

RELEASE IN PART B6

From: sbwhoep [redacted]
 Sent: Saturday, January 23, 2010 4:23 PM
 To: H
 Subject: Re: H: FYI: Any foreign nation or leader with a front company becomes a "person" under US law. S

Me, too. He shouldn't retire
 Sent via Cingular Xpress Mail with Blackberry

-----Original Message-----

From: H <HDR22@clintonemail.com>
 Date: Sat, 23 Jan 2010 16:08:57
 To: 'sbwhoep [redacted]' <sbwhoep [redacted]>
 Subject: Re: H: FYI: Any foreign nation or leader with a front company becomes a "person" under US law. S

B6

Good for him. I wish he were 50 instead 90!

----- Original Message -----

From: sbwhoep [redacted] <sbwhoep [redacted]>
 To: H
 Sent: Sat Jan 23 16:06:22 2010
 Subject: Re: H: FYI: Any foreign nation or leader with a front company becomes a "person" under US law. S

This is from Justice Stevens' dissent in the Citizens United case:

If taken seriously, our colleagues' assumption that the identity of a speaker has no relevance to the Government's ability to regulate political speech would lead to some remarkable conclusions. Such an assumption would have accorded the propaganda broadcasts to our troops by "Tokyo Rose" during World War II the same protection as speech by Allied commanders. More pertinently, it would appear to afford the same protection to multinational corporations controlled by foreigners as to individual Americans: To do otherwise, after all, could "enhance the relative voice" of some (i.e., humans) over others (i.e., nonhumans). Ante, at 33 (quoting Buckley, 424 U. S., at 49). 51
 <<http://www.law.cornell.edu/supct/html/08-205.ZX.html#51>> Under the majority's view, I suppose it may be a First Amendment <<http://www.law.cornell.edu/supct/cgi/get-const?amendment1>> problem that corporations are not permitted to vote, given that voting is, among other things, a form of speech.

<http://www.law.cornell.edu/supct/html/08-205.ZX.html>

-----Original Message-----

From: H <HDR22@clintonemail.com>
 To: 'sbwhoep [redacted]' <sbwhoep [redacted]>
 Sent: Sat, Jan 23, 2010 3:51 pm
 Subject: Re: H: FYI: Any foreign nation or leader with a front company becomes a "person" under US law. S

This is unbelievable. Or maybe totally so given the forces at work.

----- Original Message -----

From: sbw@oeop [redacted] <sbw@oeop [redacted]>

To: H

Sent: Sat Jan 23 09:26:25 2010

Subject: H: FYI: Any foreign nation or leader with a front company becomes a "person" under US law. S

<http://coloradoindependent.com/46462/hugo-chavezs-state-owned-petroleos-corp-set-to-spend-on-your-u-s-election>

Hugo Chavez's state-owned Petroleos Corp set to spend on your U.S. election

<<http://coloradoindependent.com/46462/hugo-chavezs-state-owned-petroleos-corp-set-to-spend-on-your-u-s-election>>

Digg <<http://digg.com/submit?url=http://coloradoindependent.com/46462/hugo-chavezs-state-owned-petroleos-corp-set-to-spend-on-your-u-s-election&title=Hugo%20Chavez%E2%80%99s%20state-owned%20Petroleos%20Corp%20set%20to%20spend%20on%20your%20U.S.%20election&bodytext=Bloggng+on+the+Citizens+United+Supreme+Court+ruling+is+more+of+what+we+love+about+the+web.+It%26%238217%33s+the+kind+of+typical+collective+dissection+we+have+now+come+to+expect+but+that+never+really+existed+before%3A+serious%2C+speculative%2C+arcane%2C+funny%2C+brilliant%2C+baked%2C+etc.+The+Sunlight+Foundation+blogging+is+predictably+good.+Paul+Blumenthal+dips+into+the+%5B...%5D&media=news&topic=politics>>

Tweet <<http://twitter.com/home?status=RT%20@COindependent%20-%20Hugo%20Chavez%E2%80%99s%20state-owned%20Petroleos%20Corp%20set%20to%20spend%20on%20your%20U.S.%20election%C2%A0%20http://bit.ly/7duh0Y>>

By John Tomasic <<http://coloradoindependent.com/author/johntomasic/>> 1/22/10

3:58 PM

Bloggng on the Citizens United Supreme Court ruling is more of what we love about the web. It's the kind of typical collective dissection we have now come

B6

to expect but that never really existed before: serious, speculative, arcane, funny, brilliant, baked, etc. The Sunlight Foundation blogging <<http://blog.sunlightfoundation.com/2010/01/22/wait-can-foreign-companies-now-spend-on-us-political-elections/>> is predictably good. Paul Blumenthal dips into the multinational dimension of the new "corporation as full citizen-person" framework, drawing on blogging going on at Newsweek <<http://blog.newsweek.com/blogs/thegaggle/archive/2010/01/22/should-foreign-corporations-spend-money-on-u-s-political-candidates.aspx>> and the Center for Public Integrity <<http://www.publicintegrity.org/articles/entry/1913/>>

"Looks like [the Court] might support allowing foreign companies to spend freely in elections in the United States. I guess this would be the corporate globalization of the U.S. electoral system." So you gotta ask yourself: Who does Hugo Chavez want for President?

Blumenthal excerpting the Center for Public Integrity:

<<http://coloradoindependent.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/01/Picture-142.png>>

The Center for Public Integrity looks at this closer and shows what kind of foreign influence we are looking at:

One prominent examples is CITGO Petroleum Company — once the American-born Cities Services Company, but purchased in 1990 by the Venezuelan government-owned Petr6leos de Venezuela S.A. The Citizens United ruling could conceivably allow Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez, who has sharply criticized both of the past two U.S. presidents, to spend government funds to defeat an American political candidate, just by having CITGO buy TV ads bashing his target.

And it's not just Chavez. The Saudi government owns Houston's Saudi Refining Company and half of Motiva Enterprises. Lenovo, which bought IBM's PC assets in 2004, is partially owned by the Chinese government's Chinese Academy of Sciences. And Singapore's APL Limited operates several U.S. port operations. A weakening of the limit on corporate giving could mean China, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, and any other country that owns companies that operate in the U.S. could also have significant sway in American electioneering.

I really can't see Americans being too happy about this.

Dahlia Lithwick reported for Slate <<http://www.slate.com/id/2242208/>> from the Supreme Court as the opinions were being read. She offered this aside:

While Stevens is reading the portion of his concurrence about the "cautious view of corporate power" held by the framers, I see Justice Thomas chuckle softly.

Was it a disdainful chuckle at the impotence of his colleague? Was it merely a chuckle of disagreement, of good-natured exasperation? Was it a chuckle at an anachronistic vision of the framers set beside today's modern corporate silicon and steel behemoths? I doubt he was thinking about Hugo Chavez.