditure" and "electioneering communication"*
15 *under the media exemption?*
 - 16
 - 17 2. *Are RGE's disbursements to produce, distribute, and advertise the Film for the*
18 *"bona fide commercial activity" of a commercial entity, and thus not expenditures?*
19
 - 20 3. *Are licensees' payments to host a promotional screening of the Film exempt from*
21 *the definitions of "expenditure" and "electioneering communication" under the*
22 *media or commercial entity exemptions?*
23
 - 24 4. *Is the production and distribution of the Film by RGE a coordinated*
25 *communication with Ms. Parker?*
26
 - 27 5. *Must public theatrical exhibitions of the Film by RGE include disclaimers?*
28
 - 29 6. *If an individual pays a license fee to host a promotional screening of the Film, may*
30 *Ms. Parker attend the screening without receiving a campaign contribution in the*
31 *amount of the license or exhibition fee if she (1) speaks about policy, or (2)*
32 *discusses her candidacy?*
33
 - 34 7. *If a corporation pays a license fee to host a promotional screening of the Film,*
35 *may Ms. Parker attend the screening without receiving a campaign contribution in*

1 *the amount of the license or exhibition fee if she (1) speaks about policy, or (2)*
2 *discusses her candidacy?*

3
4 8. *If Ms. Parker uses her personal funds to pay a license fee to host a promotional*
5 *screening of the Film, may she attend the screening without making an in-kind*
6 *contribution to her campaign in the amount of the license fee if she (1) speaks*
7 *about policy, (2) discusses her candidacy, including soliciting contributions to her*
8 *campaign, or (3) advertises the screening as a campaign-related event?*

9
10 9. *Is a licensee's payment of the license fee to host a theater screening of the Film*
11 *exempt from the definition of "expenditure" under the media exemption or "bona*
12 *fide commereial activity"? If not, must the licensee file FEC Form 5 (Independent*
13 *Expenditure report)?*

14
15 ***Legal Analysis and Conclusions***

16
17 ***Question 1. Are RGE's disbursements to produce, distribute, and advertise the Film***
18 ***exempt from the Act's definitions of "expenditure" and "electioneering communication"***
19 ***under the media exemption?***

20
21 Yes, RGE's disbursements to produce, distribute, and advertise the Film are
22 covered by the media exemption.

23 Under the Act, "[t]he term 'expenditure' does not include . . . any news story,
24 commentary, or editorial distributed through the facilities of any broadcasting station,
25 newspaper, magazine, or other periodical publication, unless such facilities are owned or
26 controlled by any political party, political committee, or candidate." 2 U.S.C.
27 431(9)(B)(i). The Act and Commission regulations also include a similar exemption
28 from the definition of "electioneering communication" for a communication that appears
29 in a news story, commentary, or editorial distributed through the facilities of any
30 broadcast, cable, or satellite television or radio station, unless such facilities are owned or
31 controlled by any political party, political committee, or candidate. See 2 U.S.C.
32 434(f)(3)(B)(i) and 11 CFR 100.29(c)(2). Together, these exclusions are known as the
33 "press exemption" or "media exemption."

1 The legislative history of the press exemption indicates that Congress did not
2 intend to “limit or burden in any way the First Amendment freedoms of the press and of
3 association. [The exemption] assures the unfettered right of the newspapers, TV
4 networks, and *other media* to cover and comment on political campaigns.” H.R. REP.
5 NO. 93-1239 at 4 (1974) (emphasis added). While an earlier Commission advisory
6 opinion narrowly concluded that a news story, commentary, or editorial distributed
7 through facilities other than the enumerated media (i.e., a book) is generally not covered
8 by the press exemption,³ later Commission actions have read the press exemption more
9 broadly, consistent with the Act’s legislative history, to cover cable television,⁴ the
10 Internet,⁵ satellite broadcasts,⁶ and rallies staged and broadcast by a radio talk show.⁷ In
11 fact, “[t]he Commission has not limited the press exemption to traditional news outlets,
12 but rather has applied it to ‘news stories, commentaries, and editorials no matter in what

³ Advisory Opinion 1987-08 (AIG/U.S. News). This advisory opinion involved, among other things, applicability of the media exemption to a book. The Commission concluded, “[w]ith respect to AIG’s sponsorship of the Book, the Commission notes that the ‘news story’ exemption does not apply to distribution through facilities other than a broadcasting station, newspaper, magazine, or other periodical publication.... Because the Book does not fit within any of these categories, it would not qualify for the ‘news story’ exception.” *Id.* at 5. Although the question of whether a theatrical release of a film could qualify for the media exemption was raised by some respondents in MURs 5474 (Dog Eat Dog Films, Inc.) and 5539 (Fahrenheit 9/11), the Commission ultimately found no reason to believe respondents violated the Act because the documentary constituted *bona fide* commercial activity and was not an independent expenditure or electioneering communication.

⁴ Explanation and Justification for Final Rules on Candidate Debates and News Stories, 61 FR 18049 (Apr. 24, 1996).

⁵ Explanation and Justification for Final Rules on Internet Communications, 71 FR 18589 (Apr. 12, 2006).

⁶ Advisory Opinion 2007-20 (XM Radio).

⁷ See MUR 5569 (The John and Ken Show, *et al.*), First General Counsel’s Report at 9 (in a matter where a radio talk show expressly advocated the election and defeat of Federal candidates, and that also staged and broadcast public rallies outside the offices of Federal candidates, the Commission concluded that the media exemption applied to the rallies because they were “similar in form to other broadcast events featured on the Show” which was also covered by the media exemption.).

1 medium they are published....” Advisory Opinion 2008-14 (Melothe, Inc.) (citing the
2 Commission’s 2006 rulemaking, Explanation and Justification for Final Rules on Internet
3 Communications, 71 FR 18589, 18608 (Apr. 12, 2006), extending the press exemption to
4 websites and “any Internet or electronic publication”).

5 The Commission has historically conducted a two-step analysis to determine
6 whether the media exemption applies. First, the Commission asks whether the entity
7 engaging in the activity is a press or media entity. See Advisory Opinions 2005-16 (Fired
8 Up!), 1996-16 (Bloomberg), and 1980-90 (Atlantic Richfield). Second, the Commission
9 applies the two-part analysis presented in *Reader’s Digest Ass’n v. FEC*, 509 F. Supp.
10 1210, 1215 (S.D.N.Y. 1981), which requires it to establish:

11 (A) That the entity is not owned or controlled by a political party, political
12 committee, or candidate; and

13 (B) That the entity is acting as a press entity in conducting the activity at issue
14 (i.e., whether the press entity is acting in its “legitimate press function”).

15 See also *FEC v. Phillips Publ’g*, 517 F.Supp. 1308, 1312-13 (D.D.C. 1981);
16 Advisory Opinions 2007-20 (XM Radio), 2005-19 (Inside Track), 2005-16 (Fired Up!),
17 and 2004-07 (MTV).

18 **1) Press Entity Status**

19 Neither the Act nor Commission regulations use or define the term “press entity.”
20 Nonetheless, when determining whether the term applies to a particular entity, the
21 Commission has focused on whether the entity in question produces on a regular basis a
22 program that disseminates news stories, commentary, and/or editorials. See, e.g.,
23 Advisory Opinions 2008-14 (Melothe, Inc.), 2007-20 (XM Radio), and 2005-19 (Inside

1 Track). In the Explanation and Justification for the Final Rules on Electioneering
2 Communications, the Commission stated that it will interpret “news story, commentary,
3 or editorial” to include documentaries and educational programming within the context of
4 the media exemption to the electioneering communication definition in 11 CFR
5 100.29(c)(2).⁸ See Explanation and Justification for Final Rules on Electioneering
6 Communications, 67 FR 65190, 65197 (Oct. 23, 2002). Whether an entity qualifies as a
7 press entity does not necessarily turn on the presence or absence of any one particular
8 fact. See Advisory Opinions 2007-20 (XM Radio) and 2005-19 (Inside Track).

9 Here, RGE has previously produced educational films (LUCIFER and SUPER
10 CAPERS), has produced and currently is in the process of distributing and advertising a
11 documentary (the Film), and represents that it intends to produce additional
12 documentaries in the future. In light of these facts, the Commission concludes RGE is a
13 press entity for the purposes of this advisory opinion.

14 **2) Ownership Criteria and Legitimate Press Function**

15 **A) Ownership or Control**

16 RGE represents that it is not owned or controlled by a political party, political
17 committee, or candidate.

18 **B) Legitimate Press Function**

19 There are two considerations in determining whether an entity is engaging in its
20 legitimate press function: (1) whether the entity’s materials are available to the general

⁸ The Commission has not explicitly determined that it will interpret “news story, commentary, or editorial” to include documentaries within the context of the media exemption from the definition of “expenditure.” However, because the Commission uses the same analysis to determine the application of both the 2 U.S.C. 431(9)(B)(i) and 11 CFR 100.29(c)(2) media exemptions, it follows that the term “news story, commentary, or editorial” includes documentaries for the purposes of both media exemptions discussed herein.

1 public, and (2) whether they are comparable in form to those ordinarily issued by the
2 entity. Advisory Opinions 2005-16 (Fired Up!) (citing *FEC v. Mass. Citizens for Life*
3 (*“MCFL”*), 479 U.S. 238, 251 (1986)) and 2000-13 (iNEXTV) (concluding that a
4 website was “viewable by the general public and akin to a periodical or news program
5 distributed to the general public”). In *MCFL*, the Supreme Court held that a “Special
6 Edition” newsletter did not qualify for the press exemption on the basis that it deviated
7 from certain “considerations of form” relating to the production and distribution of its
8 regular newsletter. 479 U.S. at 250-51. Among those “considerations of form”
9 enumerated by the Supreme Court were the fact that the Special Edition was not
10 published through the facilities of the regular newsletter, but by a staff which prepared no
11 previous or subsequent newsletters, and the increase in distribution to a group far larger
12 than the newsletter’s regular audience. *Id.*

13 As to the first factor in the press function analysis, RGE has made its films
14 available to the general public via distribution in theaters nationwide and through DVD.⁹
15 Similarly, RGE intends to make the Film at issue in this request available to the general
16 public through promotional screenings, a national theatrical release, and perhaps via
17 DVD, pay-per-view, premium channels, and broadcast and cable television.
18 Accordingly, RGE satisfies the first prong in the press function analysis.

19 As to the second factor in the press function analysis, RGE’s activities consist
20 solely of producing and distributing films, and the Film at issue in the request is

⁹ Although these forms of distribution are not free to the public, whether payment is required has not been a determining factor in the Commission’s discussion of this consideration. See Advisory Opinions 2010-08 (Citizens United), 2007-20 (XM Radio), and 2004-07 (MTV). *But see* Advisory Opinion 2008-14 (Melothe, Inc.) (identifying free access as a relevant factor).

1 comparable in form to those previously produced. Accordingly, RGE satisfies the second
2 prong in the press function analysis because the proposed material at issue is
3 “comparable in form to those ordinarily issued by the entity.”

4 With respect to RGE’s Film-related broadcast advertisements, courts have held
5 that where the underlying product is covered by the press exemption, so are
6 advertisements to promote that underlying product. *See Phillips Publ’g*, 517 F. Supp. at
7 1313 (citing *Reader’s Digest*, 509 F. Supp. at 1215). Accordingly, RGE’s advertisements
8 will come within the press exemption to the extent that RGE is not “acting in a manner
9 unrelated to its [press] function” when it produces and distributes the advertisements
10 themselves. *See Advisory Opinion 2004-07 (MTV)*. Advertisements promoting activities
11 that are not part of RGE’s legitimate press function, however, may be considered
12 expenditures or electioneering communications. *Advisory Opinion 2004-30 (Citizens*
13 *United)* (citing *Phillips Publ’g*, 717 F. Supp. at 1313).

14 Because RGE is a press entity that is not owned or controlled by a political party,
15 political committee, or candidate, and its production, distribution, and related marketing
16 activities with respect to the Film constitute a legitimate press function, the Film falls
17 within the media exemption for “expenditures.” Moreover, RGE’s advertisements to
18 promote the Film will also come within the press exemption for “expenditures” and
19 “electioneering communications.” *See Phillips Publ’g*, 517 F. Supp. at 1313 (citing
20 *Reader’s Digest*, 509 F. Supp. at 1215). RGE’s disbursements for these costs are exempt
21 from the Act’s disclosure, disclaimer, and reporting requirements.

22 *Question 2. Are RGE’s disbursements to produce, distribute, and advertise the Film for*
23 *the “bona fide commercial activity” of a commercial entity, and thus not expenditures?*
24

1 Yes. In addition to the media exemption, RGE's disbursements to produce,
2 distribute, and advertise the Film are also for the *bona fide* commercial activity of a
3 commercial entity and thus are not "expenditures" under the Act and Commission
4 regulations. Thus, RGE does not need to report as expenditures its disbursements for the
5 production, distribution, and advertising of the Film.

6 An "expenditure" includes "any purchase, payment, distribution, loan, advance,
7 deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, made by any person for the purpose of
8 influencing any election for Federal office." 2 U.S.C. 431(9)(A)(i); *see also* 11 CFR
9 100.111(a). The Commission has concluded that disbursements by a commercial entity
10 for *bona fide* commercial activity are not expenditures. *See* Advisory Opinion 2008-10
11 (VoterVoter.org).

12 The Commission evaluates several factors in determining whether the commercial
13 sale of candidate-related merchandise would be *bona fide* commercial activity, including:
14 (1) whether the vendor is engaging in the activity for genuinely commercial purposes and
15 not for the purpose of influencing an election; (2) whether the sales of the merchandise
16 involve fundraising activity for candidates or solicitations of political contributions; (3)
17 whether the items are sold at the vendor's usual and normal charge; (4) whether the
18 purchases are made by individuals for their personal use; (5) whether the entity is owned,
19 controlled, or affiliated with a candidate or political committee; (6) whether the entity is
20 "in the business" of conducting the type of activity involved; and (7) whether the entity
21 follows usual and normal business practices and industry standards. *See* Advisory
22 Opinions 2008-10 (VoterVoter.org), 1994-30 (Conservative Concepts/Pence) and 1989-
23 21 (Create-a-Craft); MURs 5474 (Dog Eat Dog Films, Inc.) and 5539 (Fahrenheit 9/11),

1 First General Counsel's Report, dated May 25, 2005 (disbursements were for *bona fide*
2 commercial activity where there was no information to suggest "that those who made
3 disbursements related to the production and distribution of the film were motivated by
4 anything other than making a profit").¹⁰

5 Applying these factors to the facts presented here indicates that RGE's
6 production, distribution, and advertising of the Film is the *bona fide* commercial activity
7 of a commercial entity. First, RGE is a for-profit company organized and maintained
8 solely for commercial purposes, and its sole purpose for producing and distributing the
9 Film is to generate a commercial profit. Second, RGE's licenses and ticket sales of the
10 Film will not involve fundraising activity for candidates or solicitations of political
11 contributions. Third, RGE's licenses and sale of the Film will be "similar to all other
12 movie releases." Fourth, tickets for the Film will be sold to individuals in the general
13 public for their personal use. Fifth, RGE is not owned or controlled by any political
14 party, political committee, or candidate. Sixth, RGE is "in the business" of producing,
15 distributing, and advertising films. Finally, RGE plans to follow usual and normal
16 business practices and industry standards with respect to the production, distribution, and
17 marketing of the Film. RGE has entered into arms-length commercial agreements with
18 MEISA and Freestyle¹¹ to market and distribute the Film. RGE has represented that a

¹⁰ While the Commission has noted the significance of conducting commercial activity on a non-partisan basis in determining whether the activity is engaged in for commercial purposes only, see Advisory Opinion 2008-10 (VoterVoter.org), partisanship by itself does not necessarily negate the otherwise commercial nature of an activity. See Advisory Opinion 1994-30 (Conservative Concepts/Pence).

¹¹ The requestors indicate that MEISA and Freestyle are not owned or controlled by any political party, political committee, or candidate.

1 three-phase exhibition is customary in the Film industry and that MEISA's marketing
2 strategy for the Film is typical of film marketing campaigns.

3 Under these circumstances, the production, distribution, and advertising of the Film by
4 RGE is the *bona fide* commercial activity of a commercial entity. Thus, disbursements
5 by RGE for these activities are not expenditures made in connection with any election.
6 See MURs 5474 (Dog Eat Dog Films, Inc.) and 5539 (Fahrenheit 9/11), First General
7 Counsel's Report, dated May 25, 2005.

8

9 *Question 3. Are licensees' payments to host a promotional screening of the Film exempt*
10 *from the definitions of "expenditure" and "electioneering communication" under the*
11 *media or commercial entity exemptions?*

12

13 Whether a licensee would qualify for the media or commercial activity
14 exemptions would depend on an application of the analyses set forth in Questions 1 and
15 2, respectively, to the licensee's individual circumstances.

16 Regardless, even if neither the media nor the commercial vendor exemptions
17 applied, licensees of the Film would not be required to file electioneering
18 communications reports or include disclaimers. As explained in the answer to Question 4
19 below, the exhibition of the Film is not an electioneering communication. Moreover,
20 although the Act and Commission regulations require public communications to include
21 disclaimers, this requirement applies only to communications "through any broadcasting
22 station, newspaper, magazine, outdoor advertising facility, mailing, or any other type of
23 general public political advertising." See 2 U.S.C. 441d(a); 11 CFR 110.11(a). A
24 screening of the Film does not fall under any of these enumerated means of
25 communications, and neither the Act nor Commission regulations defines what
26 constitutes "general public political advertising." Thus, the disclaimer requirement in
27 this context would be predicated on a definition of the term "general public political
28 advertising." Since "[a]ny rule of law which is not stated in [the] Act . . . may be initially

1 proposed by the Commission only as a rule or regulation pursuant to procedures
2 established in section 438(d) of [the Act],” the Commission does not define the term for
3 the purposes of this advisory opinion to impose a disclaimer requirement on Film
4 licensees who do not qualify for the media or commercial activity exemptions. 2 U.S.C.
5 437f(b).

6 *Question 4. Is the production and distribution of the Film by RGE a coordinated*
7 *communication with Ms. Parker?*

8

9 No, the production and distribution of the Film by RGE is not a coordinated
10 communication with Ms. Parker because it does not meet the content prong of 11 CFR
11 109.21(a)(2).

12 Commission regulations set forth a three-prong test to determine whether a
13 payment for a communication is an in-kind contribution to a candidate as a result of
14 coordination between the person making the payment and the candidate. See 11 CFR
15 109.21(a); see also 2 U.S.C. 441a(a)(7)(B). Under the second prong of the test, a
16 communication must satisfy at least one of the four content standards in 11 CFR
17 109.21(c) to be a coordinated communication.¹²

18 The first content standard, at 11 CFR 109.21(c)(1), covers “electioneering
19 communications,” as defined in 11 CFR 100.29. As noted above, an electioneering
20 communication must be a “broadcast, cable, or satellite communication.” 2 U.S.C.
21 434(f)(3); 11 CFR 100.29(a). RGE indicates that the Film will be shown only in theaters
22 during the time that Ms. Parker is a candidate – that is, before November 2, 2010. A

¹² The Commission recently adopted a fifth content standard, at 11 CFR 109.21(c)(5), for a public communication that is the functional equivalent of express advocacy. This content standard is not effective until December 1, 2010. See Final Rules on Coordinated Communications, 75 FR 55947 (Sept. 15, 2010).

1 documentary film shown in a movie theater is not a “broadcast, cable, or satellite
2 communication” because it is not “publicly distributed by a television station, radio
3 station, cable television system, or satellite system.” 11 CFR 100.29(b)(1).

4 The remaining content standards, at 11 CFR 109.21(c)(2) through (4), cover only
5 “public communications” as defined in 11 CFR 100.26. As explained in the response to
6 Question 3 above, the Commission concludes that the showing of the Film in movie
7 theaters is not a public communication.

8 Because none of the content standards is met, the production and distribution of
9 the Film by RGE would not be a coordinated communication with Ms. Parker under
10 11 CFR 109.21. Consequently, the payments by RGE to produce and distribute the Film
11 would not be in-kind contributions to Ms. Parker’s authorized committee. See Advisory
12 Opinion 2005-18 (Reyes).

13 *Question 5. Must public theatrical exhibitions of the Film by RGE include disclaimers?*

14
15 No, public theatrical exhibitions of the Film by RGE need not include disclaimers.

16 The Act and Commission regulations require electioneering communications and
17 certain public communications to include disclaimers. See 2 U.S.C. 441d(a); 11 CFR
18 110.11(a). The answer to Question 4, above, concludes that public theatrical exhibitions
19 of the Film by RGE will not be electioneering communications or public
20 communications. Therefore, no disclaimers will be required for its public theatrical
21 exhibitions of the Film.

22 *Question 6. If an individual pays a license fee to host a promotional screening of the*
23 *Film, may Ms. Parker attend the screening without receiving a campaign contribution in*
24 *the amount of the license or exhibition fee if she (1) speaks about policy, or (2) discusses*
25 *her candidacy?*

26

1 *Question 7. If a corporation pays a license fee to host a promotional screening of the*
2 *Film, may Ms. Parker attend the screening without receiving a campaign contribution in*
3 *the amount of the license or exhibition fee if she (1) speaks about policy, or (2) discusses*
4 *her candidacy?*

5
6 *Question 8. If Ms. Parker uses her personal funds to pay a license fee to host a*
7 *promotional screening of the Film, may she attend the screening without making an in-*
8 *kind contribution to her campaign in the amount of the license fee if she (1) speaks about*
9 *policy, (2) discusses her candidacy, including soliciting contributions to her campaign,*
10 *or (3) advertises the screening as a campaign-related event?*

11
12 These questions are being answered together. Yes, Ms. Parker may attend a
13 screening of the Film – whether paid for by an individual other than Ms. Parker, by a
14 corporation, or by Ms. Parker herself from her personal funds – and discuss only public
15 policy issues without receiving an in-kind contribution. If, however, Ms. Parker
16 discusses at the screening her own campaign, any other candidate for the same office, or
17 the election, as described below, then the license fee paid by the screening host would be
18 an in-kind contribution to Ms. Parker’s authorized committee.

19 A “contribution” includes “anything of value” made for the purpose of
20 influencing a Federal election. 2 U.S.C. 431(8)(A)(i); 11 CFR 100.52(a). “Anything of
21 value” includes all in-kind contributions. 11 CFR 100.52(d).

22 In prior advisory opinions, the Commission has determined that the financing of
23 activities in which a Federal candidate participates will result in a contribution to that
24 candidate if the activities involve (1) the solicitation, making or acceptance of
25 contributions to the candidate’s campaign, (2) communications, including
26 communications by a candidate, expressly advocating the nomination, election or defeat
27 of the candidate or that candidate’s opponent, or (3) the identification of the candidate as
28 such. See Advisory Opinions 1999-11 (Byrum), 1994-15 (Byrne), 1992-37 (Terry),

1 1992-06 (Duke), 1986-37 (National Conservative Foundation); *see also* Advisory
2 Opinion 2009-26 (Coulson).

3 Although Ms. Parker appears several times in the Film, the request indicates that
4 she is identified in the Film only as “Author and Founder, Center for Urban Renewal &
5 Education”; her remarks are limited to discussions of public policy; and the Film does not
6 identify or discuss Ms. Parker’s party affiliation or candidacy. The requestor has directed
7 the Commission to assume, for purposes of this advisory opinion only, that the Film
8 expressly advocates the election or defeat of at least one Federal candidate and does not
9 expressly advocate the election or defeat of Ms. Parker. Nor is there any indication that
10 the Film expressly advocates the election or defeat of, or even refers to, any other clearly
11 identified candidate for the same Federal office as that sought by Ms. Parker.

12 Thus, if Ms. Parker attends a screening of the Film – whether paid for by an
13 individual, a corporation, or herself – and discusses only public policy issues, then the
14 payment of screening costs would not result in a contribution to Ms. Parker’s authorized
15 committee. If, however, Ms. Parker discusses her candidacy at the screening – such as by
16 advocating her own election, or by advocating the defeat of any other candidate for the
17 same office – or solicits or accepts contributions to her campaign, or advertises the
18 screening as a campaign event, then the license fees paid by the host of the screening
19 would be an in-kind contribution to Ms. Parker’s authorized committee. Similarly, if Ms.
20 Parker is identified as a candidate when she is introduced at the screening or in publicity
21 for the screening, then her appearance at the screening would be campaign-related and
22 the license fee paid by the host of the screening would be a contribution to her authorized
23 committee. Advisory Opinion 1986-37 (National Conservative Foundation).

1 These contributions would be subject to the limitations of the Act at 2 U.S.C.
2 441a(a) and the prohibitions at 2 U.S.C. 441b, 441c, 441e, and 441f. Thus, if the host of
3 the screening is a corporation, then, under the circumstances described in the request, a
4 prohibited in-kind contribution would result. A corporation may not use its general
5 treasury funds to sponsor and finance Ms. Parker's campaign appearance to audiences
6 consisting of individuals outside of the corporation's restricted class (or the corporation's
7 employees and their families) beyond the limited circumstances described in 11 CFR
8 114.3 and 114.4. *See* Advisory Opinion 1986-37 (National Conservative Foundation).

9 Similarly, Ms. Parker would make a contribution to her own campaign by using
10 her personal funds to license the Film at a campaign event. Her authorized committee
11 would have to report the receipt of that contribution, just as it would report the receipt of
12 any other contribution. *See* 2 U.S.C. 434(a), 11 CFR 104.3(a)(3).

13 *Question 9. Is a licensee's payment of the license fee to host a theater screening of the*
14 *Film exempt from the definition of "expenditure" under the media exemption or "bona*
15 *fide commercial activity"? If not, must the licensee file FEC Form 5 (Independent*
16 *Expenditure report)?*

17
18 Whether a licensee's payment of the license fee to host a theater screening of the
19 Film would be exempt from the definition of "expenditure" under the media or
20 commercial activity exemptions would depend on an application of the analyses set forth
21 in Questions 1 and 2, respectively, to the licensee's individual circumstances. To the
22 extent that such payment does constitute an expenditure, it may need to be reported
23 pursuant to 11 CFR 109.10, and if so, may be reported in accordance with AO 2010-10
24 (National Right to Life).

