



**SOME WOULD  
TAKE POLITICAL  
PARTICIPATION  
FROM ONE GROUP .....  
AND GIVE IT  
TO ANOTHER!**

By Stephen L. Bakke 🇺🇸 August 29, 2016



An article I recently read reminded me of the controversy surrounding the “Citizens United” Supreme Court decision. The author blames that decision on “an-out-of-control Supreme Court.” He argues that because the “corporate entity” was created by the government, it is not endowed with any right of free speech, and can’t operate like it does. This argument could contain some merit, especially if “corporate personhood” were a new concept – but it’s not.

The 2010 “Citizens” decision dealt with corporate election spending and hasn’t been forgotten. We are now deep into the presidential campaign season and the Democrats are promising to reverse it. Before you decide which side you are on, I’d like you to consider facts beyond those provided by Mr. Baker. Most people use uninformed “common sense” when considering support or opposition to “Citizens.” There’s more to it than initially meets the eye.

This is a First Amendment “Freedom of Speech” debate. And because it’s a Constitutional issue, it won’t be reversed easily or quickly. So, what’s behind this controversy? The First Amendment states: “Congress shall make no law.....abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press.....” Let’s start there and find out more.



Those First Amendment words make no distinction between corporations and individuals, but even if it had said “person,” the controversy wouldn’t disappear. The “Citizens” decision affirms that freedom of speech, including political speech, also applies to corporations. Some argue that the First Amendment Freedom of Speech provision actually strengthens the Constitutional protection of Freedom of the Press.

Many opponents of “Citizens” seem to imply that corporate rights and personhood are of

recent origin. In fact, its origins go back to our founding and earlier, to the laws of England. Alexander Hamilton observed that to “erect a corporation, is to substitute a legal or artificial to

[for] a natural person” – i.e. an “artificial person.” Justice James Wilson (nominated in 1789) stated that “artificial persons have been formed to promote and perpetuate the interests of commerce, of learning, and of religion.” And an early entry in the U.S. Code specifies that corporations are included in the reference to “person.”

What this really means is that Americans, when collectively coming together in corporations, unions, or non-profit organizations, don’t give up their Constitutional rights – speech, press, and protected property ownership for example.

Careful analysis actually indicates the Supreme Court followed the Constitution and did not create a new interpretation. Who knows when or how this debate will end.

***If corporations are eventually taken out of the political mix, who might be waiting in the wings to fill the vacuum? Hold on to your hat!***

I read an article by Ron Hayduk, political science professor at Queens College, City University of New York (“The right of non-citizen residents to vote is the suffrage issue of our time,” 12/27/14). Many proponents even want to extend voting rights to illegal immigrants.

Here are a few observations on non-citizen voting rights:

- Proponents believe voting rights should follow residence, employment, etc. – not citizenship.
- Proponents view the naturalization process as an artificial barrier to citizenship, rather than a sensible process.
- They feel illegal immigrant status is just a handicap to be accommodated, rather than any sort of transgression with consequences.
- Borders are seen as artificial and bothersome impediments to multi-culturalism.

Sadly, this issue has become a political football. Whichever political extreme benefits by gaining votes, you can be sure the leaders of the movement would be from that political affiliation.

We must resist this movement because:

- Our form of government is exceptional and worthy of preservation.
- Unless viewed as something special and something to be earned, voting will never be taken seriously.
- National allegiance and regulated borders are essential for national defense.
- People can’t vote objectively if they lack exclusive national allegiance.
- The naturalization process is an essential part of an orderly and effective immigration system.

The belief in American Exceptionalism demands that any movement to give non-citizens, and even illegal immigrants, voting rights must be blocked!