

their right of free speech. Until this point Justice John Paul Stevens noted in his dissent from Citizens United while American democracy isn't perfect few outside the majority of this court would have thought its flaws included a dearth of corporate money in politics. Because corporations can outspend the average person the court has allowed the microphone of money to drown out the unamplified voices of the average citizen. One way to end this inequity is to overturn Citizens United by an amendment to the Constitution of the United States. An amendment is essentially a necessary course correction for the ship of state, when it encounters hazards the Founding Fathers could not have foreseen. For example, after the nation suffered the horrors of Civil War the 13th Amendment outlawed human slavery. The 19th Amendment gave one half of the population – women – the right to vote and a righted ship of state sails on. Is it time for another course correction? Big money from whatever source given in secrecy is so sinister the possibility of corruption so obvious that the nation fought it with a century of law and could fight it until Citizens United. So therefore we confront yet another hazard to the ship of state requiring the course correction of an amendment because unbelievably Citizens United has actually discounted the possible corrupting influence of money and denied that corruption or even the appearance of corruption would result. This is unbelievable they are kidding only themselves. We are not fooled. We all know money talks. Theodore Roosevelt was not fooled and in a 1905 message to congress noted that all contributions by corporations to any political committee or for any political purpose should be forbidden by law. Fortunately America is still blessed with a vast majority of politicians like Theodore Roosevelt who are public servants of great integrity and America needs them all. Of all political stripes and philosophies when all of them work together we can solve America's problems but America does not need politicians who succumb to big money be it from corporations which Roosevelt began this reform effort with and that expanded over history to include unions and wealthy individuals. (Moderator interrupts with 5 minute warning, to please wrap it up) Some argue that it's unfair to limit those who have big money to spend as they please is it for over a century settled law at the state and federal level said no over the course of a century statesman like Theodore Roosevelt and John McCain said no. The court has however over history maintained that limits can be placed on human speech, we cannot for example as a prank yell FIRE in a crowded theater or divulge the location of our troops in harm's way. (Moderator – Thank you I'm going to have to cut it short, we're closing in on six minutes.) I urge you to vote for Article S.

Applause.

JONATHAN RING: That's a very interesting article and it's good that we're having this national debate. To put it in context the organization that brought this forward, DACMA, Democracy Amendment Coalition for Massachusetts, in association with Common Cause has been promoting this across the state. It has collected a lot of signatures to have this on thirty-seven communities (inaudible) and this is in response to that 2010 Supreme court decision but let's look in context as to why you should vote no on this amendment. The whole doctrine of corporate personhood's started 200 years ago under the 1st amendment to allow organizations and companies to create contracts in order to form associations of people that is what corporate personhood means under the constitution. In order to form contracts that they can sue or be sued one of the problems with this amendment is that if it's enacted could undo 200 years of history and make it more difficult to sue a corporation for breach of contract so one should think about that. But there's another problem with this amendment too and it's in the second line..and here it is. Both congress meaning the federal government and state governments may place limits on both political contributions and spending what in short does that mean, that means federal control over an organization's spending its money or receiving money. This would hurt political parties of course but this would hurt PACS of course which we..nobody likes PACS but it would hurt labor unions that support candidates in short this would fly in the face of the first amendment in control a great deal of freedom of speech of these organizations on both political spectrums. This would give the federal government too much power. It would essentially limit