

## Scott Walter

---

**Subject:** Re: Kathryn Murdoch

---

**From:** Juleanna Glover  
**Sent:** Monday, June 21, 2021 3:29 PM  
**To:** Scott Walter  
**Subject:** Re: Kathryn Murdoch

Scott, thanks again. Sorry I missed your call. As you note, Kathryn gave to Pacronym which is legally distinct from Acronym. Thanks again.

Juleanna Glover

2146 Wyoming Ave. NW  
Washington, DC 20008

ridgelywalsh.com

---

**From:** Scott Walter  
**Date:** Monday, June 21, 2021 at 11:44 AM  
**To:** Juleanna Glover  
**Subject:** RE: Kathryn Murdoch

Dear Juleanna,

Sorry to miss you again on the phone. I'd like to write the update today so just wanted to clarify – I numbered these for ease of reference.

1. I'll indicate that Kathryn donated to PACRONYM but neither Kathryn nor James Murdoch donated to ACRONYM?
2. But I've never heard why you & they don't want to be linked to ACRONYM; what's objectionable? If there's a reason(s), I'm happy to report it.
3. Re your comment ACRONYM & PACRONYM don't share the same founder, perhaps you read my email too quickly. I didn't say that. I said they **\*not only\*** have the same founder, she also until recently ran those 2 groups & Courier, and the 2 groups **\*also\*** share the same financial officer.
4. So, the final question: Why are you & the Murdochs claiming there's a significant difference between ACRONYM & PACRONYM? My last email shows how they admit their close relationships. In legal documents linked below, ACRONYM indicates it 100% controls PACRONYM. So trying to claim PACRONYM is significantly separate from ACRONYM is like trying to say Fox News Channel has nothing to do with News Corp. In both cases, 2 legally distinct organizations exist, but they're inextricably linked as child and parent.

5. Given that fact, and the fact that ACRONYM is somehow objectionable, perhaps the Murdochs would like me to report they didn't realize this situation and will not be giving to PACRONYM in the future? That would fit with their claims to oppose disinformation.

Again, thanks for your help, and feel to call me anytime,  
Scott

Scott Walter

---

**From:** Juleanna Glover  
**Sent:** Friday, June 18, 2021 8:55 PM  
**To:** Scott Walter  
**Subject:** Re: Kathryn Murdoch

Dear Scott:

I am sorry I missed your call today. Was a crazy day. As you note, I did indeed make a mistake when I said that Kathryn didn't give to Pacronym (as is very clear in the FEC disclosures). She did indeed and she did NOT give to Acronym. I was racing from plane to car in NY in when I emailed you in a rush in our first exchange. I am sure you knew what I meant though and thank you for understanding.

Also, as you note Acronym and Pacronym do not share the same founder, but Courier and Pacronym do as I understand it. That said, Kathryn gave to Pacronym which is a separate entity from Acronym. And again any suggestion that she gave money to Acronym or Courier would be factual incorrect. If you would like to talk tomorrow, I would be glad to do so.

Thanks again.

Sincerely,

Juleanna

Juleanna Glover

2146 Wyoming Ave. NW  
Washington, DC 20008

ridgelywalsh.com

---

**From:** Scott Walter  
**Date:** Friday, June 18, 2021 at 4:47 PM  
**To:** Juleanna Glover  
**Subject:** RE: Kathryn Murdoch

Dear Juleanna,

Missed you again by phone.

I appreciate your email, but I'm unclear on a few things & would like to clarify.

1. I take it the original dispute--that Ms. Murdoch hadn't contributed to PACRONYM—is dropped?
2. “Kathryn ... has nothing to do with Antonym [ACRONYM]” – I take it that means neither she nor Mr. Murdoch has ever donated to ACRONYM?
3. I'm unclear if Ms. Murdoch thinks there's a problem with ACRONYM's controlled entity Courier Newsroom, which has been accused by conservatives and liberals of distributing disinformation?
4. You say that “the only connection” between those 2 entities is (A) “they have the same founder” and (B) “Pacronym appropriately reimburses Antonym for use of office space.” How do you & Ms. Murdoch make that claim in light of these facts:
  - i. money flows in both directions: You cite the money from PACRONYM to ANTONYM for office space, but ACRONYM has given PACRONYM hundreds of thousands of dollars annually.
  - ii. ACRONYM's IRS Form 990 (see p. 35 [here](#)) indicates the 2 entities are legally “related organizations.” That Form 990 states that ACRONYM is the “Direct controlling entity” of PACRONYM.
  - iii. This parent/child relationship is quite public: On PACRONYM's website, the opening words of its [About page](#) state, “PACRONYM is a political action committee affiliated with ACRONYM.”
  - iv. The 2 groups do not just share the same founder; she (Tara McGowan) also ran both groups until recently, and the 2 groups also share the same financial staffer, Vernon Gair (treasurer of PACRONYM; sr. finance dir. of ACRONYM).
  - v. The 2 groups additionally share the same digital media buyer: Lockwood Strategy Lab, which was also started by McGowan &, like PACRONYM, is controlled by ACRONYM per that Form 990.
5. So, given the web of connections between PACRONYM and ACRONYM, is Ms. Murdoch still willing to contribute to PACRONYM?

I'm working on an update to my article & want to be as complete and accurate as I can be. I'm available anytime at the cell below or by email.

Thanks for your help,  
Scott

Scott Walter

---

**From:** Juleanna Glover  
**Sent:** Friday, June 18, 2021 10:07 AM  
**To:** Scott Walter  
**Subject:** Re: Kathryn Murdoch

Scott - Thank you for your note. Kathryn gave to Pacronym and has nothing to do w Antonym. Pacronym is an entirely separate legal entity from Antonym. The only connection is they have the same founder and Pacronym appropriately reimburses Antonym for use of office space. All of this is public information. To conflate giving to Pacronym with giving to Acronym is a bad faith argument. Pls update your article to reflect the facts. Thank you. Juleanna

On Jun 18, 2021, at 9:40 AM, Scott Walter wrote:

Dear Ms. Glover,

I've been missing you by phone after our brief chat Tuesday. I see we both served in the George W. administration – I was at the Domestic Policy Council in 06-07.

Wanted to follow up to make sure we do not have any factual errors in our story – we care passionately about being accurate in every detail, and documenting our claims, just as I did with Ms. Murdoch's donations to PACRONYM.

Is there anything wrong in the FEC records I cited? Or anything else that's not correct in my article? We'll fix it asap if so, and admit our mistake.

Since you're representing Ms. Murdoch, I'd love to talk to her or you about her giving in this area. Could we set up a call?

Perhaps we didn't get anything wrong, but Ms. Murdoch would like to add to the record, in which case we'll update the article.

For instance, perhaps she'd like to state that neither she nor her husband have given to the related ACRONYM group, which directly sponsors Courier Newsroom?

Or perhaps she was unaware of these groups' connection to the Courier Newsroom project and would like to distance herself from it?

Perhaps when she's meeting with the Commission on Information Disorder, she intends to bring up the work of Courier Newsroom as part of the problem?

Again, happy to talk anytime & hope we can continue the conversation soon.

Many thanks,  
Scott (m) xxx-xxx-xxxx

---

**From:** Scott Walter  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 15, 2021 10:33 AM  
**To:** Juleanna Glover  
**Subject:** RE:

Dear Ms. Glover,

In my piece, I made the funding claim with a link to the FEC website:

Kathryn donated half a million dollars to PACRONYM

And below is a screenshot from the FEC website, showing two donations of \$250,000 each from a Kathryn Murdoch who listed her employer as Quadrivium.

If this is untrue, that will be quite interesting. Certainly it can't be that Quadrivium made the donation, because as a 501(c)(3) it cannot legally donate to a PAC.

Best wishes,

Scott Walter  
 XXX-XXX-XXXX

The screenshot shows the FEC website interface with a list of individual contributions. The browser address bar shows the URL: [fec.gov/data/receipts/individual-contributions/?committee\\_id=C00646877](https://fec.gov/data/receipts/individual-contributions/?committee_id=C00646877). The left sidebar contains filters for 'Time period', 'REPORT TIME PERIOD', 'RECEIPT DATE RANGE', 'More contributor details', 'Recipient committee type', and 'Contribution details'. The main table lists contributions with columns for recipient name, contributor name, state, employer, receipt date, and amount. Two entries for Kathryn Murdoch from Quadrivium are highlighted in orange.

Recipient Name	Contributor Name	State	Employer	Receipt Date	Amount
SPIELBERG, STEVEN	PACRONYM	CA	SELF	12/06/2019	\$500,000.00
GUND, GRAHAM	PACRONYM	MA	SELF	10/06/2020	\$450,000.00
ACRONYM	PACRONYM	DC		10/05/2018	\$300,000.00
NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC REDISTRICTING COMMITTEE	PACRONYM	DC		09/14/2018	\$250,000.00
MURDOCH, KATHRYN	PACRONYM	NY	QUADRIVUM	07/22/2020	\$250,000.00
DEMOCRACY PAC	PACRONYM	DC		08/09/2019	\$250,000.00
LOUD HOUND FOUNDATION	PACRONYM	CA		10/02/2020	\$250,000.00
GUND, GEOFFREY	PACRONYM	NY	NONE	09/25/2020	\$250,000.00
MURDOCH, KATHRYN	PACRONYM	NY	QUADRIVUM	08/14/2020	\$250,000.00
GUND, GEOFFREY	PACRONYM	NY	NONE	04/23/2020	\$200,000.00
GUND, GEOFFREY	PACRONYM	NY	NONE	04/15/2020	\$200,000.00
GUND, GEOFFREY	PACRONYM	NY	NONE	04/02/2020	\$200,000.00
HAAS, MIMI	PACRONYM	CA	NONE	01/31/2020	

Scott Walter  
President  
Capital Research Center  
1513 Sixteenth St. NW  
Washington, DC 20036

---

**From:** Juleanna Glover  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 15, 2021 9:12 AM  
**To:** Scott Walter  
**Subject:**

Hi Scott – I work with James and Kathryn Murdoch. There is a factual error in your piece. Please call me when you can? Thank you. Juleanna

**RidgelyWalsh.com**  
xxx-xxx-xxxx