

# ACROSS THE AISLE

---

The Growing Trans-Partisan Opposition to Citizens United

---

More than 100 Republican Officials on Record in Support of  
A Constitutional Amendment to Reclaim Our Democracy

REPORT COMPILED BY

Free Speech For People  
September 2014

---

Across America, a growing transpartisan movement is calling for a constitutional amendment to overturn the U.S. Supreme Court's 2010 decision in *Citizens United v. FEC* and to reclaim our democracy.

---

# Introduction

In just four years since *Citizens United*, 16 states, more than 200 Members of Congress, and more than 550 cities and towns have called for a constitutional amendment to overturn the ruling. And, on Monday, September 8, 2014, the United States Senate will hold an historic vote on the **Democracy For All Amendment (S.J. Res. 19)**, which would allow for overall campaign spending limits and would end the big money dominance of our elections.

Article V of the U.S. Constitution sets an appropriately high bar for the amendment process. To be enacted, a constitutional amendment must be first approved by 2/3 of each chamber of Congress and then ratified by 3/4 of the states.

Given these high hurdles, bipartisan support is likely to be essential.

Polling has long indicated robust popular support for an amendment, across party lines. For example, a **2010/2011 Peter Hart poll** found that 79% of Americans, including 68% of Republicans, 82% of independents, and 87% of Democrats "support a Constitutional amendment that would overturn the *Citizens United* decision and make clear that corporations do not have the same rights as people". Further, a **2012 Associated Press poll** found that 83% of Americans, including 81% of Republicans, 78% of independents, and 85% of Democrats believe "there should be limits on the amount of money corporations, unions, and other organizations can contribute to outside organizations trying to influence campaigns for president, Senate, and U.S. House." And new polling numbers from **Every Voice** show that 73% of voters in a dozen Senate battleground states that Republican presidential candidate Mitt Romney won in 2012 support an amendment to overturn *Citizens United*.

The best poll, of course, is an actual vote of the people, such as the statewide votes held in November 2012 in Colorado and Montana on ballot questions calling for a constitutional amendment. Both votes demonstrated similarly strong support: 74% of Coloradans approved Amendment 65; Montanans approved Initiative 166, also by 74%, while simultaneously backing Mitt Romney for President by a margin of more than 10 points.

Many prominent Republican officials have stepped forward to lead the way to enacting an amendment. Many more have criticized the *Citizens United* decision publicly, often in stinging terms.

**Free Speech For People** is pleased to present this compilation of more than 100 such Republican leaders, including both current and former, both federal and state, and both elected and appointed public officials.

This compilation is comprised of:

**137 REPUBLICANS** who have called for an amendment to overturn *Citizens United*;

**9 REPUBLICANS** who have criticized *Citizens United* for its claim that corporations have constitutional rights; and:

**13 MORE REPUBLICANS** who have criticized *Citizens United* in more general terms.

The total to date is **159 REPUBLICAN** officials, prominent at the federal or state level, who oppose *Citizens United*.

We are also appending quotes from three especially prominent Republicans whose criticism of the emerging problems of unchecked corporate power and corporate participation in politics pre-dated *Citizens United*.

Emphasis in bold throughout this document is added.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Republicans Calling for a Constitutional Amendment to Overturn *Citizens United*

6

Republicans Critical of *Citizens United* on the Matter of Corporate Constitutional Rights

17

Republicans Critical of *Citizens United* Generally

22

Appendix

27

About Free Speech For People

29

# Republicans Calling for a Constitutional Amendment to Overturn *Citizens United*

---

## 1. **Walter Jones**, U.S. Representative, 3rd district of North Carolina (1995-present)

Co-sponsored H.J. Res. 21 (in the 113th Congress) and H.J. Res. 88 (in the 112th Congress), identical bills to amend the U.S. Constitution to make it clear that corporations do not have constitutional rights, as if they were people: <https://beta.congress.gov/bill/113th-congress/house-joint-resolution/21/cosponsors> and <http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/z?d112:hj88>:

## 2. **David Stockman**, Director, U.S. Office of Management and Budget under President Reagan (1981-1985)

On "Moyers & Company", March 9th, 2012: <http://billmoyers.com/segment/david-stockman-on-crony-capitalism/> at 31:55

"Now we have an entitled class in this country that is far worse than, remember the "welfare queens" that Ronald Reagan used to talk about? We now have an entitled class of Wall St. financiers and corporate CEOs who believe the government is there to do... whatever it takes to keep the game going and their stock price moving upward."...

"How do we solve it? **I think we can only solve it by... a Constitutional Amendment**, so I don't say this lightly, but I think we have to eliminate all contributions above \$100.- and get corporations out of politics entirely. **Ban corporations from campaign contributions or attempting to influence elections.** Now I know that runs into current "free speech", so the only way around it is a Constitutional Amendment to cleanse our political system on a one-time basis from this enormously corrupting influence that has built up. And I think nothing is really going to change until we get money out of politics and do some radical things to change the way elections are financed and the way the process is influenced by organized money."

## 3. **Charles "Buddy" Roemer**, former Governor of Louisiana (1988-1992)

Testimony at a hearing of the U.S. Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on the Constitution, on "Taking Back Our Democracy: Responding to Citizens United and the Rise of Super PACs," July 24th, 2012: <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CHRG-112shrg86915/html/CHRG-112shrg86915.htm>

"...it is my belief that Washington DC is not just broken. It is bought, rented, leased, owned by the money givers. Special interests, the bundlers, PACs, Super PACs, lobbyists, the Wall Street bankers, the pharmaceuticals, the corporate giants, the insurance companies, organized labor, the GSE's like Fannie and Freddie, energy companies, on and on and on and on. And this is not about one party versus the other, or about one person or another. It is about systemic and institutional corruption where the size of your check rather than the strength of your need or idea determine your place in line..."

"I recommend that we work simultaneously on statutory and constitutional efforts to increase the public discourse while revealing the special interests without limiting the right to free speech."

"An appropriate Constitutional Amendment could be required as we work through this complex problem,... I see the need to follow a two-initiative approach at the same time: statutorily and constitutionally. We cannot wait as a nation, so we must have a two-pronged effort from the beginning: an immediate correction maximizing the chance for real people to get re-involved and re-move the gridlock addiction fostered by the special interests who dominate fundraising (my seven point plan for example), while constitutional efforts are coordinated."

#### 4. **John Bohlinger**, former Lieutenant Governor of Montana (2005-2013)

In a video supporting [ElectionsAreForUs.org](http://ElectionsAreForUs.org), a website calling for a constitutional amendment: <http://youtu.be/ditFMj2EhUQ>

"I'm John Bohlinger, Montana's Lieutenant Governor, and I'm a Republican. Now, Republicans and Democrats don't always agree on policy matters, but there's one thing we do agree on, and that is: corporate money should not influence the outcome of an election."

At a press conference on May 3rd, 2012 endorsing Montana's ballot initiative I-166, calling for a constitutional amendment: <http://youtu.be/opemPbg2gkw>

"This is a government of the people, by the people, for the people, and corporations are not people."

At the same press conference: <http://youtu.be/ZWSH07ksqbo>

"The Corrupt Practices Act: that was adopted by the people of Montana in 1912, putting some limits and boundaries on the influence of money on the outcome of elections. This is a question that I think goes beyond partisan matters of politics. It's not a question of, well, this is a Republican issue or this is a Democrat issue. This is an issue about fair outcomes of elections."

#### 5. **Verner Bertelsen**, former Secretary of State, Montana (1988-1989)

At the same press conference on May 3rd, 2012 endorsing Montana's ballot initiative I-166, calling for a constitutional amendment: <http://youtu.be/opemPbg2gkw>

"Without an amendment to the U.S. Constitution, clarifying that corporations are not people, and that money is not speech, policies aimed at cleaning up elections and reducing the undue influence of money in politics will remain under a threat."

In an opinion piece in the Billings Gazette, "Stand against unlimited campaign spending, vote for I-166", October 15th, 2012: <http://billingsgazette.com/news/opinion/guest/guest-opinion-stand->

[against-unlimited-campaign-spending-vote-for-i/  
article\\_8a1755d3-6539-5e37-92a6-3183d8b6eba9.html](http://www.freespeechforpeople.org/against-unlimited-campaign-spending-vote-for-i/article_8a1755d3-6539-5e37-92a6-3183d8b6eba9.html)

“On your ballot, you’ll see state initiative I-166. You should vote FOR it. A vote FOR I-166 shows that you still believe it’s people, not corporations, who should call the shots in our political system.

Amend U.S. Constitution

I-166 calls on our leaders to amend the U.S. Constitution and re-institute limits on political spending. It would assert that corporations aren’t people, they shouldn’t be granted the same rights as people, and they certainly shouldn’t be allowed to buy elections.

I-166 is a chance to fight back against the bad Citizens United decision by the U.S. Supreme Court and more recent decisions that threaten to undo Montana’s century-old laws against political corruption. It’s an initiative supported strongly by Montana Republicans and Democrats alike.

I am a lifelong Republican and I served as Montana secretary of state from 1988 to 1989...

Corporations aren’t people and money isn’t speech. CEOs of corporations may choose to personally contribute to political campaigns, but they shouldn’t be allowed to use shareholders’ money to do so.”

6. **Gary Stevens**, President of the State Senate (2009-2012), and State Senator, Alaska (2003-present) and:
7. **Kevin Meyer**, State Senator, Alaska (2009-present)

Voted “Yea” on 3/21/12 to pass bill # SJR 13:  
[http://www.legis.state.ak.us/basis/get\\_jrn\\_page.asp?session=27&bill=SJR13&jrn=1904&hse=S](http://www.legis.state.ak.us/basis/get_jrn_page.asp?session=27&bill=SJR13&jrn=1904&hse=S)

8. **Catherine Cloutier**, State Senator, Delaware (2000-present)

Joined a majority of state legislators in signing a letter to Congress calling for an amendment:

<http://freespeechforpeople.org/sites/default/files/DE-ltr-June-10-2013-3Rs-highlighted.PDF>

9. **Chris Steineger**, State Senator, Kansas (1997-2013)

Co-sponsored bill # SCR 1617:  
[http://www.kslegislature.org/li/b2011\\_12/measures/documents/scr1617\\_00\\_0000.pdf](http://www.kslegislature.org/li/b2011_12/measures/documents/scr1617_00_0000.pdf)

10. **Karen McConaughay**, State Senator, Illinois (2013-present)

Co-sponsored bill # SJR 27:  
<http://ilga.gov/legislation/billstatus.asp?DocNum=27&GAID=12&GA=98&DocTypeID=SJR&LegID=75827&SessionID=85>

Voted with the majority to pass SJR 27 on May 14<sup>th</sup>, 2013:

<http://freespeechforpeople.org/sites/default/files/IL%20Sen%20votes%20for%20SJR%2027%205-14-13.pdf>

Senator McConnaughay is also quoted in a press report describing her reasons for supporting the bill: <http://www.dailyherald.com/article/20130417/news/704179644/>

State Sen. Karen McConnaughay, a St. Charles Republican, spoke against the influence of special interest groups in front of a crowd of around 60 activists from around the state.

"That the rights to influence our political process by big business, by corporations and wealthy individuals, our forefathers never intended for that to trump the rights of us as individuals," McConnaughay said.

11. **Pamela J. Althoff**, State Senator, Illinois (2003-present)

Co-sponsored bill # SJR 27:

[http://ilga.gov/legislation/billstatus.asp?](http://ilga.gov/legislation/billstatus.asp?DocNum=27&GAID=12&GA=98&DocTypeID=SJR&LegID=75827&SessionID=85)

[DocNum=27&GAID=12&GA=98&DocTypeID=SJR&LegID=75827&SessionID=85](http://ilga.gov/legislation/billstatus.asp?DocNum=27&GAID=12&GA=98&DocTypeID=SJR&LegID=75827&SessionID=85)

Voted with the majority to pass SJR 27 on May 14<sup>th</sup>, 2013:

<http://freespeechforpeople.org/sites/default/files/IL%20Sen%20votes%20for%20SJR%2027%205-14-13.pdf>

12. **David Burns**, State Senator, Maine (2012-present), and:

13. **Ronald F. Collins**, State Senator, Maine (2010-present),

Cosponsored SP 548: <http://www.mainelegislature.org/LawMakerWeb/sponsors.asp?ID=280048833>

14. **Roger Katz**, State Senator, Maine (2010-present),

15. **Brian Langley**, State Senator, Maine (2010-present),

16. **Tom Saviello**, State Senator, Maine (2010-present), and:

17. **Edward Youngblood**, State Senator, Maine (2012-present)

Cosponsored SP 548: <http://www.mainelegislature.org/LawMakerWeb/sponsors.asp?ID=280048833>

Senators Katz, Langley, Saviello, and Youngblood also voted with the majority to pass SP 548:

[http://www.mainelegislature.org/LawMakerWeb/rollcall.asp?](http://www.mainelegislature.org/LawMakerWeb/rollcall.asp?ID=280048833&chamber=Senate&serialnumber=57)

[ID=280048833&chamber=Senate&serialnumber=57](http://www.mainelegislature.org/LawMakerWeb/rollcall.asp?ID=280048833&chamber=Senate&serialnumber=57)

In addition, Senator Youngblood appeared at a rally in support of this resolution, on January 22nd, 2013, as reported in a Bangor Daily News story: <http://bangordailynews.com/2013/01/22/politics/maine-lawmakers-join-effort-to-amend-constitution-to-allow-campaign-funding-limits/>

Republican state Sen. Edward Youngblood of Brewer and Democratic state Sen. Geoff Gratwick of Bangor joined forces Tuesday to endorse a constitutional amendment to overturn the Supreme Court's 2010 ruling that equates campaign donations to free speech protected by the First Amendment...

...Youngblood supports a constitutional amendment to overturn Citizens United and has submitted legislation... Youngblood said Tuesday that he expects it will draw Democrats, Republicans and independents as co-sponsors.

“There has to be a way to secure First Amendment rights to speech and still control the amount of dollars spent on campaigns,” he said. “It should be plain to everyone after the election we’ve just had, which broke records for spending, that the system isn’t getting better.”

18. **Rodney Whittemore**, State Senator, Maine (2010-present)

Voted with the majority to pass SP 548:

<http://www.mainelegislature.org/LawMakerWeb/rollcall.asp?ID=280048833&chamber=Senate&serialnumber=57>

19. **Sean Nienow**, State Senator, Minnesota (2011-present)

Voted with the majority to pass bill # SF 17:

[http://freespeechforpeople.org/sites/default/files/MN\\_Sen\\_Nienow\\_May\\_2013.pdf](http://freespeechforpeople.org/sites/default/files/MN_Sen_Nienow_May_2013.pdf) or <http://www.senate.leg.state.mn.us/journals/2013-2014/20130502048.pdf>

20. **Ron Arthun**, State Senator, Montana (2011-present),

21. **Edward Buttrey**, State Senator, Montana (2011-present),

22. **Jennifer Fielder**, State Senator, Montana (2013-present),

23. **Llew Jones**, State Senator, Montana (2011-present),

24. **Alan Olson**, State Senator, Montana (2011-present),

25. **Scott Sales**, State Senator, Montana (2013-present),

26. **Bruce Tutvedt**, State Senator, Montana (2009-present), and:

27. **Chas Vincent**, State Senator, Montana (2011-present)

Voted “Yea” on bill # SJ 19:

[http://laws.leg.mt.gov/legprd/LAW0211W\\$BLAC.VoteTabulation?P\\_VOTE\\_SEQ=S765&P\\_SESS=20131](http://laws.leg.mt.gov/legprd/LAW0211W$BLAC.VoteTabulation?P_VOTE_SEQ=S765&P_SESS=20131)

Bill text is on record at: [http://leg.mt.gov/bills/2013/senjoint/SJ0019\\_2.pdf](http://leg.mt.gov/bills/2013/senjoint/SJ0019_2.pdf)

28. **Kevin Mullin**, State Senator, Vermont (2003-present),

29. **Vincent Illuzzi**, State Senator, Vermont (1981-2013),

30. **Diane B. Snelling**, State Senator, Vermont (2002-present),

31. **Richard Westman**, State Senator, Vermont (2011-present), and:

32. **William T. Doyle**, State Senator, Vermont (1969-present)

Voted in support of bill # JRS 11:

<http://www.leg.state.vt.us/database/status/rcdetail.cfm?Session=2012&RollCallID=466>

33. **Bob Lynn**, Chair, Committee on State Affairs, and State Representative, Alaska (2003-present) and:

34. **Doug Isaacson**, State Representative, Alaska (2013-present)

Described in a press report as supporting bill # HJR 8: <http://radiokenai.net/campaign-reform-being-discussed-in-juneau/>

The House State Affairs Committee held a hearing yesterday on House Joint Resolution 8, sponsored by Anchorage Representative Les Gara.

HJR8 asks Congress to amend the U.S. constitution to prohibit corporations and unions from unlimited spending on political campaigns.

Committee chair, Bob Lynn of Anchorage, said that he supports the resolution since companies with a foreign board of directors can influence domestic politics; North Pole Representative Doug Issacson also backed the resolution.

Bill text is on record at: [http://www.legis.state.ak.us/basis/get\\_bill\\_text.asp?hsid=HJR008A&session=28](http://www.legis.state.ak.us/basis/get_bill_text.asp?hsid=HJR008A&session=28)

35. **Donald Blakey**, State Representative, Delaware (2006-present), and:  
36. **Michael Ramone**, State Representative, Delaware (2008-present)

Joined a majority of state legislators in signing a letter to Congress calling for an amendment:  
<http://freespeechforpeople.org/sites/default/files/DE-ltr-June-10-2013-3Rs-highlighted.PDF>

37. **Josh Harms**, State Representative, Illinois (2012-present),  
38. **David Harris**, State Representative, Illinois (2010-present),  
39. **Michael McAuliffe**, State Representative, Illinois (1996-present),  
40. **Sandra Pihos**, State Representative, Illinois (2002-present),  
41. **Robert Pritchard**, State Representative, Illinois (2003-present),  
42. **Pam Roth**, State Representative, Illinois (2011-present),  
43. **Jim Sacia**, State Representative, Illinois (2002-present),  
44. **Michael Tryon**, State Representative, Illinois (2004-present), and  
45. **Barbara Wheeler**, State Representative, Illinois (2012-present)

Voted with the majority of State Representatives to pass bill # SJR 27: <http://freespeechforpeople.org/sites/default/files/IL%20House%20Vote.pdf> or [http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/votehistory/98/senate/09800SJ0027\\_05142013\\_049000D.pdf](http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/votehistory/98/senate/09800SJ0027_05142013_049000D.pdf)

46. **Dennis Keschl**, State Representative, Maine (2010-present)

Co-sponsored SP 548: <http://www.mainelegislature.org/LawMakerWeb/sponsors.asp?ID=280048833>

...and also voted with the majority of State Representatives to pass it: <http://www.mainelegislature.org/LawMakerWeb/rollcall.asp?ID=280048833&chamber=House&serialnumber=60>

Representative Keschl was also quoted in a Bangor Daily News Story describing his reasons for supporting SP 548: <http://bangordailynews.com/2013/04/30/politics/senate-backs-resolutions-supporting-campaign-finance-immigration-reforms/>

In a House floor speech, Rep. Dennis Keschl, R-Belgrade, said, “Unions, corporations and other wealthy special interest groups should not be able to use their money to drown out the voices of the people.”

47. **Alexander Willette**, Assistant Republican Leader and State Representative, Maine (2010-Present),
48. **Bernard Ayotte**, State Representative, Maine (2006-present),
49. **Michael Beaulieu**, State Representative, Maine (2006-present),
50. **Tyler Clark**, State Representative, Maine (2008-present),
51. **David Cotta**, State Representative, Maine (2006-present),
52. **Larry Dunphy**, State Representative, Maine (2010-present),
53. **Brian Duprey**, State Representative, Maine (2012-present),
54. **James Gillway**, State Representative, Maine (2010-present),
55. **Lance Harvell**, State Representative, Maine (2009-present),
56. **Jon Kinney**, State Representative, Maine (2012-present),
57. **Gary Knight**, State Representative, Maine (2006-present),
58. **Sharri MacDonald**, State Representative, Maine (2012-present),
59. **Joyce Maker**, State Representative, Maine (2010-present),
60. **Richard Malaby**, State Representative, Maine (2010-present),
61. **Don Marean**, State Representative, Maine (2012-present),
62. **Matt Pouliot**, State Representative, Maine (2012-present),
63. **Roger Reed**, State Representative, Maine (2012-present),
64. **Beth Turner**, State Representative, Maine (2011-present),
65. **Tom Tyler**, State Representative, Maine (2012-present),
66. **Amy Volk**, State Representative, Maine (2010-present),
67. **Windol Weaver**, State Representative, Maine (2006-present),
68. **Corey Wilson**, State Representative, Maine (2012-present),
69. **Ellen Winchenbach**, State Representative, Maine (2012-present), and:
70. **Steve Wood**, State Representative, Maine (2010-present)

Voted with the majority of State Representatives to pass SP 548: <http://www.mainelegislature.org/LawMakerWeb/rollcall.asp?ID=280048833&chamber=House&serialnumber=60>

71. **Ron George**, State Delegate, Maryland (2007-present)

Joined a majority of state legislators in signing a letter to Congress calling for an amendment: <http://freespeechforpeople.org/sites/default/files/MDGeneralAssembly-5pages-RonGeorge-highlight.pdf>

72. **Liz Bangerter**, State Representative, Montana (2011-present)

Voted in favor of bills # HJ 10 (in 2011) and # HJ 6 (in 2013): [http://laws.leg.mt.gov/legprd/LAW0211W\\$BLAC.VoteTabulation?P\\_VOTE\\_SEQ=H695&P\\_SESS=20111](http://laws.leg.mt.gov/legprd/LAW0211W$BLAC.VoteTabulation?P_VOTE_SEQ=H695&P_SESS=20111)

And:

[http://laws.leg.mt.gov/legprd/LAW0211W\\$BLAC.VoteTabulation?P\\_VOTE\\_SEQ=H798&P\\_SESS=20131](http://laws.leg.mt.gov/legprd/LAW0211W$BLAC.VoteTabulation?P_VOTE_SEQ=H798&P_SESS=20131)

73. **Lila Walter Evans**, State Representative, Montana (2011-2013),

74. **Daniel Salomon**, State Representative, Montana (2011-present), and:
75. **Bob Wagner**, State Representative, Montana (2009-2013)

Voted in favor of bill # HJ 10: [http://laws.leg.mt.gov/legprd/LAW0211W\\$BLAC.VoteTabulation?P\\_VOTE\\_SEQ=H695&P\\_SESS=20111](http://laws.leg.mt.gov/legprd/LAW0211W$BLAC.VoteTabulation?P_VOTE_SEQ=H695&P_SESS=20111)

76. **Christy Clark**, State Representative, Montana (2011-present),
77. **Steve Gibson**, State Representative, Montana (2011-present),
78. **Sarah Laszloffy**, State Representative, Montana (2013-present),
79. **Dennis Lenz**, State Representative, Montana (2013-present),
80. **Jesse O'Hara**, State Representative, Montana (2007-present),
81. **Nicholas Schwaderer**, State Representative, Montana (2013-present),
82. **Ray Shaw**, State Representative, Montana (2013-present),
83. **Kirk Wagoner**, State Representative, Montana (2013-present), and:
84. **Jeffrey Welborn**, State Representative, Montana (2009-present),

Voted in favor of bill # HJ 6:  
[http://laws.leg.mt.gov/legprd/LAW0211W\\$BLAC.VoteTabulation?P\\_VOTE\\_SEQ=H798&P\\_SESS=20131](http://laws.leg.mt.gov/legprd/LAW0211W$BLAC.VoteTabulation?P_VOTE_SEQ=H798&P_SESS=20131)

85. **David Bickford**, State Representative, New Hampshire (1996-2006, 2008-2010, 2012-present),
86. **Timothy Comerford**, State Representative, New Hampshire (2008-present),
87. **Carolyn Gargasz**, State Representative, New Hampshire (2000-present),
88. **James Grenier**, State Representative, New Hampshire (2012-present),
89. **Daniel Itse**, State Representative, New Hampshire (2000-present),
90. **David Kidder**, State Representative, New Hampshire (2004-present), and:

Voted with the majority on May 15, 2014 to pass bill # SB307:  
<http://legiscan.com/NH/rollcall/SB307/id/364694>

And:

Voted with the majority on March 20th, 2013 to pass bill # HCR 2:  
<https://org2.salsalabs.com/o/7003/images/HCR%202%20Final%20RollCall%203-20-13%20w%2010%20R%20yeas.pdf> or [http://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/bill\\_status/Roll\\_calls/billstatus\\_rcdetails.aspx?vs=79&sy=2013&lb=H&eb=HCR0002&sortoption=billnumber&txtsessionyear=2013&txtbillnumber=HCR2&ddlsporsors=&lrs=290](http://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/bill_status/Roll_calls/billstatus_rcdetails.aspx?vs=79&sy=2013&lb=H&eb=HCR0002&sortoption=billnumber&txtsessionyear=2013&txtbillnumber=HCR2&ddlsporsors=&lrs=290)

91. **James Belanger**, State Representative, New Hampshire (2010-present),
92. **Ronald Belanger**, State Representative, New Hampshire (1992-present),
93. **Regina Birdsell**, State Representative, New Hampshire (2010-present),
94. **Gene Charron**, State Representative, New Hampshire (2004-present),
95. **Lars Christiansen**, State Representative, New Hampshire (1996-present)
96. **Gary Daniels**, State Representative, New Hampshire (1996-2000, 2006-present)
97. **Ralph Doolan**, State Representative, New Hampshire (2012-present)
98. **Robert Elliot**, State Representative, New Hampshire (2006-present)
99. **Beverly Ferrante**, State Representative, New Hampshire (2008-present)
100. **Donald Flanders**, State Representative, New Hampshire (2000-present)

101. **Jack Hayes**, State Representative, New Hampshire (2012-present)
102. **Laura Jones**, State Representative, New Hampshire (2010-present)
103. **Priscilla Lockwood**, State Representative, New Hampshire (1998-present)
104. **Robert Luther**, State Representative, New Hampshire (2010-present)
105. **David Murotake**, State Representative, New Hampshire (2012-present)
106. **Robert Nigrello**, State Representative, New Hampshire (2012-present)
107. **Elisabeth Sanders**, State Representative, New Hampshire (2004-present)
108. **John Sedensky**, State Representative, New Hampshire (2008-present)
109. **Steven Smith**, State Representative, New Hampshire (2010-present)
110. **Kevin St. James**, State Representative, New Hampshire (2012-present)
111. **Jordan Ulery**, State Representative, New Hampshire (2004-present)
112. **Karen Umberger**, State Representative, New Hampshire (2008-present)
113. **Kenneth Weyler**, State Representative, New Hampshire (1990-2008, 2010-present)

Voted with the majority on May 15, 2014 to pass bill # SB307:

<http://legiscan.com/NH/rollcall/SB307/id/364694>

114. **Susan Emerson**, State Representative, New Hampshire (2000-2002, 2004-present),
115. **Richard Gordon**, State Representative, New Hampshire (2012-present),
116. **Stephen Holmes**, State Representative, New Hampshire (2012-present),
117. **Herbert Richardson**, State Representative, New Hampshire (2002-2006, 2008-present)

Voted with the majority on March 20th, 2013 to pass bill # HCR 2:

<https://org2.salsalabs.com/o/7003/images/HCR%202%20Final%20RollCall%203-20-13%20w%2010%20R%20yeas.pdf> or [http://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/bill\\_status/Roll\\_calls/billstatus\\_rcdetails.aspx?vs=79&sy=2013&lb=H&eb=HCR0002&sortoption=billnumber&txtsessionyear=2013&txtbillnumber=HCR2&dclsponsors=&lsr=290](http://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/bill_status/Roll_calls/billstatus_rcdetails.aspx?vs=79&sy=2013&lb=H&eb=HCR0002&sortoption=billnumber&txtsessionyear=2013&txtbillnumber=HCR2&dclsponsors=&lsr=290)

118. **Jack Ciattarelli**, State Assembly Member, New Jersey (2011-present)

Voted with the majority on October 18th, 2012 to pass bill # AR 86:

<https://org2.salsalabs.com/o/7003/images/NJ%20AR86%20roll%20call%2010-18-12.pdf>; Roll call also available via navigation under the following general link: <http://www.njleg.state.nj.us/bills/BillView.asp>

119. **Don Tripp**, State Representative, New Mexico (1999-present)

Voted with the majority on January 31st, 2012 to pass bill # HM 4: <http://www.nmlegis.gov/Sessions/12%20regular/votes/HM004HVOTE.pdf>

120. **Michael Montesano**, State Assembly Member, New York (2010-present)

Joined a majority of State Assembly Members in signing a June 2014 letter to Congress calling for an amendment:

<http://www.ny4democracy.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/AssemblyLetter.pdf>

And:

Co-sponsored bill # K 1016: [http://assembly.state.ny.us/leg/?default\\_fld=%0D%0A&bn=K1016&term=2011&Summary=Y&Actions=Y&Votes=Y&Memo=Y&Text=Y](http://assembly.state.ny.us/leg/?default_fld=%0D%0A&bn=K1016&term=2011&Summary=Y&Actions=Y&Votes=Y&Memo=Y&Text=Y)

- 121. **Clifford Crouch**, State Assembly Member, New York (1995-present)
- 122. **Chad Lupinacci**, State Assembly Member, New York (2013-present)
- 123. **David McDonough**, State Assembly Member, New York (2002-present)

Joined a majority of State Assembly Members in signing a June 2014 letter to Congress calling for an amendment:

<http://www.ny4democracy.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/AssemblyLetter.pdf>

- 124. **Dan Moul**, State Representative, Pennsylvania (2007-present),
- 125. **Mark Mustio**, State Representative, Pennsylvania (2003-present), and:
- 126. **RoseMarie Swanger**, State Representative, Pennsylvania (2007-present)

Co-sponsored bill # HR 556: <http://www.legis.state.pa.us/CFDOCS/Legis/PN/Public/btCheck.cfmxType=HTM&sessYr=2011&sessInd=0&billBody=H&billTyp=R&billNbr=0556&pn=3029>

- 127. **Bob Faehn**, former State House Majority Leader and former State Representative, South Dakota (2005-2011)

Co-sponsored bill # HCR 1018: [http://legis.sd.gov/Legislative\\_Session/Bills/Bill.aspx?Bill=HCR1018&Session=2010](http://legis.sd.gov/Legislative_Session/Bills/Bill.aspx?Bill=HCR1018&Session=2010)

- 128. **Mark Kirkeby**, former State Representative, South Dakota (2007-2012; State Senator, 2013-present)

Voted for bill # HCR 1018: [http://legis.sd.gov/Legislative\\_Session/Bills/RollCall.aspx?Vote=7679&Session=2010](http://legis.sd.gov/Legislative_Session/Bills/RollCall.aspx?Vote=7679&Session=2010)

- 129. **Dennis Devereux**, State Representative, Vermont (2007-present),
- 130. **Adam Howard**, State Representative, Vermont (2009-2013),
- 131. **Patti Komline**, State Representative, Vermont (2005-present),
- 132. **Oliver Olsen**, State Representative, Vermont (2010-2013), and:
- 133. **Kurt Wright**, State Representative, Vermont (2001-present)

Voted with the majority to pass bill # JRS 11: <http://www.leg.state.vt.us/database/status/rcdetail.cfm?Session=2012&RollCallID=481>

- 134. **Mike Hope**, State Representative, Washington State (2009-present)

Co-sponsored bill # HJM 4001: <http://apps.leg.wa.gov/billinfo/summary.aspx?bill=4001&year=2013>

- 135. **Jan Angel**, State Representative, Washington State (2009-present)

Voted for bill # HJM 4001: <http://apps.leg.wa.gov/billinfo/summary.aspx?bill=4001&>

136. **John Ellem**, State Delegate, West Virginia (2000-present)

Co-sponsored bill # HR 8 in 2012: [http://www.legis.state.wv.us/Bill\\_Text\\_HTML/2012\\_SESSIONS/RS/Bills/hr8%20intr.htm](http://www.legis.state.wv.us/Bill_Text_HTML/2012_SESSIONS/RS/Bills/hr8%20intr.htm)

Delegate Ellem is also quoted in a press report describing his reasons for supporting bill # HR 9, in 2013: <http://www.statejournal.com/story/21820476/wv-house-resolution-seeks-to-overturn-citizens-united>

Delegate John Ellem, R-Wood, dusted off the history books and pointed out the Dutch East India Company, the first multi-national corporation, was created to do big business and had powers to declare war and to try, imprison and execute people. But, Ellem said, times have changed.

"It was a tool," he said. "Corporations existed before the 1st Amendment. They existed before our constitution. Since a corporation is a tool for commerce, I strongly believe being a tool we created, we have the power, we as the legislative body, and the Supreme Court has chimed in on it, but we have the right to impose restrictions."

The text of HR 9 is on record at: [http://www.legis.state.wv.us/Bill\\_Text\\_HTML/2013\\_SESSIONS/RS/Bills/hr9%20intr.htm](http://www.legis.state.wv.us/Bill_Text_HTML/2013_SESSIONS/RS/Bills/hr9%20intr.htm)

137. **Bill Hamilton**, State Delegate, West Virginia (2003-present)

Co-sponsored bill # HR 8: [http://www.legis.state.wv.us/Bill\\_Text\\_HTML/2012\\_SESSIONS/RS/Bills/hr8%20intr.htm](http://www.legis.state.wv.us/Bill_Text_HTML/2012_SESSIONS/RS/Bills/hr8%20intr.htm)

## Republicans Critical of *Citizens United* on the Matter of Corporate Constitutional Rights

---

1. **John McCain**, U.S. Senator from Arizona (1987-present), former Republican nominee for President (2008)

*MSNBC, The Daily Rundown, August 27, 2014*

<http://www.msnbc.com/the-daily-rundown/watch/meet-the-press--1-guest-surprises-chuck-todd-322437187546> at 8:50

“I believe that history will show that the *Citizens United* decision by the United States Supreme Court was one of the worst in history saying that corporations are people and money is speech -- a violation of everything that I believe, certainly in the 20<sup>th</sup> century what we believed as far as financing of elections is concerned.”

*PBS NewsHour, June 14th, 2012:*

[http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/politics/jan-june12/mccain\\_06-14.html](http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/politics/jan-june12/mccain_06-14.html) at 9:56

“Yes. That is a great deal of money. And, again, we need a level playing field and we need to go back to the realization that Teddy Roosevelt had that we have to have a limit on the flow of money, and that **corporations are not people.**”

**“That's why we have different laws that govern corporations than govern individual citizens. And so to say that corporations are people, again, flies in the face of all the traditional Supreme Court decisions that we have made -- that have been made in the past.”**

*Reuters, March 28th, 2012:*

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GNZU-vlfAs0>

“What the Supreme Court did is a combination of arrogance, naivete and stupidity the likes of which I have never seen. Russ Feingold and I went over to watch the arguments before the United States Supreme Court. I couldn't believe how little these justices understood about the realities of political campaigns.... They were incredibly naive. **Since when is a corporation a person?...** What it has done is it has unleashed a flood of money...”

“And by the way you know Sheldon [Adelson], the Las Vegas casino owner, who owns a casino also, casinos in Macau, he's contributing I think over \$20 million right now, so foreign money already is into American political campaigning, in a roundabout way, but it is.”

“I promise you this. I promise you there will be huge scandals, because there's too much money washing around, too much of it is you don't know who contributed, and there's too much corruption associated with that kind of money. There will be major scandals.”

“We will go out there again, we’ll fight again, and we’ll continue to fight, because it’s not fair to the American people. This system is not fair to the American people... I grieve right now for the average citizen, for the average voter.”

“Meet the Press”, January 29th, 2012:

<http://www.nbcnews.com/id/3032608/vp/46181493#46181493> at 9:40

“I condemn them [SuperPACs] on all sides and I condemn the United States Supreme Court for their naiveté in the *Citizens vs. United* [sic], a decision which is an outrage.”

2. **Rob McKenna**, Attorney General of Washington State (2005-2013),
3. **Mark Shurtleff**, Attorney General of Utah (2001-2013), and
4. **Lawrence G. Wasden**, Attorney General of Idaho (2003-present)

In an amicus brief before the U.S. Supreme Court in *American Tradition Partnership v. Bullock*, filed by twenty-two state Attorneys General including these three Republicans:

<http://www.ag.ny.gov/sites/default/files/press-releases/2012/ATPvBullock-States-Brief-Supporting-Montana.pdf>

“In particular, the amici States believe that the Court should reexamine the assertion in *Citizens United* that independent expenditures, no matter their size or circumstances, rarely cause corruption or the appearance of corruption of federal officeholders, as well as the holding that the federal law at issue in that case could not be supported, in whole or in part, by government interests in preventing distortion of political campaigns and protecting shareholders from the use of corporate funds for political communications they do not support.”

“The States have regulated corporate participation in politics for over a century.”

“The States’ legislative responses [to the *Citizens United* decision], however, evidence their continuing interest in ensuring that corporate expenditures do not threaten the integrity of their democratic processes.”

“The States have a compelling interest in preventing domination of state and local elections by nonresident corporate interests.”

“...the anti-corruption interest is not the only cognizable government interest that can support restrictions on campaign expenditures: a polity also has a compelling interest in regulating electoral influence by nonresidents.”

“And nonresident corporations, due to their large aggregations of wealth and discrete economic interests, present the greatest risk of domination or distortion of state and local elections by nonresidents.”

5. **Jim Leach**, former Chair, National Endowment for the Humanities (2009-2013), and former U.S. Representative, 1st then 2nd district of Iowa (1977-2007)

*In a speech at the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in Cambridge, MA on October 7th, 2012, reported in the Boston Globe, "Democracy For Sale", October 14th, 2012: [http://articles.boston.com/2012-10-14/opinion/34427397\\_1\\_civility-political-process-political-retribution](http://articles.boston.com/2012-10-14/opinion/34427397_1_civility-political-process-political-retribution)*

"Brazenly, in Citizens United, the court employed parallel logic to the syllogism embedded in the most repugnant ruling it ever made, the 1857 Dred Scott decision. To justify slavery, the court in Dred Scott defined a class of human beings as private property. To magnify corporate power a century and a half later, it defined a class of private property (corporations) as people...

**A corporation is an artificial creation of the state which in turn is a creation of the people. To vest with constitutionally protected political rights an inanimate entity makes mockery of our individual-rights heritage...**

There is great inequality between corporations, no equality of individual and corporate "personhood," and no equality of individuals when one with many corporate ties may have more capacity to influence decision-making than one with none or just a few...

There is no escaping the reality that the precept of corporate personhood pushes American politics in an oligarchic direction...

The court's law-making judgment cannot be challenged by Congress because an activist 5-to-4 majority has presumptuously held that the moneyed speech powers it has granted corporations are protected by the First Amendment...

**The effect: Under a free speech guise, the Supreme Court has authorized masked men to use unlimited resources to rob America of its democratic idealism...**

The arc of our history that has bent toward justice has suddenly with the Citizens United decision twisted back to that part of our constitutional heritage that was self-evidently unjust. Property considerations have again become accentuated in a key aspect of citizenship, the injustice of which weakens the links between government and the people...

a tertiary effect of corporate giving is that it diminishes citizen respect for the political system...

A citizenry simply cannot be expected to have confidence in a judicial system in which the standard becomes equal application of unfair laws. Equal justice requires that the law itself be fair...**moneyed "speech" must not be allowed to weaken the voices of the people. The Constitution begins "We the people. . ." not "We the corporations. . ."**

## 6. **Jon Huntsman**, former Governor of Utah (2005-2009), former U.S. Ambassador to China (2009-2011)

*Slate, January 6th, 2012: [http://www.slate.com/blogs/weigel/2012/01/06/occupiers\\_for\\_huntsman\\_part\\_ii\\_of\\_course\\_corporations\\_are\\_not\\_people\\_.html](http://www.slate.com/blogs/weigel/2012/01/06/occupiers_for_huntsman_part_ii_of_course_corporations_are_not_people_.html)*

"Of course corporations are not people," joked Huntman [sic]. "Who would say such an outlandish thing!"

*KSL.com, August 7th, 2012: <http://www.ksl.com/?nid=757&sid=21601347>*

"The party has become a holding company for super PACs," he said, describing the Citizen's United Supreme Court case, which opened the door to unlimited, secret money in campaigns as disastrous.

Huntsman said he longed for the party of Lincoln, who elevated "the notion of individual liberty," of Roosevelt (Teddy, not Franklin), who stood up to too-large corporations "in the name of fairness and equality" and Eisenhower "who built our infrastructure."

7. **Ron Paul**, former U.S. Representative, 22nd then 14th district of Texas (1979-1985; 1997-2013)

*In an interview while campaigning for the presidency in August, 2011: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s-xFexgH76g>*

*Originally transcribed at RonPaul.com: <http://www.ronpaul.com/2011-08-17/ron-paul-corporations-are-not-people/>*

Interviewer: "What did you make of Mitt Romney's statement that corporations are people yesterday?"

Ron Paul: "Well obviously, they are not. People are individuals, they're not groups and they're not companies. Individuals have rights, they're not collective. You can't duck that. So individuals should be responsible for corporations, and they shouldn't be a new creature so-to-speak. Rights and obligations should be always back to the individual."

8. **Warren Rudman**, late former U.S. Senator from New Hampshire (1980 -1993)

*In a column he wrote in the Washington Post, published February 3rd, 2010, "Republicans losing their way on campaign finance reform":*

*<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/02/04/AR2010020403624.html>*

"...laws limiting corporate money in federal elections and requiring strict disclosure of campaign funds... were dealt a serious blow by [the] Supreme Court decision in Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission. That such a rash and immoderate ruling could come from a chief justice once committed to respecting precedent, and win praise from leaders of my party, is beyond my comprehension..."

**Supreme Court opinion notwithstanding, corporations are not defined as people under the Constitution**, and free speech can hardly be called free when only the rich are heard."

9. **Trevor Potter**, former Commissioner (1991-1995), Federal Election Commission

*In a video interview with Bill Moyers, "Trevor Potter on Fighting Big Money in the 2012 Election": <http://billmoyers.com/segment/trevor-potter-on-fighting-big-money-in-the-2012-election/>*

“...the Citizens United decision,... that I and I think many other people think was a big mistake...

It seems to me that the Supreme Court majority and Citizens United ignored, essentially, a hundred years of American history, going back to date Theodore Roosevelt and his first clarion call, that big money and Wall Street not dominate the presidential election. And his urging of Congress to limit corporate contributions...

So to say that the right thing to do in a democracy is have a corporation spend money in ways that will give them the most profit, never mind what happens to anyone else or the rest of the country. It is, I think, an example of why **you don't really want corporations participating directly in elections.**

They have a very narrow interest. Which is supposed to be their shareholders. But we want voters and citizens to have a broader interest. To think about the next generation, to think about the greater good. There's an interesting quote from the head of Exxon in a new book out on Exxon where he says, "Exxon is not a U.S. corporation, we do not act in the best interest of the United States."

Well, it is a U.S. corporation, but what he meant is, they have shareholders all over the world, they have investments all over the world, and it's not his job to do things that are good for America, it's his job to do things that are good for his international shareholders."

*Featured in a video by The Atlantic, "Stephen Colbert's Lawyer Explains the Danger of SuperPACs":*  
<http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2012/09/stephen-colberts-lawyer-explains-the-danger-of-super-pacs/262419/>

[Interviewer:] "How radically would you say that the campaign finance landscape has changed since the *Citizens United* decision?"

[Potter:] "I think it's safe to change that today we're probably at the lowest place I have seen in my legal career." ...

[Interviewer:] "What concerns you about the idea of unlimited corporate donations in politics?"

[Potter:] "I think the fundamental belief here is that citizens, who are, after all, voters, should be the ones participating in election advocacy because you and I have a whole range of reasons to vote for someone or to give to a candidate. But in theory, in law, in reality, a corporation only has one reason, which is to maximize their profits."

# Republicans Critical of Citizens United Generally

---

## 1. Olympia Snowe, U.S. Senator, Maine (1995-2013)

*In an article on Maine Public Broadcasting, November 6th, 2012: <http://www.mpbn.net/News/MPBNNews/tabid/1159/ctl/ViewItem/mid/3762/ItemId/24561/Default.aspx>*

Outside groups have spent more than \$7 million on Maine's U.S. Senate race alone. And Sen. Snowe says the unleashing of their attack ads has been a disservice to the candidates and the voters because they've dampened discussion of real issues. That's why **Snowe says she'd endorse a future effort to repeal Citizens United.**

"It's ridiculing our process, it's ridiculing, frankly, the common sense, practicality and intelligence of the American people," Snowe says. "They expect better, should get better, deserve better."

*Senator Snowe also shared her views on Citizens United in an interview on the Diane Rehm Show on May 21<sup>st</sup>, 2013: <http://thedianerehmshow.org/shows/2013-05-21/olympia-snowe-fighting-common-ground-how-we-can-fix-stalemate-congress>, at 35:30*

**... I think it matters profoundly, the decision that was issued by the Supreme Court on Citizens United.** And as a matter of fact, it was my provision in the campaign finance law that was challenged in *Citizens United*.

It was based on issue advocacy ads that Senator Jeffords and I had drafted to try to combat the influence of these ads by outside organizations right before an election. I said they were designed to influence the outcome. You know, if you're identifying members of Congress or Senators by name shortly before the election, in this case it was 60 days. So we thought we drew a very bright line. In fact, it was upheld in the first challenge before the Supreme Court. There were three hours of arguments on my provision. It was sustained because at that point, of course, we had Sandra Day O'Connor on the Court.

But, regrettably, it wasn't in this case. And **then they unraveled, you know, another 100 years of case law and precedent. So I think it matters because it's just more money where they can, you know, flood the airways with invectives and demonize individuals and positions and viewpoints, even during the course of the legislative session, not just in matter of the campaign, so it becomes perpetual. And 71 percent of the ads that are run are attack ads. So that has a spillover effect into the legislative process. It's undeniable, in many ways.**

*Senator Snowe was also quoted previously in an article on initial reaction to the Citizens United decision, at Examiner.com: <http://www.examiner.com/article/congressional-reaction-and-non-reaction-to-supreme-court-ruling-on-mccain-feingold-law>*

Senator Olympia Snowe (R-Maine), for example, was one Republican to publicly declare her unease with the decision. Snowe said she was "deeply troubled" by the ruling.

"The effects of the decision will be to undermine existing law, flood the airwaves with corporate and union advertisements and undercut landmark reforms that I and many others fought to secure to put elections back in the hands of the American people.

Today's decision was a serious disservice to our country."

2. **Lisa Murkowski**, U.S. Senator, Alaska (2002-present)

*In Washington Post Op-Ed by Senators Murkowski and Ron Wyden (D-OR), published December 27th, 2012, "Our states vouch for transparent campaign financing": [http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/a-federal-blueprint-for-transparent-campaign-financing/2012/12/27/b1c6287e-43eb-11e2-8061-253bccfc7532\\_story.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/a-federal-blueprint-for-transparent-campaign-financing/2012/12/27/b1c6287e-43eb-11e2-8061-253bccfc7532_story.html)*

"Take it from two United States senators from both sides of the aisle who have decades of experience in public life: Campaign-finance rules have a tremendous impact on the public policy agenda in Congress. Contrary to the popular perception, the prospect of getting — or not getting — a check from an individual or political action committee does not drive the typical decision on Capitol Hill. But decision-making is often colored by the prospect of facing \$5 million in anonymous attacks ads if a member of Congress crosses an economically powerful interest.

**This influx of unregulated political cash stemming from the Supreme Court's 2010 Citizens United decision spawned a particularly vitriolic political cycle.** Groups on both sides dumped some \$6 billion into tearing down candidates for public office. The anonymity of much of this spending encourages ads that lower the level of political discourse and makes it harder, not easier, for Americans to make informed decisions. Most of all, this spending ensured that those elected in November would carry that pressure for strict and absolute partisanship back to Washington, hobbling our efforts to govern for another two years.

The resulting political gridlock is preventing progress in a number of areas — apparent in the "fiscal cliff" negotiations — but most significantly on fundamental campaign-finance reforms...

**Along with many Americans, we are uncomfortable with the Citizens United decision. Unlimited corporate and individual spending is corrosive to democracy and undermines the political process..."**

3. **Newt Gingrich**, former Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives (1995-1999), and former U.S. Representative (1979-1999)

*In a guest appearance on The Colbert Report, November 13th, 2012:*  
<http://thecolbertreport.cc.com/episodes/ws071h/november-13--2012---newt-gingrich>

Gingrich: **"I think super PACs as such are in fact very dangerous in the long run. When you see Mayor Bloomberg put a million seven hundred thousand into a democratic district in California to beat somebody, there's something fundamentally, profoundly wrong about what's happening, and it's happening in both parties and in the long run it's going to be very negative and very destructive of our system."**...

Gingrich: "I had one billionaire, a good friend and a person who's deeply passionate about..."

Colbert: "Great friend to have. Billionaires are some of the best friends to have."

Gingrich: "I'd love to have had ten or 15. Romney had about 26. It turned out 26 billionaires beat one. This was a great revelation to us. So I think Romney..."

Colbert: "**That would make a great reality show: Billionaire Fight**"

Gingrich: "**There you go. We just had it. It was called the election.**"

4. **Richard Posner**, Judge, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit (1981-present), nominated by President Reagan

*Speaking at the University of Chicago Law School on July 12th, 2012, as reported in The Daily Beast in this piece, which also describes Posner as "the most influential conservative judge outside the Supreme Court": <http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2012/07/14/richard-posner-bashes-supreme-court-s-citizens-united-ruling.html>*

"Our political system is pervasively corrupt due to our Supreme Court taking away campaign-contribution restrictions on the basis of the First Amendment."

"wealthy people essential[ly] bribe legislators" [with campaign contributions]

5. **Robert Dold**, U.S. Representative, 10th district of Illinois (2011-2013)

*The New York Times, "Mauled by Ads, Incumbents Look to Declaw Outside Groups", October 23, 2012: <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/10/24/us/politics/incumbents-hit-hard-by-attack-ads-considering-tightening-campaign-finance-laws.html?hp&r=1&>*

"I think what we're going to find as history takes a look is that the Citizens United case diluted the voice of the average voter with the amount of advertising from outside groups. There are going to be those that say that was a good thing, but I do think the people of the 10th District deserved better."

6. **Michael Steele**, former Chairman, Republican National Committee (2009-2011)

*In a RepublicReport.org video posted April 6th, 2012: <http://youtu.be/aImNDsdGe-o>*

"I think that there's going to be a movement if you will to somehow fix or correct this market that we currently have for campaign finance with respect to *Citizens United*. And I'm fine with that."

7. **Sue Kelly**, former U.S. Representative, 19th district of New York (1995-2007)

*Quoted in this article on her appearance at Boston University on September 24th, 2012: <http://dailyfreepress.com/2012/09/25/former-congressmen-address-partisan-politics/>*

"I think the money situation is corrupting the political process," Kelly said in response to a student question about flaws in American politics. "There's so much money [in politics] now."

Kelly referred to the Citizens United Supreme Court case, in which the court ruled that the First Amendment prevents the government from limiting the amount of money corporations or unions can spend on political campaigns.

8. **Artur Davis**, former U.S. Representative, 7th district of Alabama (2003-2011); Republican since 2012

*Interviewed in The Washington Times, October 2nd, 2012: <http://communities.washingtontimes.com/neighborhood/conscience-realist/2012/oct/2/artur-davis-ron-paul-citizens-united-and-public-se/>*

"I remain of the opinion that **the Supreme Court got it wrong in Citizens United**. The Court's conceit that the financing of independent expenditures creates no appearance of corruption or influence peddling, while direct contributions do, is the kind of distinction that only a court whose members have never run for so much as city council could contemplate. While I recognize that most conservatives disagree, I subscribe to an older view that preserving trust in public institutions is a conservative value in its own right. I think over time, conservatives will lament the ruling, as the left invariably uses it to maximize its own special interest influence."

9. **Jim Clancy**, Chairman (2013-present), and previously Commissioner (2010-2013), Texas Ethics Commission

*Interviewed in The Texas Tribune, February 5th, 2013: <http://www.texastribune.org/2013/02/05/jim-clancy-and-paul-hobby-tt-interview/>*

"TT: What has Citizens United meant for the watchdog role of the Ethics Commission?"

"Clancy: Citizens United created uncertainty for the people who have to follow our rules. There are a lot of very good, well-intentioned people trying to find out what to do in certain circumstances. One of challenges we have is that those people who come to us, who try to disclose, are typically the ones who are fined. People who don't report, who ignore the disclosure system, those folks are rarely involved. The reason why you see a real pushback when you start talking about some expanded powers, more disclosure, more fines, is because there's a feeling that those people who try to comply are punished for doing so."

10. **Michael Ellis**, President, Wisconsin State Senate (1982-present)

*Quoted in this report in the Appleton Post-Crescent: <http://www.postcrescent.com/article/U0/20130422/APC0101/304220312>*

And Ellis cited one of his longtime crusades — campaign finance reform.

"**We've had roadblocks because of the Supreme Court decision**," he said. "**Citizens United** shifts pressure from individuals to collectivism. Collectivism can spend as much as they want, **rendering the individual citizen of our state null and void**. We have to do what we can within the confines of the Supreme Court decision."

11. **Alan Simpson**, Former U.S. Senator, Wyoming (1979-1997)

Quoted in Bloomberg View, May 25, 2014:

<http://www.bloombergtview.com/articles/2014-05-25/shrinking-line-separates-campaign-donations-from-bribes>

Special interests work both sides of the political aisle. Some of the most persuasive voices against the influence of big money are prominent Republicans.

"Who can seriously contend that a \$100,000 donation does not alter the way one thinks about and possibly votes on an issue?" said former Republican Senator Alan Simpson.

12. **Bill Brock**, Former Chairman, Republican National Committee, (1977-1981)

Quoted in Bloomberg View, May 25, 2014:

<http://www.bloombergtview.com/articles/2014-05-25/shrinking-line-separates-campaign-donations-from-bribes>

Bill Brock, one of the most successful chairmen of the Republican National Committee, has said the problem goes well beyond bribery: "The appearance of corruption is corrosive and is undermining our democracy."

13. **Vance McAllister**, U.S. Representative, 5<sup>th</sup> District of Louisiana, (2013-present)

Quoted in Think Progress, June 10, 2014:

<http://thinkprogress.org/justice/2014/06/10/3446992/republican-congressman-demolishes-the-supreme-courts-rationale-for-killing-campaign-finance-laws/>

"Money controls Washington," according to Congressman Vance McAllister (R-LA), who also told an audience of Louisiana accountants that Congress is caught in a "steady cycle of voting for fundraising and money instead of voting for what is right."

## Appendix: Republican Critics of Unchecked Corporate Power and Corporate Participation in Politics, predating Citizens United

---

### 1. Theodore Roosevelt, President of the United States, 1901-1909

In his "New Nationalism" speech, 1910: <http://teachingamericanhistory.org/library/index.asp?document=501>

"For every special interest is entitled to justice, but not one is entitled to a vote in Congress, to a voice on the bench, or to representation in any public office. The Constitution guarantees protection to property, and we must make that promise good. But it does not give the right of suffrage to any corporation."

"The true friend of property, the true conservative, is he who insists that property shall be the servant and not the master of the commonwealth; who insists that the creature of man's making shall be the servant and not the master of the man who made it. The citizens of the United States must effectively control the mighty commercial forces which they have called into being."

"There can be no effective control of corporations while their political activity remains. To put an end to it will be neither a short nor an easy task, but it can be done."

### 2. William Rehnquist, Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, 1986-2005

In his dissent in the case *First National Bank of Boston v. Bellotti*, 1978: <http://caselaw.lp.findlaw.com/cgi-bin/getcase.pl?court=us&vol=435&invol=765>

"Nevertheless, we concluded soon thereafter that **the liberty protected by that [fourteenth] Amendment "is the liberty of natural, not artificial persons."** Northwestern Nat. Life Ins. Co. v. Riggs, (1906)."

"However, the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the Congress of the United States, and the legislatures of 30 other States of this Republic have considered the matter, and have concluded that **restrictions upon the political activity of business corporations are both politically desirable and constitutionally permissible.** The judgment of such a broad consensus of governmental bodies expressed over a period of many decades is entitled to considerable deference from this Court. I think it quite probable that their judgment may properly be reconciled with our controlling precedents, but **I am certain that under my views** of the limited application of the First Amendment to the States, which I share with the two immediately preceding occupants of my seat on the Court, but not with my present colleagues, **the judgment of the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts should be affirmed.**"

"Since **it cannot be disputed that the mere creation of a corporation does not invest it with all the liberties enjoyed by natural persons,** United States v. White, (1944)

(corporations do not enjoy the privilege against self-incrimination), our inquiry must seek to determine which constitutional protections are "incidental to its very existence." Dartmouth College, *supra*, at 636."

"Although the Court has never explicitly recognized a corporation's right of commercial speech, such a right might be considered necessarily incidental to the business of a commercial corporation.

It cannot be so readily concluded that the right of political expression is equally necessary to carry out the functions of a corporation organized for commercial purposes. **5 A State grants to a business corporation the blessings of potentially perpetual life and limited liability** to enhance its efficiency as an economic entity. It might reasonably be concluded that **those properties**, so beneficial in the economic sphere, **pose special dangers in the political sphere.**

Furthermore, it might be argued that **liberties of political expression are not at all necessary to effectuate the purposes for which States permit commercial corporations to exist.** So long as the Judicial Branches of the State and Federal Governments remain open to protect the corporation's interest in its property, it has no need, though it may have the desire, to petition the political branches for similar protection. Indeed, the States might reasonably fear that **the corporation would use its economic power to obtain further benefits beyond those already bestowed.**"

"It is true, as the Court points out, *ante*, at 781-783, that recent decisions of this Court have emphasized the interest of the public in receiving the information offered by the speaker seeking protection. **The free flow of information is in no way diminished by the Commonwealth's decision to permit the operation of business corporations with limited rights of political expression. All natural persons, who owe their existence to a higher sovereign than the Commonwealth, remain as free as before to engage in political activity.** Cf. *Maier v. Roe*, (1977)."

3. **Barry Goldwater**, U.S. Senator, Arizona (1953-1965), Republican nominee for President (1964)

*In his seminal book, The Conscience of a Conservative, on page 54:*

*In order to achieve the widest possible distribution of political power, financial contributions to political campaigns should be made by individuals and individuals alone. I see no reason for labor unions – or corporations – to participate in politics. Both were created for economic purposes and their activities should be restricted accordingly.*

[Italics in the original.]

## About Free Speech For People

---

Launched on the day of the *Citizens United* decision, **Free Speech For People** is a national non-partisan organization which works to restore republican democracy to the people and to challenge the misuse of corporate power. The organization helps to lead the movement to amend the U.S. Constitution to overturn the Supreme Court's rulings in *Citizens United v. FEC*, *McCutcheon v. FEC*, and *Buckley v. Valeo*, and to overturn the fabricated doctrine of corporate constitutional rights. The organization also engages in legal advocacy to advance a new jurisprudence in defense of our democracy. For more on Free Speech For People, visit: <http://www.freespeechforpeople.org>.

