Seasongood v. Commissioner, 22 T.C. 671 (1954)

Contributions to organizations are not deductible under section 23(o) if a substantial part of their activities involves attempting to influence legislation, even if the organization's overall purpose is charitable or educational.

Summary

The case involves the deductibility of contributions made by taxpayers to several organizations: the League, the Fund, and the Cincinnati League of Women Voters. The court addressed whether these organizations qualified for tax-exempt status under the Internal Revenue Code, focusing on whether they were engaged in substantial political activities that would disqualify them from exemption and, consequently, prevent donors from deducting their contributions. The court determined that the League's political activities were substantial, precluding the deduction of contributions. The Cincinnati League of Women Voters lacked sufficient evidence to determine its activities, also preventing deduction. The Fund, however, which made a single donation to the League, was deemed not to be engaged in political activities itself and the contributions were allowed as deductions. The court also addressed whether contributions could be deducted as business expenses under section 23(a)(1)(A) but denied them.

Facts

The petitioners, Mr. and Mrs. Seasongood, made contributions to the League, the Fund, and the Cincinnati League of Women Voters. The League engaged in various activities, including public forums and educational campaigns. However, it also actively investigated legislation, endorsed political candidates, and lobbied legislative bodies. The Fund made donations to various charitable organizations, including one donation to the League. The Cincinnati League of Women Voters had general purposes and its activities were not clear in the record. Seasongood was a lawyer with substantial income. He claimed the contributions as charitable deductions under section 23(o) of the Internal Revenue Code and, alternatively, as ordinary and necessary business expenses under section 23(a)(1)(A).

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed the deductions claimed by the Seasongoods for their contributions to the League, the Fund, and the Cincinnati League of Women Voters. The taxpayers subsequently petitioned the Tax Court to review the Commissioner's decision. The Tax Court heard the case and issued a decision determining the deductibility of the contributions.

Issue(s)

1. Whether contributions made to the League are deductible under section 23(o) of the Internal Revenue Code.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

2. Whether contributions made to the Cincinnati League of Women Voters are deductible under section 23(o) of the Internal Revenue Code.

3. Whether contributions made to the Fund are deductible under section 23(o) of the Internal Revenue Code.

4. Whether the contributions to the League and Cincinnati League of Women Voters are deductible as ordinary and necessary business expenses under section 23(a)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Holding

1. No, because the League's activities in attempting to influence legislation were substantial.

2. No, because there was no evidence presented of its activities.

3. Yes, because the Fund's primary activities were charitable and the single donation did not represent a substantial attempt to influence legislation.

4. No, because the contributions were not made for business reasons.

Court's Reasoning

The court based its decision on the interpretation of sections 23(o) and 101(6) of the Internal Revenue Code, which govern the deductibility of charitable contributions and the tax-exempt status of organizations. The court explained that if a substantial part of an organization's activities consists of "carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting, to influence legislation," then contributions to that organization are not deductible. The court examined the activities of each organization. The court concluded that the League's political activities, including the endorsement of candidates and lobbying efforts, constituted a substantial part of its overall activities. The court stated: "Efforts to convince the voters that certain candidates are best fitted for a public office or that certain legislation is for the public good are activities of a political nature. They do not qualify under the statute as educational." The court distinguished the League from the Fund, which was created for purely charitable purposes and had only made one small donation to the League. The court reasoned that the single donation did not constitute an attempt by the Fund to influence legislation.

Practical Implications

This case clarifies the limits on charitable deductions for contributions to organizations involved in political activities. It underscores the importance of examining an organization's activities to determine whether they constitute a substantial part of its overall operations. The court's reasoning highlights how an organization's focus on political advocacy can affect the deductibility of

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

contributions to it. The case serves as a guide for attorneys advising clients on charitable giving, helping them to determine if organizations qualify for tax-exempt status and if donations are deductible. This case has implications for both nonprofit organizations, guiding them on the permissible scope of their political activities, and donors, advising them on the deductibility of their contributions. Later cases often cite Seasongood in defining the line between permissible educational activities and prohibited political activities that jeopardize tax-exempt status.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.