


If you don't regularly receive my reports, request a free subscription at steve_bakke@comcast.net !
Follow me on Twitter at <http://twitter.com/@BakkeSteve> and receive links to my posts and more!
Visit my website at <http://www.myslantonthings.com> !

 **TODAY'S "QUICK HIT":**
CITIZENS UNITED:
DEBATE PRODUCES
CLARITY AND
UNDERSTANDING!



By Stephen L. Bakke  September 25, 2016

Here's what provoked me:

One of my "full blown" guest columns, which was recently published, dealt with the Supreme Court's "Citizens United" decision. It ruffled the feathers of a reader who responded with a published rebuttal. Here is my response. I'll be lucky if this is published, but one can never be sure.

Here's my response:

Citizens United: Debate Produces Clarity and Understanding!

I thank the writer on September 25 who gave a rebuttal of my earlier guest column ("Citizens United rebuttal"). Debate brings clarity, and that's a good thing. Here are a few of my clarifying comments:

- I did not identify corporations as "people," as asserted – rather I referred to the concept of "person."
- I used the term "corporate personhood," which is a very old legal concept.
- "Corporate personhood" is NOT a concept of recent construct. It dates back to pre-Revolutionary War times and the laws of England. It also appears in an early entry to the U.S. Code.
- Our Founders were NOT unanimous on anything. But there's adequate early evidence and references for one to assume there was "Founders' intent," in general.
- One justification for "corporate personhood" and the related freedom of speech is that individual "people," when collectively coming together in corporations, unions, or non-profit organizations, don't give up any Constitutional rights.
- Careful analysis indicates the Supreme Court followed the Constitution and did not create a new interpretation in deciding "Citizens United."

I believe those comments apply "whether we like it or not." I advise the writer that the strongest rebuttal he can make is "Tell me it ain't so!"