

# Buying the Sunday Law

## U.S. CHURCHES WILL NOW BE ABLE TO BRIBE CONGRESS INTO ENACTING THE NATIONAL SUNDAY LAW!

They will be able to do this either directly through lobbyist bribes or through campaign donations to Congressmen!

Campaign donations and direct bribing of politicians through lobbyists has become rampant on all levels of American politics—from the local community, on up through the county, state, and national levels.

It is a scandal screaming for change. Yet the decision handed down by the U.S. Supreme Court in the case, *Citizens United v. FEC* (Federal Election Commission), on Thursday, January 21, 2010—will henceforth have the effect of ballooning the bribery problem to far wider levels of corrupt influence.

**From now on, corporations (both for-profit and nonprofit), as well as labor unions, will have full freedom to corrupt public officials on all levels in our nation.**

—Do you recognize what this means? Churches and denominations in America, large and small, will also be able to fund politicians and influence legislation. This could hasten federal enactment of a strict National Sunday Law in our nation!

—*vf*

### THE STORY BEHIND THIS LANDMARK DECISION

*Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission*, 558 U.S. (2010), is a landmark 5-to-4 decision by the United States Supreme Court, that corporate funding of independent political broadcasts in candidate elections cannot be limited, because doing so would be in noncompliance with the *First Amendment*. The decision of the Court resulted from the case of the non-profit corporation, called Citizens United, regarding whether the group's film being critical of a political candidate could be defined as a campaign advertisement under the 2002 Bipartisan *Campaign Reform Act*, commonly known as the *McCain-Feingold Act*.

The decision reached the Supreme Court on appeal from a 2008 decision by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, which sided with the *Federal Election Commission* (FEC), holding that under the *McCain-Feingold Act* the film, *Hillary: The Movie*, could not be shown on television right before the 2008 Democratic primaries.

**The Court's decision struck down a provision of the McCain-Feingold Act that banned for-profit**

**and not-for-profit corporations and unions from broadcasting "electioneering communications" in the 30 days before a presidential primary and in the 60 days before the general elections.** The decision completely overruled *Austin v. Michigan Chamber of Commerce* (1990) and partially overruled *McConnell v. Federal Election Commission* (2003). The decision upheld the requirements for disclaimer and disclosure by sponsors of advertisements.

### THE MAJORITY DECISION

The majority opinion, which was delivered by Justice Kennedy, found that **previous restrictions on expenditures were invalid** and could not be applied to spending like that in the film in question. Kennedy wrote: "If the First Amendment has any force, it prohibits Congress from fining or jailing citizens, or associations of citizens, for simply engaging in political speech." He also noted that, since there was no way to distinguish between media and other corporations, these restrictions would allow Congress to suppress political speech in newspapers, books, television, and blogs. **The Court overruled *Austin v. Michigan Chamber of Commerce*, which had previously held that a Michigan Campaign Finance act that prohibited corporations from using treasury money to support or oppose candidates in elections did not violate the First and Fourteenth Amendments.** The Court also overruled the part of *McConnell v. Federal Election Commission* that upheld BCRA §203's extension of §441b's restrictions on independent corporate expenditures.

### STEVEN'S CONCURRENCE/DISSENT

Justice Stevens (with whom Justice Ginsburg, Justice Breyer, and Justice Sotomayor joined) concurred in part, in the Court's decision to sustain BCRA's disclosure provisions and joining Part IV of its opinion, and dissented with the principal holding of the majority opinion. **The dissent held that the Court's ruling "threatens to undermine the integrity of elected institutions across the nation. The path it has taken to reach its outcome will, I fear, do damage to this institution."** The dissent also argued that the Court, declaring §203 of BCRA facially unconstitutional, was a ruling on a question not brought before them by the litigants; and so they **"changed the case to give themselves an**

**opportunity to change the law.”** Stevens concluded his dissent with:

**“At bottom, the Court’s opinion is thus a rejection of the common sense of the American people, who have recognized a need to prevent corporations from undermining our government, and who have fought against the distinctive corrupting potential of corporate electioneering since the days of Theodore Roosevelt. It is a strange time to repudiate that common sense. While American democracy is imperfect, few outside the majority of this Court would have thought its flaws included a dearth of corporate money in politics.”**

There was a wide range of reactions to *Citizens United v. FEC* from politicians, advocacy groups, academics, attorneys, and journalists. **In general conservatives (which would include church organizations and libertarians) praised the ruling** as preservation of the First Amendment and freedom of speech. And liberals and campaign finance reformers criticized it as greatly expanding the the role of corporate money in politics.

#### **COMMENTS BY SOME WHO OPPOSE THIS RULING**

Democratic senator Russ Feingold and co-crafter of the 2002 *Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act* stated **“This decision was a terrible mistake. Presented with a relatively narrow legal issue, the Supreme Court chose to roll back laws that have limited the role of corporate money in federal elections since Teddy Roosevelt was president.”**

**Rep. Alan Grayson stated that it was “the worst Supreme Court decision since the *Dred Scott* case”; and he accused the Court of opening the door to political bribery and corruption.**

Democratic congresswoman Donna Edwards, along with constitutional law professor and Democrat Jamie Raskin, have advocated petitions to reverse the decision by means of constitutional amendment. Rep. Leonard Boswell has formally introduced legislation to amend the constitution; and he is currently seeking cosponsors.

Republican presidential candidate and Senator John McCain, co-crafter of the 2002 *Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act*, said **“there’s going to be, over time, a backlash . . . when you see the amounts of union and corporate money that’s going to go into the political campaign.”** McCain was “disappointed by the decision of the Supreme Court and the lifting of the limits on corporate and union contributions”; but he was not surprised by the decision, saying that “it was clear that Justice Roberts, Alito, and Scalia (by their very skeptical and even sarcastic comments) were very much opposed to

BCRA.” He pointed out that “Justice Rehnquist and Justice O’Connor, who had taken a different position on this issue, both had significant political experience, while Justices Roberts, Alito, and Scalia have none.” Republican Senator Olympia Snowe opined that **“Today’s decision was a serious disservice to our country.”**

Sanda Everette, co-chair of the *Green Party*, stated that “the ruling especially hurts the ability of parties that don’t accept corporate contributions, like the Green Party, to compete.” Rich Whitney stated **“In a transparently political decision, a majority of the U.S. Supreme Court overturned its own recent precedent and paid tribute to the giant corporate interests that already wield tremendous power over our political process and political speech.”**

David Cobb stated that **“the Court has literally legalized corporate bribery of our elected officials.”** Jody Grage, treasurer of the Green Party, stated that **“the decision will cement the Democratic and Republican parties’ status as subsidiaries of Wall Street, oil companies, defense contractors, insurance firms, media conglomerates, and other top corporations. It cancels the idea that candidates run for public office to serve the public interest. The ruling will help block government measures to curb global warming, regulation of financial firms, health care reform, consumer rights, and all other protections for ‘We the People’ against corporate power.”**

Farheen Hakeem, co-chair of the Green Party, commented that “restoring democracy and the idea that constitutional rights should only apply to humans will now require a citizens’ effort as strong as the Civil Rights Movement.”

Ralph Nader, a lawyer and advocate of individual rights, who took the third place in three presidential elections, condemned the ruling, saying that **“with this decision, corporations can now directly pour vast amounts of corporate money, through independent expenditures, into the electoral swamp already flooded with corporate campaign PAC contribution dollars.”** He called for shareholder resolutions, asking company directors to pledge not to use company money to favor or oppose electoral candidates.

Pat Choate, Reform Party candidate, stated that **“the Court has, in effect, legalized foreign governments and foreign corporations to participate in our electoral politics.”**

The constitutional law scholar, Laurence H. Tribe, wrote that **the decision “marks a major upheaval in First Amendment law.”**

The *New York Times* stated in an editorial, **“The**

## Buying the Sunday Law

**Supreme Court has handed lobbyists a new weapon. A lobbyist can now tell any elected official: If you vote wrong, my company, labor union or interest group will spend unlimited sums explicitly advertising against your re-election."**

Jonathan Alter called it the **"most serious threat to American democracy in a generation."**

The *New York Times* reported that 24 states with laws prohibiting independent expenditures by unions and corporations will have to change their campaign finance laws because of the ruling. It also will affect pending trials under those laws.

*Here is most of that article:*

---

### NEW YORK TIMES ARTICLE

*24 States' Laws Open to Attack After Campaign Finance Ruling, New York Times, January 22, 2010*—In Wisconsin, conservative and pro-business groups said Friday that they were considering a lawsuit to block a proposed law that would ban corporate spending during political campaigns.

In Kentucky and Colorado, lawmakers looked for provisions in their state constitutions that may need to be rewritten. And, in Texas, lawyers for Tom DeLay, the former House majority leader, said the pending state campaign finance case against him should be thrown out.

**A day after the United States Supreme Court ruled that the federal government may not ban political spending by corporations or unions in candidate elections, officials across the country were rushing to cope with the fallout, as laws in 24 states were directly or indirectly called into question by the ruling.**

"One day the Constitution of Colorado is the highest law of the state," said Robert F. Williams, a law professor at Rutgers University. **"The next day it's wastepaper."**

The states that explicitly prohibit independent expenditures by unions and corporations will be most affected by the ruling. **The decision, however, has consequences for all states, since they are now effectively prohibited from adopting restrictions on corporate and union spending on political campaigns.**

In his dissent to the 5-to-4 ruling, Justice John Paul Stevens highlighted the burden placed on states:

**"The court operates with a sledgehammer rather than a scalpel, when it strikes down one of Congress's most significant efforts to regulate the role that corporations and unions play in electoral politics,"** he wrote. **"It compounds the offense by implicitly striking down a great many state laws as well."**

Montana is one of the states that will probably be affected. It has one of the nation's oldest campaign finance laws approved by voters in 1912 after a copper baron, William A. Clark of Butte, bribed members of the State Legislature to get a United States Senate seat.

Chris Gallus, a former lobbyist and a lawyer who represents business interests in Montana, said his clients would most likely challenge the statute if it were not stricken.

**States that can expect to see the biggest and most sudden influx of money are those—like Ohio and Florida—where it is relatively expensive to run campaigns and where races are competitive,** said Ray La Raja, a political science professor at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst. **He predicted corporate spending would increase in states where control of state governments hang in the balance.**

"This tug of war will continue as long as we have fundamental disagreements in the country over the role of money in politics," he said.

Richard Hasen, an election law specialist at Loyola Law School in Los Angeles, said **he expected state judicial races to be especially affected by the Supreme Court decision.**

In recent years, he said, **the states where corporate contributions were permitted saw an explosion in spending in judicial races.** With the new ruling, those states and others, where such donations were limited or banned, are likely to see more money spent on these races.

Between 2000 and 2009, spending on state supreme court races across 22 states that had competitive elections was about \$207 million, up from \$86 million between 1990 and 2000, according to Justice at Stake, at watchdog group that monitors money in court races.

---

That concludes the above article.

**Now for the bombshell! Read how the Roman Catholic Church is planning to use this new freedom—afforded them by this Supreme Court decision—to push through Congressional legislation they wish to achieve.** The following article, written only one day after the High Court decision was announced, is about enactment of a law reversing the 1973 abortion ruling (*Roe v. Wade*). But you can just know what law they will begin working to get passed: a U.S. National Sunday Law with teeth in it, requiring worship on the first day of the week. Read how the Catholic Church is handling this in the following article:

---

**CATHOLIC LEADERS WELCOME  
THE NEW RULING WITH OPEN ARMS!**

**Supreme Court Decision in “Citizens United v. FEC” Empowers New Citizen Action—By Deacon Keith Fournier, 1/22/2010, Catholic Online, Washington, D.C.—The decision handed down in Citizens United opens the door for our work.** It is a “game changer.”

The decision in “*Citizens United v. FEC*” was handed down on Thursday, January 21, 2010, the day before millions of Americans commemorate *Roe v. Wade*, the Supreme Court decision which eviscerated the Fundamental Right to Life of our youngest neighbors. The “coincidence” of the events is vital for **all who know what we must do to overturn Roe.**

The fact that the Court overruled its prior decisions is very significant to anyone who has set their sites on overturning *Roe v. Wade* and **engaging in the kind of massive political action** such a result will require. **We must persuade the Court to reverse Roe and Doe. This will take massive organizational development as well as effective and sustained political and legal activism. It will also take a lot of money. In addition, we must encourage candidates to run for office who recognize the fundamental human right to life, oppose those who do not, and pressure those who waver.**

*Roe* is grounded in faulty history, relies upon disproven junk “science,” and rejects both the Natural Law and the Equal Protection Clause of the U.S. Constitution. Its flawed reasoning cries out for reversal.

**The decision handed down in *Citizens United v. FEC* is what they call, in political and policy activism circles, a “game changer.”** Here are some salient quotes from the majority opinion [in *Citizens United v. FEC*]:

“The First Amendment does not permit laws that force speakers to retain a campaign finance attorney, conduct demographic marketing research, or seek declaratory rulings **before discussing the most salient political issues** of our day.

“Premised on mistrust of governmental power, the First Amendment stands against attempts to disfavor certain subjects or viewpoints . . . **Prohibited, too, are restrictions distinguishing among different speakers, allowing speech by some but not others** . . . As instruments to censor, these categories are interrelated. Speech restrictions, based on the identity of the speaker, are all too often sim-

ply a means to control content.

“We find no basis for the proposition that, in the context of political speech, the Government may impose restrictions on certain disfavored speakers. Both history and logic lead us to this conclusion . . . If the First Amendment has any force, **it prohibits Congress from fining or jailing citizens, or associations of citizens, for simply engaging in political speech** . . .

“When Government seeks to use its full power, including the criminal law, to command where a person may get his or her information or what dis-trusted source he or she may not hear, it uses censorship to control thought. This is unlawful. The First Amendment confirms the freedom to think for ourselves.

“Due consideration leads to this conclusion: *Austin* should be, and now is, overruled. We return to the principle established in *Buckley* and *Bellotti*, that **the Government may not suppress political speech on the basis of the speaker’s corporate identity. No sufficient governmental interest justifies limits on the political speech of nonprofit or for-profit corporations.**” [End of quotation from the Supreme Court decision.]

**We must change this nation’s laws** in order to ensure that the Fundamental and inalienable Rights to Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness are protected for all of our neighbors—including our young, our infirm, and our elderly. **This opinion helps us along the path to victory.**

**We should be emboldened by this Supreme Court decision. We should also use it as a blueprint for our FUTURE political and legal activism.** [Full caps ours.]

**Wielding the language set forth in this opinion we need to build—and massively fund—the organizations, associations, and movements desperately needed in this urgent hour. It is time for boldness!** A truly free nation must recognize the first freedom, the freedom to be born, or it will lose freedom itself. In the wake of the March for Life, **the Supreme Court Decision in “Citizens United” Empowers a New Citizen Action.** —*Deacon Keith Fournier asks that you join with us and help in this vital mission by sending this article to your family, friends, and neighbors . . . WE ARE PROUD TO BE CATHOLIC!*

That concludes the above Roman Catholic January 22, 2010, news release. Surely, we are nearing the end!  
—vf