

It for my eco class

[Business](#), [Marketing](#)



Has the Supreme Court made it possible for corporations to buy elections?

This question alludes to the Supreme Court ruling in the Citizens United v Federal Election Commission case of 2010 in which the Court overruled the ban on political spending by corporations. This paper will discuss a pro and a con of this matter and state my opinion on it.

The Supreme Court has not made it possible for corporations to buy elections. Rather, a pro of this ruling is that it safeguards the freedom of speech entrenched in the First Amendment of the Constitution of the United States. Political spending by corporations is a form of speech that the government should not be allowed to restrict since in doing so, it shall be restricting free speech. This is correct because the First Amendment prohibition against Congress making laws abridging speech does not exempt corporate speech. A potential danger of distinguishing corporate speech from free speech is that it places a limit on free speech. This is a danger because limiting constitutional rights is the same as questioning the integrity of the document and implying that the rights can be selectively applied (Polsby 23).

On the other hand, a con of the Supreme Court's ruling is that it has in a way made it possible for corporations to buy elections because it has opened elections to undue corporate influence over the election process.

Corporations bring people together and give them tremendous power and influence that is more than that of individual voters. Another dimension to the ruling's risk of opening the election to undue corporate influence is the potential for foreign corporate influence (Wilks 67). This risk is imminent especially because of the fact that foreign entities and persons own many

corporations in the United States. Allowing foreign corporate influence on the elections of the United States is like creating a lee way for these foreign entities and individuals to support and endorse regimes which support their agenda even if it is not meant to benefit Americans (Smith 36).

My opinion on this matter is that despite the advantages that come with this Court decision, it has serious negative implications that cannot be overlooked. Allowing corporations to fund certain political candidates compromises the efficacy of the outcomes of elections. This is because it will make voters feel that their preferred candidate did not win or lose the election justly. This is because voters reckon that corporations have more access to capital than they have and as such the outcomes of elections will represent the voice of corporations more than that of the individual voter. This undermines democracy because democracy succeeds only when people believe that their opinions feature significantly and are represented in the outcome of a democratic process such as an election (Clements 53).

In conclusion, the Supreme Court has not made it possible for corporations to buy elections. Rather, it has safeguarded the freedom of speech as captured in the First Amendment. On the other hand, the Supreme Court has made it possible for corporations to buy elections because it has allowed undue corporate influence on elections. My opinion on this matter is that the ruling has negative implications that are more serious than its positive implications.

Works Cited

Clements, Jeffrey. Corporations are not people: why they have more rights than you do and what you can do about it. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler

Publishers, 2012. Print.

Polsby, Nelson. Presidential elections: strategies and structures of American politics. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2012. Print.

Smith, Craig. A First Amendment profile of the Supreme Court. Lanham, Md.: University of Delaware Press, 2011. Print.

Wilks, Stephen. The Political Power of the Business Corporation. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing, 2013. Print.