



Should corporations be allowed to donate unlimited amounts of money to campaigns?

Published: Saturday, January 21, 2012, 2:35 PM
By Maria Amante | The Grand Rapids Press

Grand Rapids was [occupied yesterday](#), but the group was protesting something other than the 1 percent.

The group, [Move to Amend](#), was demonstrating in an effort to get the Supreme Court decision of *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission* overturned. The decision, made two years ago Friday, does not limit the amount of money donated to political candidates by corporations. The protests were taking place nationwide outside of federal court houses.

Mlive commenters have mixed feelings on the Court's decision. Some say corporations should not be allowed to donate to elections at all, others feel that the Court was right in their decision.

[ispheet](#) says neither corporations nor unions should be allowed to donate to campaigns.

Neither corporations nor unions should be allowed to donate to political supporters at all. Both of those entities consist of members from all political parties.
My case: my mother in law is a teacher, and a Republican. But her teachers' union dues, which she has no choice but to contribute to, are given in support to Democratic candidates.

The same thing happens on the other side of the fence: people that lean Democrat regularly see the company they work for swear that they can't afford raises for people, then donate money to support a Republican candidate.

Neither is right. Politics should remain private decisions, especially considering all these special interests seem to do is generally cancel each other out in fund donation, at their members' expense. The net gain is zero to a political party in relation to the other, while the net loss to members of both unions and corporations is staggering.

Not to mention that campaign money is being used to advertise and robo-dial us all to death during election time. [mark1973](#) says donating money to campaigns is a method of exercising one's free speech rights, and whether or not it's a person or corporation exercising free speech rights is irrelevant.

The First Amendment protects free speech. It pointedly does not discuss the speaker of that speech, so the origin of the speech is irrelevant to its protected status--i.e. whether it comes from a person or union or corporation, etc. There's a reason why the right-wing Heritage Foundation, the libertarian Cato Institute and the left-wing ACLU all united to back the court's decision--it is clearly a Constitutionally based decision that re-affirms the right to freedom of speech.

What do you think? Should the decision be overturned? Should corporations be limited in the amounts of money they donate to campaigns? Sound off in the comments!

E-mail the author of this story: Maria_Amante@mlivemediagroup.com or subscribe to her updates on twitter.com/1mamante.