

TESTIMONY SJR 19 February 26, 2013

Mark Mackin, 4703 Almosta Road, Helena 59602 406-227-5237 markmackin@juno.com

In the 1970's now Senator Max Baucus walked the highways of Montana pledging to reform Congress. Recently, a rider attached to the "fiscal cliff" bill gave Amgen Incorporated favorable treatment worth an estimated \$500,000,000.00. Senator Baucus was in the room when that rider was attached to the bill. The bill passed without a hearing.

Max Baucus's connections to Amgen, Inc., and their campaign contributions to him made the news. How did Baucus, the young reformer, become associated with corporate influence in politics? To get the campaign cash he needs to be re-elected. Or to put it another way, by finding favor with Washington lobbyists, who will funnel the necessary corporate cash to him.

Did Baucus receive anything for this \$500,000,000.00 favor? According to news sources, over a period of years Amgen executives and stockholders gave Baucus at least \$68,000.00 in campaign contributions.

Why so little? According to lobbyist Jack Abramoff, politicians deal in stolen goods. Favors are free to the politician, and every other politician is driving the price down.

Of course that \$68,000.00 was campaign contributions and not bribes, or as Jack Abramoff would put it, it was a perfectly legal bribe. And if you fund-raise 147 perfectly legal \$68,000.00 bribes over the course of six years you have the \$10 million you need for the next U.S. Senate campaign.

But Senator Mitch McConnell, and Senator Orin Hatch were also in that room. All of our politicians depend on campaign contributions before they depend on votes. Congressmen spend at least one third of their time raising money. No matter who we send to Washington, they will need to raise large amounts of campaign cash for re-election. Lobbyists -- corporate, union, and otherwise -- are happy to make fund-raising easier and less time consuming. And that corrupts our politics.

In 1773 the British East India Company used political influence to exempt their corporation from the tax on tea. The corporation agents could then sell tea at cheaper prices than American merchants, driving them out of the market. Resistance led to the Boston Tea Party. The King also offered members of parliament choice jobs in the government. If you wanted to keep your job, you voted with the King -- no bribe needed.

The Framers of the Constitution of the United States talked a lot about preventing these kinds of corruption. The Framers were not just concerned about the sale of a vote. They wanted government officials to attend to the interests of "the people alone", the voters. *Lawrence Lessig, Republic Lost, p 241-42*. Anything that interfered with the dependence of the politician on the voter corrupted the political process. Anything that distracted the attention of the politician from the voter was a form of corruption. Anything that caused the voter to lose confidence in their government was corruption.

What did "the people alone" receive when Amgen, Inc., was granted a special midnight favor? The questionable benefit of paying high prices for drugs that could have been provided at a lower price. Did the three Senators' dependence on the steady dribble of campaign contributions from Amgen distract them away from the people's interest to the interest of the

stockholders of Amgen? The Framers would have regarded this as at least the appearance of corruption.

But the United States Supreme Court cannot see corruption in this system of legalized bribery. In Citizens United Justice Kennedy wrote for the majority, "It is in the nature of an elected representative to favor certain policies, . . . and to favor the voters and contributors who support those policies." Lessig, p.242 citing *Citizens United v. Fed. Election Comm'n*, 130 S. Ct. 676, 910 (2010). *And contributors*. With those two words, the Court went wrong. "The Framers did not intend to make representatives dependent upon contributors." The focus was intended to be on the voters alone.

The decision that corporations are just a different kind of person, and so entitled to full free speech rights, has loosed a flood of independent cash into political campaigns. And now we have banks "too big to fail" and corporations increasing their lobbying staff. Amgen's contributions and lobbying returned hundreds of dollars for every dollar spent. Why invest in research when you can purchase profit for a small investment in campaign? The increasing cost of campaigns increases the dependence of politicians on money and fund-raising, and so lobbyists.

In ten years the Anaconda corporation completely dominated Montana's political system. Then the Anaconda quickly froze out or undercut all competition. Citizens United must be reversed as soon as possible.

Mark Mackin, 4703 Almosta Road, Helena 59602 406-227-5237 markmackin@juno.com

In the 1970's now Senator Max Baucus walked the highways of Montana pledging to reform Congress. Recently, a rider attached to the "fiscal cliff" bill gave Amgen Incorporated favorable treatment worth an estimated \$500,000,000.00. Senator Baucus was in the room when that rider was attached to the bill. The bill passed without a hearing.

Max Baucus's connections to Amgen, Inc., and their campaign contributions to him made the news. How did Baucus, the young reformer, become associated with corporate influence in politics? To get the campaign cash he needs to be re-elected. Or to put it another way, by finding favor with Washington lobbyists, who will funnel the necessary corporate cash to him.

Did Baucus receive anything for this \$500,000,000.00 favor? According to news sources, over a period of years Amgen executives and stockholders gave Baucus at least \$68,000.00 in campaign contributions.

Why so little? According to lobbyist Jack Abramoff, politicians deal in stolen goods. Favors are free to the politician, and every other politician is driving the price down.

Of course that \$68,000.00 was campaign contributions and not bribes, or as Jack Abramoff would put it, it was a perfectly legal bribe. And if you fund-raise 147 perfectly legal \$68,000.00 bribes over the course of six years you have the \$10 million you need for the next U.S. Senate campaign.

But Senator Mitch McConnell, and Senator Orin Hatch were also in that room. All of our politicians depend on campaign contributions before they depend on votes. Congressmen spend at least one third of their time raising money. No matter who we send to Washington, they will need to raise large amounts of campaign cash for re-election. Lobbyists -- corporate, union, and otherwise -- are happy to make fund-raising easier and less time consuming. And that corrupts our politics.

In 1773 the British East India Company used political influence to exempt their corporation from the tax on tea. The corporation agents could then sell tea at cheaper prices than American merchants, driving them out of the market. Resistance led to the Boston Tea Party. The King also offered members of parliament choice jobs in the government. If you wanted to keep your job, you voted with the King -- no bribe needed.

The Framers of the Constitution of the United States talked a lot about preventing these kinds of corruption. The Framers were not just concerned about the sale of a vote. They wanted government officials to attend to the interests of "the people alone", the voters. *Lawrence Lessig, Republic Lost, p 241-42*. Anything that interfered with the dependence of the politician on the voter corrupted the political process. Anything that distracted the attention of the politician from the voter was a form of corruption. Anything that caused the voter to lose confidence in their government was corruption.

What did "the people alone" receive when Amgen, Inc., was granted a special midnight favor? The questionable benefit of paying high prices for drugs that could have been provided at a lower price. Did the three Senators' dependence on the steady dribble of campaign contributions from Amgen distract them away from the people's interest to the interest of the

stockholders of Amgen? The Framers would have regarded this as at least the appearance of corruption.

But the United States Supreme Court cannot see corruption in this system of legalized bribery. In Citizens United Justice Kennedy wrote for the majority, "It is in the nature of an elected representative to favor certain policies, . . . and to favor the voters and contributors who support those policies." Lessig, p.242 citing *Citizens United v. Fed. Election Comm'n*, 130 S. Ct. 676, 910 (2010). *And contributors*. With those two words, the Court went wrong. "The Framers did not intend to make representatives dependent upon contributors." The focus was intended to be on the voters alone.

The decision that corporations are just a different kind of person, and so entitled to full free speech rights, has loosed a flood of independent cash into political campaigns. And now we have banks "too big to fail" and corporations increasing their lobbying staff. Amgen's contributions and lobbying returned hundreds of dollars for every dollar spent. Why invest in research when you can purchase profit for a small investment in campaign? The increasing cost of campaigns increases the dependence of politicians on money and fund-raising, and so lobbyists.

In ten years the Anaconda corporation completely dominated Montana's political system. Then the Anaconda quickly froze out or undercut all competition. Citizens United must be reversed as soon as possible.

Mark Mackin, 4703 Almosta Road, Helena 59602 406-227-5237 markmackin@juno.com

In the 1970's now Senator Max Baucus walked the highways of Montana pledging to reform Congress. Recently, a rider attached to the "fiscal cliff" bill gave Amgen Incorporated favorable treatment worth an estimated \$500,000,000.00. Senator Baucus was in the room when that rider was attached to the bill. The bill passed without a hearing.

Max Baucus's connections to Amgen, Inc., and their campaign contributions to him made the news. How did Baucus, the young reformer, become associated with corporate influence in politics? To get the campaign cash he needs to be re-elected. Or to put it another way, by finding favor with Washington lobbyists, who will funnel the necessary corporate cash to him.

Did Baucus receive anything for this \$500,000,000.00 favor? According to news sources, over a period of years Amgen executives and stockholders gave Baucus at least \$68,000.00 in campaign contributions.

Why so little? According to lobbyist Jack Abramoff, politicians deal in stolen goods. Favors are free to the politician, and every other politician is driving the price down.

Of course that \$68,000.00 was campaign contributions and not bribes, or as Jack Abramoff would put it, it was a perfectly legal bribe. And if you fund-raise 147 perfectly legal \$68,000.00 bribes over the course of six years you have the \$10 million you need for the next U.S. Senate campaign.

But Senator Mitch McConnell, and Senator Orin Hatch were also in that room. All of our politicians depend on campaign contributions before they depend on votes. Congressmen spend at least one third of their time raising money. No matter who we send to Washington, they will need to raise large amounts of campaign cash for re-election. Lobbyists -- corporate, union, and otherwise -- are happy to make fund-raising easier and less time consuming. And that corrupts our politics.

In 1773 the British East India Company used political influence to exempt their corporation from the tax on tea. The corporation agents could then sell tea at cheaper prices than American merchants, driving them out of the market. Resistance led to the Boston Tea Party. The King also offered members of parliament choice jobs in the government. If you wanted to keep your job, you voted with the King -- no bribe needed.

The Framers of the Constitution of the United States talked a lot about preventing these kinds of corruption. The Framers were not just concerned about the sale of a vote. They wanted government officials to attend to the interests of "the people alone", the voters. *Lawrence Lessig, Republic Lost, p 241-42*. Anything that interfered with the dependence of the politician on the voter corrupted the political process. Anything that distracted the attention of the politician from the voter was a form of corruption. Anything that caused the voter to lose confidence in their government was corruption.

What did "the people alone" receive when Amgen, Inc., was granted a special midnight favor? The questionable benefit of paying high prices for drugs that could have been provided at a lower price. Did the three Senators' dependence on the steady dribble of campaign contributions from Amgen distract them away from the people's interest to the interest of the

stockholders of Amgen? The Framers would have regarded this as at least the appearance of corruption.

But the United States Supreme Court cannot see corruption in this system of legalized bribery. In Citizens United Justice Kennedy wrote for the majority, "It is in the nature of an elected representative to favor certain policies, . . . and to favor the voters and contributors who support those policies." Lessig, p.242 citing *Citizens United v. Fed. Election Comm'n*, 130 S. Ct. 676, 910 (2010). *And contributors*. With those two words, the Court went wrong. "The Framers did not intend to make representatives dependent upon contributors." The focus was intended to be on the voters alone.

The decision that corporations are just a different kind of person, and so entitled to full free speech rights, has loosed a flood of independent cash into political campaigns. And now we have banks "too big to fail" and corporations increasing their lobbying staff. Amgen's contributions and lobbying returned hundreds of dollars for every dollar spent. Why invest in research when you can purchase profit for a small investment in campaign? The increasing cost of campaigns increases the dependence of politicians on money and fund-raising, and so lobbyists.

In ten years the Anaconda corporation completely dominated Montana's political system. Then the Anaconda quickly froze out or undercut all competition. Citizens United must be reversed as soon as possible.

Mark Mackin, 4703 Almosta Road, Helena 59602 406-227-5237 markmackin@juno.com

In the 1970's now Senator Max Baucus walked the highways of Montana pledging to reform Congress. Recently, a rider attached to the "fiscal cliff" bill gave Amgen Incorporated favorable treatment worth an estimated \$500,000,000.00. Senator Baucus was in the room when that rider was attached to the bill. The bill passed without a hearing.

Max Baucus's connections to Amgen, Inc., and their campaign contributions to him made the news. How did Baucus, the young reformer, become associated with corporate influence in politics? To get the campaign cash he needs to be re-elected. Or to put it another way, by finding favor with Washington lobbyists, who will funnel the necessary corporate cash to him.

Did Baucus receive anything for this \$500,000,000.00 favor? According to news sources, over a period of years Amgen executives and stockholders gave Baucus at least \$68,000.00 in campaign contributions.

Why so little? According to lobbyist Jack Abramoff, politicians deal in stolen goods. Favors are free to the politician, and every other politician is driving the price down.

Of course that \$68,000.00 was campaign contributions and not bribes, or as Jack Abramoff would put it, it was a perfectly legal bribe. And if you fund-raise 147 perfectly legal \$68,000.00 bribes over the course of six years you have the \$10 million you need for the next U.S. Senate campaign.

But Senator Mitch McConnell, and Senator Orin Hatch were also in that room. All of our politicians depend on campaign contributions before they depend on votes. Congressmen spend at least one third of their time raising money. No matter who we send to Washington, they will need to raise large amounts of campaign cash for re-election. Lobbyists -- corporate, union, and otherwise -- are happy to make fund-raising easier and less time consuming. And that corrupts our politics.

In 1773 the British East India Company used political influence to exempt their corporation from the tax on tea. The corporation agents could then sell tea at cheaper prices than American merchants, driving them out of the market. Resistance led to the Boston Tea Party. The King also offered members of parliament choice jobs in the government. If you wanted to keep your job, you voted with the King -- no bribe needed.

The Framers of the Constitution of the United States talked a lot about preventing these kinds of corruption. The Framers were not just concerned about the sale of a vote. They wanted government officials to attend to the interests of "the people alone", the voters. *Lawrence Lessig, Republic Lost, p 241-42*. Anything that interfered with the dependence of the politician on the voter corrupted the political process. Anything that distracted the attention of the politician from the voter was a form of corruption. Anything that caused the voter to lose confidence in their government was corruption.

What did "the people alone" receive when Amgen, Inc., was granted a special midnight favor? The questionable benefit of paying high prices for drugs that could have been provided at a lower price. Did the three Senators' dependence on the steady dribble of campaign contributions from Amgen distract them away from the people's interest to the interest of the

stockholders of Amgen? The Framers would have regarded this as at least the appearance of corruption.

But the United States Supreme Court cannot see corruption in this system of legalized bribery. In Citizens United Justice Kennedy wrote for the majority, "It is in the nature of an elected representative to favor certain policies, . . . and to favor the voters and contributors who support those policies." Lessig, p.242 citing *Citizens United v. Fed. Election Comm'n*, 130 S. Ct. 676, 910 (2010). *And contributors*. With those two words, the Court went wrong. "The Framers did not intend to make representatives dependent upon contributors." The focus was intended to be on the voters alone.

The decision that corporations are just a different kind of person, and so entitled to full free speech rights, has loosed a flood of independent cash into political campaigns. And now we have banks "too big to fail" and corporations increasing their lobbying staff. Amgen's contributions and lobbying returned hundreds of dollars for every dollar spent. Why invest in research when you can purchase profit for a small investment in campaign? The increasing cost of campaigns increases the dependence of politicians on money and fund-raising, and so lobbyists.

In ten years the Anaconda corporation completely dominated Montana's political system. Then the Anaconda quickly froze out or undercut all competition. Citizens United must be reversed as soon as possible.

Mark Mackin, 4703 Almosta Road, Helena 59602 406-227-5237 markmackin@juno.com

In the 1970's now Senator Max Baucus walked the highways of Montana pledging to reform Congress. Recently, a rider attached to the "fiscal cliff" bill gave Amgen Incorporated favorable treatment worth an estimated \$500,000,000.00. Senator Baucus was in the room when that rider was attached to the bill. The bill passed without a hearing.

Max Baucus's connections to Amgen, Inc., and their campaign contributions to him made the news. How did Baucus, the young reformer, become associated with corporate influence in politics? To get the campaign cash he needs to be re-elected. Or to put it another way, by finding favor with Washington lobbyists, who will funnel the necessary corporate cash to him.

Did Baucus receive anything for this \$500,000,000.00 favor? According to news sources, over a period of years Amgen executives and stockholders gave Baucus at least \$68,000.00 in campaign contributions.

Why so little? According to lobbyist Jack Abramoff, politicians deal in stolen goods. Favors are free to the politician, and every other politician is driving the price down.

Of course that \$68,000.00 was campaign contributions and not bribes, or as Jack Abramoff would put it, it was a perfectly legal bribe. And if you fund-raise 147 perfectly legal \$68,000.00 bribes over the course of six years you have the \$10 million you need for the next U.S. Senate campaign.

But Senator Mitch McConnell, and Senator Orin Hatch were also in that room. All of our politicians depend on campaign contributions before they depend on votes. Congressmen spend at least one third of their time raising money. No matter who we send to Washington, they will need to raise large amounts of campaign cash for re-election. Lobbyists -- corporate, union, and otherwise -- are happy to make fund-raising easier and less time consuming. And that corrupts our politics.

In 1773 the British East India Company used political influence to exempt their corporation from the tax on tea. The corporation agents could then sell tea at cheaper prices than American merchants, driving them out of the market. Resistance led to the Boston Tea Party. The King also offered members of parliament choice jobs in the government. If you wanted to keep your job, you voted with the King -- no bribe needed.

The Framers of the Constitution of the United States talked a lot about preventing these kinds of corruption. The Framers were not just concerned about the sale of a vote. They wanted government officials to attend to the interests of "the people alone", the voters. *Lawrence Lessig, Republic Lost, p 241-42*. Anything that interfered with the dependence of the politician on the voter corrupted the political process. Anything that distracted the attention of the politician from the voter was a form of corruption. Anything that caused the voter to lose confidence in their government was corruption.

What did "the people alone" receive when Amgen, Inc., was granted a special midnight favor? The questionable benefit of paying high prices for drugs that could have been provided at a lower price. Did the three Senators' dependence on the steady dribble of campaign contributions from Amgen distract them away from the people's interest to the interest of the

stockholders of Amgen? The Framers would have regarded this as at least the appearance of corruption.

But the United States Supreme Court cannot see corruption in this system of legalized bribery. In Citizens United Justice Kennedy wrote for the majority, "It is in the nature of an elected representative to favor certain policies, . . . and to favor the voters and contributors who support those policies." Lessig, p.242 citing *Citizens United v. Fed. Election Comm'n*, 130 S. Ct. 676, 910 (2010). *And contributors*. With those two words, the Court went wrong. "The Framers did not intend to make representatives dependent upon contributors." The focus was intended to be on the voters alone.

The decision that corporations are just a different kind of person, and so entitled to full free speech rights, has loosed a flood of independent cash into political campaigns. And now we have banks "too big to fail" and corporations increasing their lobbying staff. Amgen's contributions and lobbying returned hundreds of dollars for every dollar spent. Why invest in research when you can purchase profit for a small investment in campaign? The increasing cost of campaigns increases the dependence of politicians on money and fund-raising, and so lobbyists.

In ten years the Anaconda corporation completely dominated Montana's political system. Then the Anaconda quickly froze out or undercut all competition. Citizens United must be reversed as soon as possible.

Mark Mackin, 4703 Almosta Road, Helena 59602 406-227-5237 markmackin@juno.com

In the 1970's now Senator Max Baucus walked the highways of Montana pledging to reform Congress. Recently, a rider attached to the "fiscal cliff" bill gave Amgen Incorporated favorable treatment worth an estimated \$500,000,000.00. Senator Baucus was in the room when that rider was attached to the bill. The bill passed without a hearing.

Max Baucus's connections to Amgen, Inc., and their campaign contributions to him made the news. How did Baucus, the young reformer, become associated with corporate influence in politics? To get the campaign cash he needs to be re-elected. Or to put it another way, by finding favor with Washington lobbyists, who will funnel the necessary corporate cash to him.

Did Baucus receive anything for this \$500,000,000.00 favor? According to news sources, over a period of years Amgen executives and stockholders gave Baucus at least \$68,000.00 in campaign contributions.

Why so little? According to lobbyist Jack Abramoff, politicians deal in stolen goods. Favors are free to the politician, and every other politician is driving the price down.

Of course that \$68,000.00 was campaign contributions and not bribes, or as Jack Abramoff would put it, it was a perfectly legal bribe. And if you fund-raise 147 perfectly legal \$68,000.00 bribes over the course of six years you have the \$10 million you need for the next U.S. Senate campaign.

But Senator Mitch McConnell, and Senator Orin Hatch were also in that room. All of our politicians depend on campaign contributions before they depend on votes. Congressmen spend at least one third of their time raising money. No matter who we send to Washington, they will need to raise large amounts of campaign cash for re-election. Lobbyists -- corporate, union, and otherwise -- are happy to make fund-raising easier and less time consuming. And that corrupts our politics.

In 1773 the British East India Company used political influence to exempt their corporation from the tax on tea. The corporation agents could then sell tea at cheaper prices than American merchants, driving them out of the market. Resistance led to the Boston Tea Party. The King also offered members of parliament choice jobs in the government. If you wanted to keep your job, you voted with the King -- no bribe needed.

The Framers of the Constitution of the United States talked a lot about preventing these kinds of corruption. The Framers were not just concerned about the sale of a vote. They wanted government officials to attend to the interests of "the people alone", the voters. *Lawrence Lessig, Republic Lost, p 241-42*. Anything that interfered with the dependence of the politician on the voter corrupted the political process. Anything that distracted the attention of the politician from the voter was a form of corruption. Anything that caused the voter to lose confidence in their government was corruption.

What did "the people alone" receive when Amgen, Inc., was granted a special midnight favor? The questionable benefit of paying high prices for drugs that could have been provided at a lower price. Did the three Senators' dependence on the steady dribble of campaign contributions from Amgen distract them away from the people's interest to the interest of the

stockholders of Amgen? The Framers would have regarded this as at least the appearance of corruption.

But the United States Supreme Court cannot see corruption in this system of legalized bribery. In Citizens United Justice Kennedy wrote for the majority, "It is in the nature of an elected representative to favor certain policies, . . . and to favor the voters and contributors who support those policies." Lessig, p.242 citing *Citizens United v. Fed. Election Comm'n*, 130 S. Ct. 676, 910 (2010). *And contributors*. With those two words, the Court went wrong. "The Framers did not intend to make representatives dependent upon contributors." The focus was intended to be on the voters alone.

The decision that corporations are just a different kind of person, and so entitled to full free speech rights, has loosed a flood of independent cash into political campaigns. And now we have banks "too big to fail" and corporations increasing their lobbying staff. Amgen's contributions and lobbying returned hundreds of dollars for every dollar spent. Why invest in research when you can purchase profit for a small investment in campaign? The increasing cost of campaigns increases the dependence of politicians on money and fund-raising, and so lobbyists.

In ten years the Anaconda corporation completely dominated Montana's political system. Then the Anaconda quickly froze out or undercut all competition. Citizens United must be reversed as soon as possible.

Mark Mackin, 4703 Almosta Road, Helena 59602 406-227-5237 markmackin@juno.com

In the 1970's now Senator Max Baucus walked the highways of Montana pledging to reform Congress. Recently, a rider attached to the "fiscal cliff" bill gave Amgen Incorporated favorable treatment worth an estimated \$500,000,000.00. Senator Baucus was in the room when that rider was attached to the bill. The bill passed without a hearing.

Max Baucus's connections to Amgen, Inc., and their campaign contributions to him made the news. How did Baucus, the young reformer, become associated with corporate influence in politics? To get the campaign cash he needs to be re-elected. Or to put it another way, by finding favor with Washington lobbyists, who will funnel the necessary corporate cash to him.

Did Baucus receive anything for this \$500,000,000.00 favor? According to news sources, over a period of years Amgen executives and stockholders gave Baucus at least \$68,000.00 in campaign contributions.

Why so little? According to lobbyist Jack Abramoff, politicians deal in stolen goods. Favors are free to the politician, and every other politician is driving the price down.

Of course that \$68,000.00 was campaign contributions and not bribes, or as Jack Abramoff would put it, it was a perfectly legal bribe. And if you fund-raise 147 perfectly legal \$68,000.00 bribes over the course of six years you have the \$10 million you need for the next U.S. Senate campaign.

But Senator Mitch McConnell, and Senator Orin Hatch were also in that room. All of our politicians depend on campaign contributions before they depend on votes. Congressmen spend at least one third of their time raising money. No matter who we send to Washington, they will need to raise large amounts of campaign cash for re-election. Lobbyists -- corporate, union, and otherwise -- are happy to make fund-raising easier and less time consuming. And that corrupts our politics.

In 1773 the British East India Company used political influence to exempt their corporation from the tax on tea. The corporation agents could then sell tea at cheaper prices than American merchants, driving them out of the market. Resistance led to the Boston Tea Party. The King also offered members of parliament choice jobs in the government. If you wanted to keep your job, you voted with the King -- no bribe needed.

The Framers of the Constitution of the United States talked a lot about preventing these kinds of corruption. The Framers were not just concerned about the sale of a vote. They wanted government officials to attend to the interests of "the people alone", the voters. *Lawrence Lessig, Republic Lost, p 241-42*. Anything that interfered with the dependence of the politician on the voter corrupted the political process. Anything that distracted the attention of the politician from the voter was a form of corruption. Anything that caused the voter to lose confidence in their government was corruption.

What did "the people alone" receive when Amgen, Inc., was granted a special midnight favor? The questionable benefit of paying high prices for drugs that could have been provided at a lower price. Did the three Senators' dependence on the steady dribble of campaign contributions from Amgen distract them away from the people's interest to the interest of the

stockholders of Amgen? The Framers would have regarded this as at least the appearance of corruption.

But the United States Supreme Court cannot see corruption in this system of legalized bribery. In Citizens United Justice Kennedy wrote for the majority, "It is in the nature of an elected representative to favor certain policies, . . . and to favor the voters and contributors who support those policies." Lessig, p.242 citing *Citizens United v. Fed. Election Comm'n*, 130 S. Ct. 676, 910 (2010). *And contributors*. With those two words, the Court went wrong. "The Framers did not intend to make representatives dependent upon contributors." The focus was intended to be on the voters alone.

The decision that corporations are just a different kind of person, and so entitled to full free speech rights, has loosed a flood of independent cash into political campaigns. And now we have banks "too big to fail" and corporations increasing their lobbying staff. Amgen's contributions and lobbying returned hundreds of dollars for every dollar spent. Why invest in research when you can purchase profit for a small investment in campaign? The increasing cost of campaigns increases the dependence of politicians on money and fund-raising, and so lobbyists.

In ten years the Anaconda corporation completely dominated Montana's political system. Then the Anaconda quickly froze out or undercut all competition. Citizens United must be reversed as soon as possible.

Mark Mackin, 4703 Almosta Road, Helena 59602 406-227-5237 markmackin@juno.com

In the 1970's now Senator Max Baucus walked the highways of Montana pledging to reform Congress. Recently, a rider attached to the "fiscal cliff" bill gave Amgen Incorporated favorable treatment worth an estimated \$500,000,000.00. Senator Baucus was in the room when that rider was attached to the bill. The bill passed without a hearing.

Max Baucus's connections to Amgen, Inc., and their campaign contributions to him made the news. How did Baucus, the young reformer, become associated with corporate influence in politics? To get the campaign cash he needs to be re-elected. Or to put it another way, by finding favor with Washington lobbyists, who will funnel the necessary corporate cash to him.

Did Baucus receive anything for this \$500,000,000.00 favor? According to news sources, over a period of years Amgen executives and stockholders gave Baucus at least \$68,000.00 in campaign contributions.

Why so little? According to lobbyist Jack Abramoff, politicians deal in stolen goods. Favors are free to the politician, and every other politician is driving the price down.

Of course that \$68,000.00 was campaign contributions and not bribes, or as Jack Abramoff would put it, it was a perfectly legal bribe. And if you fund-raise 147 perfectly legal \$68,000.00 bribes over the course of six years you have the \$10 million you need for the next U.S. Senate campaign.

But Senator Mitch McConnell, and Senator Orin Hatch were also in that room. All of our politicians depend on campaign contributions before they depend on votes. Congressmen spend at least one third of their time raising money. No matter who we send to Washington, they will need to raise large amounts of campaign cash for re-election. Lobbyists -- corporate, union, and otherwise -- are happy to make fund-raising easier and less time consuming. And that corrupts our politics.

In 1773 the British East India Company used political influence to exempt their corporation from the tax on tea. The corporation agents could then sell tea at cheaper prices than American merchants, driving them out of the market. Resistance led to the Boston Tea Party. The King also offered members of parliament choice jobs in the government. If you wanted to keep your job, you voted with the King -- no bribe needed.

The Framers of the Constitution of the United States talked a lot about preventing these kinds of corruption. The Framers were not just concerned about the sale of a vote. They wanted government officials to attend to the interests of "the people alone", the voters. *Lawrence Lessig, Republic Lost, p 241-42*. Anything that interfered with the dependence of the politician on the voter corrupted the political process. Anything that distracted the attention of the politician from the voter was a form of corruption. Anything that caused the voter to lose confidence in their government was corruption.

What did "the people alone" receive when Amgen, Inc., was granted a special midnight favor? The questionable benefit of paying high prices for drugs that could have been provided at a lower price. Did the three Senators' dependence on the steady dribble of campaign contributions from Amgen distract them away from the people's interest to the interest of the

stockholders of Amgen? The Framers would have regarded this as at least the appearance of corruption.

But the United States Supreme Court cannot see corruption in this system of legalized bribery. In Citizens United Justice Kennedy wrote for the majority, "It is in the nature of an elected representative to favor certain policies, . . . and to favor the voters and contributors who support those policies." Lessig, p.242 citing *Citizens United v. Fed. Election Comm'n*, 130 S. Ct. 676, 910 (2010). *And contributors*. With those two words, the Court went wrong. "The Framers did not intend to make representatives dependent upon contributors." The focus was intended to be on the voters alone.

The decision that corporations are just a different kind of person, and so entitled to full free speech rights, has loosed a flood of independent cash into political campaigns. And now we have banks "too big to fail" and corporations increasing their lobbying staff. Amgen's contributions and lobbying returned hundreds of dollars for every dollar spent. Why invest in research when you can purchase profit for a small investment in campaign? The increasing cost of campaigns increases the dependence of politicians on money and fund-raising, and so lobbyists.

In ten years the Anaconda corporation completely dominated Montana's political system. Then the Anaconda quickly froze out or undercut all competition. Citizens United must be reversed as soon as possible.

Mark Mackin, 4703 Almosta Road, Helena 59602 406-227-5237 markmackin@juno.com

In the 1970's now Senator Max Baucus walked the highways of Montana pledging to reform Congress. Recently, a rider attached to the "fiscal cliff" bill gave Amgen Incorporated favorable treatment worth an estimated \$500,000,000.00. Senator Baucus was in the room when that rider was attached to the bill. The bill passed without a hearing.

Max Baucus's connections to Amgen, Inc., and their campaign contributions to him made the news. How did Baucus, the young reformer, become associated with corporate influence in politics? To get the campaign cash he needs to be re-elected. Or to put it another way, by finding favor with Washington lobbyists, who will funnel the necessary corporate cash to him.

Did Baucus receive anything for this \$500,000,000.00 favor? According to news sources, over a period of years Amgen executives and stockholders gave Baucus at least \$68,000.00 in campaign contributions.

Why so little? According to lobbyist Jack Abramoff, politicians deal in stolen goods. Favors are free to the politician, and every other politician is driving the price down.

Of course that \$68,000.00 was campaign contributions and not bribes, or as Jack Abramoff would put it, it was a perfectly legal bribe. And if you fund-raise 147 perfectly legal \$68,000.00 bribes over the course of six years you have the \$10 million you need for the next U.S. Senate campaign.

But Senator Mitch McConnell, and Senator Orin Hatch were also in that room. All of our politicians depend on campaign contributions before they depend on votes. Congressmen spend at least one third of their time raising money. No matter who we send to Washington, they will need to raise large amounts of campaign cash for re-election. Lobbyists -- corporate, union, and otherwise -- are happy to make fund-raising easier and less time consuming. And that corrupts our politics.

In 1773 the British East India Company used political influence to exempt their corporation from the tax on tea. The corporation agents could then sell tea at cheaper prices than American merchants, driving them out of the market. Resistance led to the Boston Tea Party. The King also offered members of parliament choice jobs in the government. If you wanted to keep your job, you voted with the King -- no bribe needed.

The Framers of the Constitution of the United States talked a lot about preventing these kinds of corruption. The Framers were not just concerned about the sale of a vote. They wanted government officials to attend to the interests of "the people alone", the voters. *Lawrence Lessig, Republic Lost, p 241-42*. Anything that interfered with the dependence of the politician on the voter corrupted the political process. Anything that distracted the attention of the politician from the voter was a form of corruption. Anything that caused the voter to lose confidence in their government was corruption.

What did "the people alone" receive when Amgen, Inc., was granted a special midnight favor? The questionable benefit of paying high prices for drugs that could have been provided at a lower price. Did the three Senators' dependence on the steady dribble of campaign contributions from Amgen distract them away from the people's interest to the interest of the

stockholders of Amgen? The Framers would have regarded this as at least the appearance of corruption.

But the United States Supreme Court cannot see corruption in this system of legalized bribery. In Citizens United Justice Kennedy wrote for the majority, "It is in the nature of an elected representative to favor certain policies, . . . and to favor the voters and contributors who support those policies." Lessig, p.242 citing *Citizens United v. Fed. Election Comm'n*, 130 S. Ct. 676, 910 (2010). *And contributors*. With those two words, the Court went wrong. "The Framers did not intend to make representatives dependent upon contributors." The focus was intended to be on the voters alone.

The decision that corporations are just a different kind of person, and so entitled to full free speech rights, has loosed a flood of independent cash into political campaigns. And now we have banks "too big to fail" and corporations increasing their lobbying staff. Amgen's contributions and lobbying returned hundreds of dollars for every dollar spent. Why invest in research when you can purchase profit for a small investment in campaign? The increasing cost of campaigns increases the dependence of politicians on money and fund-raising, and so lobbyists.

In ten years the Anaconda corporation completely dominated Montana's political system. Then the Anaconda quickly froze out or undercut all competition. Citizens United must be reversed as soon as possible.

Mark Mackin, 4703 Almosta Road, Helena 59602 406-227-5237 markmackin@juno.com

In the 1970's now Senator Max Baucus walked the highways of Montana pledging to reform Congress. Recently, a rider attached to the "fiscal cliff" bill gave Amgen Incorporated favorable treatment worth an estimated \$500,000,000.00. Senator Baucus was in the room when that rider was attached to the bill. The bill passed without a hearing.

Max Baucus's connections to Amgen, Inc., and their campaign contributions to him made the news. How did Baucus, the young reformer, become associated with corporate influence in politics? To get the campaign cash he needs to be re-elected. Or to put it another way, by finding favor with Washington lobbyists, who will funnel the necessary corporate cash to him.

Did Baucus receive anything for this \$500,000,000.00 favor? According to news sources, over a period of years Amgen executives and stockholders gave Baucus at least \$68,000.00 in campaign contributions.

Why so little? According to lobbyist Jack Abramoff, politicians deal in stolen goods. Favors are free to the politician, and every other politician is driving the price down.

Of course that \$68,000.00 was campaign contributions and not bribes, or as Jack Abramoff would put it, it was a perfectly legal bribe. And if you fund-raise 147 perfectly legal \$68,000.00 bribes over the course of six years you have the \$10 million you need for the next U.S. Senate campaign.

But Senator Mitch McConnell, and Senator Orin Hatch were also in that room. All of our politicians depend on campaign contributions before they depend on votes. Congressmen spend at least one third of their time raising money. No matter who we send to Washington, they will need to raise large amounts of campaign cash for re-election. Lobbyists -- corporate, union, and otherwise -- are happy to make fund-raising easier and less time consuming. And that corrupts our politics.

In 1773 the British East India Company used political influence to exempt their corporation from the tax on tea. The corporation agents could then sell tea at cheaper prices than American merchants, driving them out of the market. Resistance led to the Boston Tea Party. The King also offered members of parliament choice jobs in the government. If you wanted to keep your job, you voted with the King -- no bribe needed.

The Framers of the Constitution of the United States talked a lot about preventing these kinds of corruption. The Framers were not just concerned about the sale of a vote. They wanted government officials to attend to the interests of "the people alone", the voters. *Lawrence Lessig, Republic Lost, p 241-42*. Anything that interfered with the dependence of the politician on the voter corrupted the political process. Anything that distracted the attention of the politician from the voter was a form of corruption. Anything that caused the voter to lose confidence in their government was corruption.

What did "the people alone" receive when Amgen, Inc., was granted a special midnight favor? The questionable benefit of paying high prices for drugs that could have been provided at a lower price. Did the three Senators' dependence on the steady dribble of campaign contributions from Amgen distract them away from the people's interest to the interest of the

stockholders of Amgen? The Framers would have regarded this as at least the appearance of corruption.

But the United States Supreme Court cannot see corruption in this system of legalized bribery. In Citizens United Justice Kennedy wrote for the majority, "It is in the nature of an elected representative to favor certain policies, . . . and to favor the voters and contributors who support those policies." Lessig, p.242 citing *Citizens United v. Fed. Election Comm'n*, 130 S. Ct. 676, 910 (2010). *And contributors*. With those two words, the Court went wrong. "The Framers did not intend to make representatives dependent upon contributors." The focus was intended to be on the voters alone.

The decision that corporations are just a different kind of person, and so entitled to full free speech rights, has loosed a flood of independent cash into political campaigns. And now we have banks "too big to fail" and corporations increasing their lobbying staff. Amgen's contributions and lobbying returned hundreds of dollars for every dollar spent. Why invest in research when you can purchase profit for a small investment in campaign? The increasing cost of campaigns increases the dependence of politicians on money and fund-raising, and so lobbyists.

In ten years the Anaconda corporation completely dominated Montana's political system. Then the Anaconda quickly froze out or undercut all competition. Citizens United must be reversed as soon as possible.

Mark Mackin, 4703 Almosta Road, Helena 59602 406-227-5237 markmackin@juno.com

In the 1970's now Senator Max Baucus walked the highways of Montana pledging to reform Congress. Recently, a rider attached to the "fiscal cliff" bill gave Amgen Incorporated favorable treatment worth an estimated \$500,000,000.00. Senator Baucus was in the room when that rider was attached to the bill. The bill passed without a hearing.

Max Baucus's connections to Amgen, Inc., and their campaign contributions to him made the news. How did Baucus, the young reformer, become associated with corporate influence in politics? To get the campaign cash he needs to be re-elected. Or to put it another way, by finding favor with Washington lobbyists, who will funnel the necessary corporate cash to him.

Did Baucus receive anything for this \$500,000,000.00 favor? According to news sources, over a period of years Amgen executives and stockholders gave Baucus at least \$68,000.00 in campaign contributions.

Why so little? According to lobbyist Jack Abramoff, politicians deal in stolen goods. Favors are free to the politician, and every other politician is driving the price down.

Of course that \$68,000.00 was campaign contributions and not bribes, or as Jack Abramoff would put it, it was a perfectly legal bribe. And if you fund-raise 147 perfectly legal \$68,000.00 bribes over the course of six years you have the \$10 million you need for the next U.S. Senate campaign.

But Senator Mitch McConnell, and Senator Orin Hatch were also in that room. All of our politicians depend on campaign contributions before they depend on votes. Congressmen spend at least one third of their time raising money. No matter who we send to Washington, they will need to raise large amounts of campaign cash for re-election. Lobbyists -- corporate, union, and otherwise -- are happy to make fund-raising easier and less time consuming. And that corrupts our politics.

In 1773 the British East India Company used political influence to exempt their corporation from the tax on tea. The corporation agents could then sell tea at cheaper prices than American merchants, driving them out of the market. Resistance led to the Boston Tea Party. The King also offered members of parliament choice jobs in the government. If you wanted to keep your job, you voted with the King -- no bribe needed.

The Framers of the Constitution of the United States talked a lot about preventing these kinds of corruption. The Framers were not just concerned about the sale of a vote. They wanted government officials to attend to the interests of "the people alone", the voters. *Lawrence Lessig, Republic Lost, p 241-42*. Anything that interfered with the dependence of the politician on the voter corrupted the political process. Anything that distracted the attention of the politician from the voter was a form of corruption. Anything that caused the voter to lose confidence in their government was corruption.

What did "the people alone" receive when Amgen, Inc., was granted a special midnight favor? The questionable benefit of paying high prices for drugs that could have been provided at a lower price. Did the three Senators' dependence on the steady dribble of campaign contributions from Amgen distract them away from the people's interest to the interest of the

stockholders of Amgen? The Framers would have regarded this as at least the appearance of corruption.

But the United States Supreme Court cannot see corruption in this system of legalized bribery. In Citizens United Justice Kennedy wrote for the majority, "It is in the nature of an elected representative to favor certain policies, . . . and to favor the voters and contributors who support those policies." Lessig, p.242 citing *Citizens United v. Fed. Election Comm'n*, 130 S. Ct. 676, 910 (2010). *And contributors*. With those two words, the Court went wrong. "The Framers did not intend to make representatives dependent upon contributors." The focus was intended to be on the voters alone.

The decision that corporations are just a different kind of person, and so entitled to full free speech rights, has loosed a flood of independent cash into political campaigns. And now we have banks "too big to fail" and corporations increasing their lobbying staff. Amgen's contributions and lobbying returned hundreds of dollars for every dollar spent. Why invest in research when you can purchase profit for a small investment in campaign? The increasing cost of campaigns increases the dependence of politicians on money and fund-raising, and so lobbyists.

In ten years the Anaconda corporation completely dominated Montana's political system. Then the Anaconda quickly froze out or undercut all competition. Citizens United must be reversed as soon as possible.

Mark Mackin, 4703 Almosta Road, Helena 59602 406-227-5237 markmackin@juno.com

In the 1970's now Senator Max Baucus walked the highways of Montana pledging to reform Congress. Recently, a rider attached to the "fiscal cliff" bill gave Amgen Incorporated favorable treatment worth an estimated \$500,000,000.00. Senator Baucus was in the room when that rider was attached to the bill. The bill passed without a hearing.

Max Baucus's connections to Amgen, Inc., and their campaign contributions to him made the news. How did Baucus, the young reformer, become associated with corporate influence in politics? To get the campaign cash he needs to be re-elected. Or to put it another way, by finding favor with Washington lobbyists, who will funnel the necessary corporate cash to him.

Did Baucus receive anything for this \$500,000,000.00 favor? According to news sources, over a period of years Amgen executives and stockholders gave Baucus at least \$68,000.00 in campaign contributions.

Why so little? According to lobbyist Jack Abramoff, politicians deal in stolen goods. Favors are free to the politician, and every other politician is driving the price down.

Of course that \$68,000.00 was campaign contributions and not bribes, or as Jack Abramoff would put it, it was a perfectly legal bribe. And if you fund-raise 147 perfectly legal \$68,000.00 bribes over the course of six years you have the \$10 million you need for the next U.S. Senate campaign.

But Senator Mitch McConnell, and Senator Orin Hatch were also in that room. All of our politicians depend on campaign contributions before they depend on votes. Congressmen spend at least one third of their time raising money. No matter who we send to Washington, they will need to raise large amounts of campaign cash for re-election. Lobbyists -- corporate, union, and otherwise -- are happy to make fund-raising easier and less time consuming. And that corrupts our politics.

In 1773 the British East India Company used political influence to exempt their corporation from the tax on tea. The corporation agents could then sell tea at cheaper prices than American merchants, driving them out of the market. Resistance led to the Boston Tea Party. The King also offered members of parliament choice jobs in the government. If you wanted to keep your job, you voted with the King -- no bribe needed.

The Framers of the Constitution of the United States talked a lot about preventing these kinds of corruption. The Framers were not just concerned about the sale of a vote. They wanted government officials to attend to the interests of "the people alone", the voters. *Lawrence Lessig, Republic Lost, p 241-42*. Anything that interfered with the dependence of the politician on the voter corrupted the political process. Anything that distracted the attention of the politician from the voter was a form of corruption. Anything that caused the voter to lose confidence in their government was corruption.

What did "the people alone" receive when Amgen, Inc., was granted a special midnight favor? The questionable benefit of paying high prices for drugs that could have been provided at a lower price. Did the three Senators' dependence on the steady dribble of campaign contributions from Amgen distract them away from the people's interest to the interest of the

stockholders of Amgen? The Framers would have regarded this as at least the appearance of corruption.

But the United States Supreme Court cannot see corruption in this system of legalized bribery. In Citizens United Justice Kennedy wrote for the majority, "It is in the nature of an elected representative to favor certain policies, . . . and to favor the voters and contributors who support those policies." Lessig, p.242 citing *Citizens United v. Fed. Election Comm'n*, 130 S. Ct. 676, 910 (2010). *And contributors*. With those two words, the Court went wrong. "The Framers did not intend to make representatives dependent upon contributors." The focus was intended to be on the voters alone.

The decision that corporations are just a different kind of person, and so entitled to full free speech rights, has loosed a flood of independent cash into political campaigns. And now we have banks "too big to fail" and corporations increasing their lobbying staff. Amgen's contributions and lobbying returned hundreds of dollars for every dollar spent. Why invest in research when you can purchase profit for a small investment in campaign? The increasing cost of campaigns increases the dependence of politicians on money and fund-raising, and so lobbyists.

In ten years the Anaconda corporation completely dominated Montana's political system. Then the Anaconda quickly froze out or undercut all competition. Citizens United must be reversed as soon as possible.

Mark Mackin, 4703 Almosta Road, Helena 59602 406-227-5237 markmackin@juno.com

In the 1970's now Senator Max Baucus walked the highways of Montana pledging to reform Congress. Recently, a rider attached to the "fiscal cliff" bill gave Amgen Incorporated favorable treatment worth an estimated \$500,000,000.00. Senator Baucus was in the room when that rider was attached to the bill. The bill passed without a hearing.

Max Baucus's connections to Amgen, Inc., and their campaign contributions to him made the news. How did Baucus, the young reformer, become associated with corporate influence in politics? To get the campaign cash he needs to be re-elected. Or to put it another way, by finding favor with Washington lobbyists, who will funnel the necessary corporate cash to him.

Did Baucus receive anything for this \$500,000,000.00 favor? According to news sources, over a period of years Amgen executives and stockholders gave Baucus at least \$68,000.00 in campaign contributions.

Why so little? According to lobbyist Jack Abramoff, politicians deal in stolen goods. Favors are free to the politician, and every other politician is driving the price down.

Of course that \$68,000.00 was campaign contributions and not bribes, or as Jack Abramoff would put it, it was a perfectly legal bribe. And if you fund-raise 147 perfectly legal \$68,000.00 bribes over the course of six years you have the \$10 million you need for the next U.S. Senate campaign.

But Senator Mitch McConnell, and Senator Orin Hatch were also in that room. All of our politicians depend on campaign contributions before they depend on votes. Congressmen spend at least one third of their time raising money. No matter who we send to Washington, they will need to raise large amounts of campaign cash for re-election. Lobbyists -- corporate, union, and otherwise -- are happy to make fund-raising easier and less time consuming. And that corrupts our politics.

In 1773 the British East India Company used political influence to exempt their corporation from the tax on tea. The corporation agents could then sell tea at cheaper prices than American merchants, driving them out of the market. Resistance led to the Boston Tea Party. The King also offered members of parliament choice jobs in the government. If you wanted to keep your job, you voted with the King -- no bribe needed.

The Framers of the Constitution of the United States talked a lot about preventing these kinds of corruption. The Framers were not just concerned about the sale of a vote. They wanted government officials to attend to the interests of "the people alone", the voters. *Lawrence Lessig, Republic Lost, p 241-42*. Anything that interfered with the dependence of the politician on the voter corrupted the political process. Anything that distracted the attention of the politician from the voter was a form of corruption. Anything that caused the voter to lose confidence in their government was corruption.

What did "the people alone" receive when Amgen, Inc., was granted a special midnight favor? The questionable benefit of paying high prices for drugs that could have been provided at a lower price. Did the three Senators' dependence on the steady dribble of campaign contributions from Amgen distract them away from the people's interest to the interest of the

stockholders of Amgen? The Framers would have regarded this as at least the appearance of corruption.

But the United States Supreme Court cannot see corruption in this system of legalized bribery. In Citizens United Justice Kennedy wrote for the majority, "It is in the nature of an elected representative to favor certain policies, . . . and to favor the voters and contributors who support those policies." Lessig, p.242 citing *Citizens United v. Fed. Election Comm'n*, 130 S. Ct. 676, 910 (2010). *And contributors*. With those two words, the Court went wrong. "The Framers did not intend to make representatives dependent upon contributors." The focus was intended to be on the voters alone.

The decision that corporations are just a different kind of person, and so entitled to full free speech rights, has loosed a flood of independent cash into political campaigns. And now we have banks "too big to fail" and corporations increasing their lobbying staff. Amgen's contributions and lobbying returned hundreds of dollars for every dollar spent. Why invest in research when you can purchase profit for a small investment in campaign? The increasing cost of campaigns increases the dependence of politicians on money and fund-raising, and so lobbyists.

In ten years the Anaconda corporation completely dominated Montana's political system. Then the Anaconda quickly froze out or undercut all competition. Citizens United must be reversed as soon as possible.

Mark Mackin, 4703 Almosta Road, Helena 59602 406-227-5237 markmackin@juno.com

In the 1970's now Senator Max Baucus walked the highways of Montana pledging to reform Congress. Recently, a rider attached to the "fiscal cliff" bill gave Amgen Incorporated favorable treatment worth an estimated \$500,000,000.00. Senator Baucus was in the room when that rider was attached to the bill. The bill passed without a hearing.

Max Baucus's connections to Amgen, Inc., and their campaign contributions to him made the news. How did Baucus, the young reformer, become associated with corporate influence in politics? To get the campaign cash he needs to be re-elected. Or to put it another way, by finding favor with Washington lobbyists, who will funnel the necessary corporate cash to him.

Did Baucus receive anything for this \$500,000,000.00 favor? According to news sources, over a period of years Amgen executives and stockholders gave Baucus at least \$68,000.00 in campaign contributions.

Why so little? According to lobbyist Jack Abramoff, politicians deal in stolen goods. Favors are free to the politician, and every other politician is driving the price down.

Of course that \$68,000.00 was campaign contributions and not bribes, or as Jack Abramoff would put it, it was a perfectly legal bribe. And if you fund-raise 147 perfectly legal \$68,000.00 bribes over the course of six years you have the \$10 million you need for the next U.S. Senate campaign.

But Senator Mitch McConnell, and Senator Orin Hatch were also in that room. All of our politicians depend on campaign contributions before they depend on votes. Congressmen spend at least one third of their time raising money. No matter who we send to Washington, they will need to raise large amounts of campaign cash for re-election. Lobbyists -- corporate, union, and otherwise -- are happy to make fund-raising easier and less time consuming. And that corrupts our politics.

In 1773 the British East India Company used political influence to exempt their corporation from the tax on tea. The corporation agents could then sell tea at cheaper prices than American merchants, driving them out of the market. Resistance led to the Boston Tea Party. The King also offered members of parliament choice jobs in the government. If you wanted to keep your job, you voted with the King -- no bribe needed.

The Framers of the Constitution of the United States talked a lot about preventing these kinds of corruption. The Framers were not just concerned about the sale of a vote. They wanted government officials to attend to the interests of "the people alone", the voters. *Lawrence Lessig, Republic Lost, p 241-42*. Anything that interfered with the dependence of the politician on the voter corrupted the political process. Anything that distracted the attention of the politician from the voter was a form of corruption. Anything that caused the voter to lose confidence in their government was corruption.

What did "the people alone" receive when Amgen, Inc., was granted a special midnight favor? The questionable benefit of paying high prices for drugs that could have been provided at a lower price. Did the three Senators' dependence on the steady dribble of campaign contributions from Amgen distract them away from the people's interest to the interest of the

stockholders of Amgen? The Framers would have regarded this as at least the appearance of corruption.

But the United States Supreme Court cannot see corruption in this system of legalized bribery. In Citizens United Justice Kennedy wrote for the majority, "It is in the nature of an elected representative to favor certain policies, . . . and to favor the voters and contributors who support those policies." Lessig, p.242 citing *Citizens United v. Fed. Election Comm'n*, 130 S. Ct. 676, 910 (2010). *And contributors*. With those two words, the Court went wrong. "The Framers did not intend to make representatives dependent upon contributors." The focus was intended to be on the voters alone.

The decision that corporations are just a different kind of person, and so entitled to full free speech rights, has loosed a flood of independent cash into political campaigns. And now we have banks "too big to fail" and corporations increasing their lobbying staff. Amgen's contributions and lobbying returned hundreds of dollars for every dollar spent. Why invest in research when you can purchase profit for a small investment in campaign? The increasing cost of campaigns increases the dependence of politicians on money and fund-raising, and so lobbyists.

In ten years the Anaconda corporation completely dominated Montana's political system. Then the Anaconda quickly froze out or undercut all competition. Citizens United must be reversed as soon as possible.