If you don't regularly receive my reports, request a free subscription at steve_bakke@comcast.net!

Follow me on Twitter at http://www.myslantonthings.com!

Visit my website at http://www.myslantonthings.com!

TODAY'S "QUICK HIT": GORSUCH AND CITIZENS UNITED: SOME PEOPLE ARE MAKING FOOLISH PREDICTIONS!

By Stephen L. Bakke 🏁 April 14, 2017



Here's what provoked me:

The objections to the concept of "corporate personhood" keeps coming back to us. I can only keep rolling out what I have learned in researching the concept. This is a "like it or not" situation and I believe people waste their breath by objecting.

Here's my response:

Gorsuch and Citizens United: Some People Are Making Foolish Predictions!

An April 14 writer predicted that, as an "originalist," Supreme Court Justice Gorsuch would support reversing Citizens United. The writer obviously believes this to be a new concept, and objects to Freedom of Speech (in the form of political expression) applying to corporations. I ask you to consider:

- "Corporate personhood" is an old legal concept dating back to pre-Revolutionary War times and the laws of England. It also appears in an early entry to the U.S. Code.
- 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 "artificial persons have been formed to promote and perpetuate the interests of commerce, of learning, and of religion."
- 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 applied precedent in deciding "Citizens United." No new precedent was established!

Those comments apply "whether we like it or not." I advise the writer that the strongest rebuttal that can be made is "Tell me it ain't so!"