

=====

I strongly feel that the FEC should withdraw these proposed regulations and respect the First Amendment. Too many times we have seen donor lists mined by agenda-driven individuals to harass and bully their political opponents for their views, a tactic that sadly is easier than ever in this age of online communications and social media. It is inevitable that such would be the case were these ill-advised regulations to prevail. The background that led to the celebrated NAACP vs. Alabama decision shows how political advocacy (such as the NAACP's) can be threatened in a way completely counter to the best traditions of our nation, and regulations such as the ones now proposed would only encourage similar intimidation and thus effectively nullify Americans' constitutional protections. I encourage the FEC to consider this unacceptable downside and to table this proposal permanently.

Comments provided by :  
Hubeart , T

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_muir\_chris\_10\_26\_2015\_20\_37\_56\_CommentText.txt

=====

abandon these efforts to regulate speech!!

Comments provided by :  
muir, chris

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Converse\_Deanna\_10\_26\_2015\_20\_45\_52\_CommentText.txt

=====

Please do not enact these new rules. Private citizens are being threatened by the exposure of donor lists. We also see harassment from the IRS and John Doe in Wisconsin. The new rule would subject private citizens to potential harassment. Thank you.

Comments provided by :  
Converse, Deanna

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Phelps\_Priscilla\_10\_26\_2015\_20\_47\_29\_CommentText.txt

=====

Non profit organizations enjoy the same free speech rights as any American. Forced disclosure is just a way to silence those who disagree with the current power structure. The Supreme Court ruled on this and it is the right of people to contribute anonymously to causes/organizations.

Comments provided by :  
Phelps, Priscilla

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_fenton\_joshua\_10\_26\_2015\_20\_48\_51\_CommentText.txt

=====

The disclosure required by this regulation will open any American who exercises his or her free speech rights through political donations to intimidation by those of opposing views, in direct opposition to the intent of the First Amendment. I oppose this proposed regulation on those grounds and encourage the FEC to reconsider.

Comments provided by :  
fenton, joshua

=====

=====

To Whom it May Concern at the Federal Election Commission:

This petition is to prevent nonprofit advocacy organizations that are not political committees and that do not spend a majority of their time and resources on candidate-related activity to reveal their donors, something they are not required to do by federal law or IRS regulations. In fact, the fundamental rights of association, privacy, and free speech of such organizations and their donors are protected by the First Amendment, as the U.S. Supreme Court held in NAACP v. Alabama, 357 U.S. 449 (1958). Such mandated disclosure has no purpose other than to try to open up the donors of such organizations to harassment and intimidation for their political and social beliefs in associating with particular membership organizations. The FEC has no statutory authority to mandate such disclosure of organizations that are not political committees. That being the case, the FEC should immediately and completely abandon any and all efforts to implement this unconstitutional policy.

Comments provided by :  
Martin, Kevin

=====

=====

This petition is an attempt to force nonprofit advocacy organizations that are not political committees and that do not spend a majority of their time and resources on candidate-related activity to reveal their donors, something they are not required to do by federal law or IRS regulations. In fact, the fundamental rights of association, privacy, and free speech of such organizations and their donors are protected by the First Amendment, as the U.S. Supreme Court held in NAACP v. Alabama, 357 U.S. 449 (1958). Such mandated disclosure has no purpose other than to try to open up the donors of such organizations to harassment and intimidation for their political and social beliefs in associating with particular membership organizations. The FEC has no statutory authority to mandate such disclosure of organizations that are not political committees.

Thank You  
Don Stubbs

Comments provided by :  
Stubbs, Don

=====

=====

this petition is an attempt to force nonprofit advocacy organizations that are not political committees and that do not spend a majority of their time and resources on candidate-related activity to reveal their donors, something they are not required to do by federal law or IRS regulations. In fact, the fundamental rights of association, privacy, and free speech of such organizations and their donors are protected by the First Amendment, as the U.S. Supreme Court held in NAACP v. Alabama, 357 U.S. 449 (1958). Such mandated disclosure has no purpose other than to try to open up the donors of such organizations to harassment and intimidation for their political and social beliefs in associating with particular membership organizations. The FEC has no statutory authority to mandate such disclosure of organizations that are not political committees.

Comments provided by :  
Burgess, Peter

=====



Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Hillberg\_Ronald\_10\_26\_2015\_21\_01\_38\_CommentText.txt

=====

Freedom of speech under the first amendment is critical to our democracy. The Federalist Papers were anonymous. Maintain that important precedent.

Comments provided by :  
Hillberg, Ronald

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Youngstrom\_Eric\_10\_26\_2015\_21\_02\_50\_CommentText.txt

=====

The first amendment protects are rights to free speech. The Supreme Court has found political contributions to be protected as speech.

Given this, the FEC has no business attempting to regulate the speech rights of individuals or corporations.

Requiring donor disclosure will result in attacks upon those who have points of view that are opposed by others. This prohibits the speech rights of those holding minority opinions.

Comments provided by :  
Youngstrom, Eric

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_lucas\_james\_10\_26\_2015\_21\_05\_25\_CommentText.txt

=====

The Supreme Court saw that disclosing the identity of donors could undermine the mission of a group like the NAACP during the dark days of the Civil Rights era. The proposed rule, however, seems to be in direct conflict with NAACP v. Alabama, 357 U.S. 449 (1958). This proposed change has attracted my strong opposition ...

Comments provided by :  
lucas, james

=====

=====

The fundamental rights of association, privacy, and free speech of such organizations and their donors are protected by the First Amendment, as the U.S. Supreme Court held in NAACP v. Alabama, 357 U.S. 449 (1958).

The FEC has no statutory authority to mandate such disclosure of organizations that are not political committees.

The FEC should not force mandatory disclosure of donors. There is a fundamental right of privacy to uphold.

Comments provided by :  
Cole, Jesse

=====

=====

This petition is an attempt to force nonprofit advocacy organizations that are not political committees and that do not spend a majority of their time and resources on candidate-related activity to reveal their donors, something they are not required to do by federal law or IRS regulations.

In fact, the fundamental rights of association, privacy, and free speech of such organizations and their donors are protected by the First Amendment, as the U.S. Supreme Court held in NAACP v. Alabama, 357 U.S. 449 (1958).

Such mandated disclosure has no purpose other than to try to open up the donors of such organizations to harassment and intimidation for their political and social beliefs in associating with particular membership organizations. The FEC has no statutory authority to mandate such disclosure of organizations that are not political committees.

Comments provided by :  
Krodel, Francois

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Buckley\_Mark\_10\_26\_2015\_21\_10\_25\_CommentText.txt

=====

Free speech needs no regulation. And even if it did, unelected bodies would not be making the regulations. It is not a new idea: speech that one disagrees with should be answered with more speech.

Comments provided by :  
Buckley, Mark

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Miller\_Carla\_10\_26\_2015\_21\_13\_27\_CommentText.txt

=====

I oppose the rules which could force non-profit organizations — such as a pro-life organization — to disclose the names of donors. I support various non-profit organizations and I do not want my name disclosed to far left wing groups who then unleash their fanatical followers on people like me. I have the right to support non-profits without worrying that my house will be picketed or my job put in danger.

Comments provided by :  
Miller, Carla

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Feehan\_John\_10\_26\_2015\_21\_15\_55\_CommentText.txt

=====

I ask that you do NOT adopt this rule, and never consider it again.

It's a bad idea - as bad an idea as forcing disclosure of how we vote.

Comments provided by :  
Feehan, John

=====



Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Guaspari\_David\_10\_26\_2015\_21\_15\_51\_CommentText.txt

=====

Forcing nonpolitical non-profits to disclose the names of donors is a blatant attempt to stifle free speech by making donors to unpopular causes subject to harassment. That's why Supreme Court decisions forbid attempts to force disclosure of donors to the NAACP.

Comments provided by :  
Guaspari, David

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Allsmiller\_Pam\_10\_26\_2015\_21\_16\_20\_CommentText.txt

=====

Please do not restrict the First Amendment. We have the right to it constitutionally.

Comments provided by :  
Allsmiller, Pam

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Best\_Graham\_10\_26\_2015\_21\_16\_12\_CommentText.txt

=====

Please respect the first amendment. You actions with this regulation will serve to stifle free speech, by exposing donors to abuse and intimidation by the opposition.

Please stop. Do not pass REG 2015-04.

Comments provided by :

Best, Graham

=====

=====

In NAACP vs. Alabama the Supreme Court protected the NAACP from having to disclose supporter information because of the harassment campaigns that would follow.

I am strongly against the proposed FEC rules which could force non-profit organizations to disclose the names of donors.

-Katherine Dougherty

Comments provided by :  
Dougherty, Katherine

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Schreiber\_Ronald\_10\_26\_2015\_21\_19\_38\_CommentText.txt

=====

This is an outrageous attempt to suppress free political speech. I urge the Commission to reject this proposal.

Comments provided by :  
Schreiber, Ronald

=====

=====

I oppose any rule requiring the disclosure of the names of donors who contribute to outside spending groups. My concern is that disclosure of donor information will expose these individuals -- who were acting within the parameters of the law -- to harassment and intimidation by activists who oppose the cause to which those donors have contributed. Furthermore, I believe that allowing such disclosures will only serve to stifle, rather than promote the vigorous debate and disputation that has been a healthy characteristic of American political life. Individuals who contribute to an advocacy group are exercising a form of free speech that in no way intrudes upon the rights of their fellow citizens. It is a sad fact of American life that some individuals may potentially choose to harass donors who contribute to an opposing cause. My concern is that forced disclosures will ease the task of those looking to intimidate others. I also note that the proposed reporting limit for a donation is 250 dollars. This is not a meaningful sum given the expense of modern day electioneering and lobbying; it leads me to believe that the proposed rule is aimed at even small donors.

Comments provided by :  
Veit, Brian

=====

=====

These are my opinions, and as such, they are appropriate material for this hearing.

Would that the FEC would remove all the still-voting dead people from Democrat-controlled voting precincts around the country, and leave the Constitution alone.

McCarthy was a sainted interrogator compared to the witch-hunting Democrats today.

My opinion is that Stalin is alive and well in the Democrat cabal.

Sam Carlsson  
Florence, Colorado

Comments provided by :  
Carlsson, Sam

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Carter\_Jeff\_10\_26\_2015\_21\_30\_24\_CommentText.txt

=====

Citizens United should not be overturned. It's a freedom of speech issue. I should be able to donate to any group I want without anyone finding out. It's my money, and I should be free to choose how to donate it any way I want.

Opponents of Citizens United will use "transparency" to hunt and destroy people that contribute money to organizations they don't like.

Comments provided by :  
Carter, Jeff

=====



Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Gualandi\_Thomas\_10\_26\_2015\_21\_31\_22\_CommentText.txt

=====

As a combat veteran and Marine officer with 24 years of service I demand that you respect the First Amendment rights of of ALL Americans!

Comments provided by :  
Gualandi, Thomas

=====

=====

I am strongly opposed to requiring donor's names be disclosed. In the past this has been used to intimidate free speech, which must be the overriding concern of the commission. Instead of placing obstacles to free speech, we must promote free speech.

I have never commented on an impending federal commission's decision before. This is the first time, demonstrating how strongly I feel about this.

Comments provided by :  
Gustafson, Robert

=====

=====

I agree with the Public Interest Legal Foundation:

"[T]his petition is an attempt to force nonprofit advocacy organizations that are not political committees and that do not spend a majority of their time and resources on candidate-related activity to reveal their donors, something they are not required to do by federal law or IRS regulations. In fact, the fundamental rights of association, privacy, and free speech of such organizations and their donors are protected by the First Amendment, as the U.S. Supreme Court held in NAACP v. Alabama, 357 U.S. 449 (1958).

Such mandated disclosure has no purpose other than to try to open up the donors of such organizations to harassment and intimidation for their political and social beliefs in associating with particular membership organizations. The FEC has no statutory authority to mandate such disclosure of organizations that are not political committees."

I ask that you quit this effort to regulate our Constitutionally guaranteed right to free speech.

Thank you,  
Stephen DiNino

Comments provided by :  
DiNino, Stephen

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Rigger\_Jaycen\_10\_26\_2015\_21\_33\_36\_CommentText.txt

=====

Non profit groups should not be required to publish their donor lists. This becomes a tool by which other political groups may harass members to silence their free speech.

What irony that the group petitioning the FEC for this regulation conveniently refuses to list the full name of their own founder.

Comments provided by :  
Rigger, Jaycen

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Mugge\_Wayne\_10\_26\_2015\_21\_37\_35\_CommentText.txt

=====

I am very much opposed to the FEC issuing regulations which would mandate donor disclosure for non-profit groups. Such a regulation violates the spirit of the First Amendment & will only encourage neo-fascism in the U.S.

Comments provided by :  
Mugge, Wayne

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Salmon\_Mark\_10\_26\_2015\_21\_41\_35\_CommentText.txt

=====

The proposed rules violate the First Amendment. The government is proposing to interfere with Americans' rights of free association and free speech. The proposed rules are a mistake and should be abandoned.

Comments provided by :  
Salmon, Mark

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Sherman\_Carol\_10\_26\_2015\_21\_44\_21\_CommentText.txt

=====

Please do not reveal donors to conservative causes. It will be infringement on civil liberties and privacy.

Comments provided by :  
Sherman, Carol

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Schwimmer\_Gene\_10\_26\_2015\_21\_47\_17\_CommentText.txt

=====

I strongly oppose your proposed rule to require non-profit organizations to publicize the names of their donors. What happened to the First Amendment?

Comments provided by :  
Schwimmer, Gene

=====



Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Creegan\_Edith\_10\_26\_2015\_21\_51\_34\_CommentText.txt

=====

In today's environment of harassment of contributors to unpopular causes, it is grossly unreasonable to forbid anonymous contributions.

Comments provided by :  
Creegan, Edith

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Hardin\_Rich\_10\_26\_2015\_21\_54\_47\_CommentText.txt

=====

This petition is a transparent attempt to force nonprofit advocacy organizations that are not political to reveal their donors, something that is not required by federal law.

This enforced disclosure is an infringement on the rights of association, privacy and free speech. It will do nothing more than open such organizations and their members to harassment and intimidation for their political and social beliefs. The FEC has no authority to mandate that organizations reveal this information if they are not political committees. If the FEC continues such activities, they should be defunded.

Comments provided by :  
Hardin, Rich

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Long\_Mark\_10\_26\_2015\_21\_55\_02\_CommentText.txt

=====

I believe in the first amendment and want the FEC to support the Supreme Court's interpretation in the Citizens United case. Back off.

Comments provided by :  
Long, Mark

=====

=====

I have recently learned that the FEC is considering rules which would could force non-profit organizations — such as a pro-life organization — to disclose the names of donors. The speech-regulating proponents have long been in favor of forced donor disclosure, because it facilitates their most fanatical followers unleashing abuse on those donors.

We have seen this many times after elections in which causes were lost. Americans free speech and free association will be severely limited by such a rule. In fact, given that this rule violates both of these individual rights, it's shocking that it's being considered.

Please stop this madness. This rule has no right seeing the light of day.

Sincerely,

Tim Porter  
Citizen

Comments provided by :  
Porter, Timothy

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Leyshon\_David\_10\_26\_2015\_22\_02\_06\_CommentText.txt

=====

Dear FEC Agent,

The fundamental rights of free speech are protected by the first amendment, as the US Supreme Court held in NAACP vs Alabama, 357 US 449 (1958). Mandated disclosure has no purpose other than to intimidate donors for their beliefs. The FEC has no authority to mandate such disclosure. I feel this data will be abused, such as it was in the recent IRS targeting scandal.

Comments provided by :  
Leyshon, David

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Aitken\_David\_10\_26\_2015\_22\_06\_38\_CommentText.txt

=====

Please support the First Amendment and the Citizens United decision. No regulation of spending or disclosure of donor information.

Comments provided by :  
Aitken, David

=====

=====

The proposed rule is an attempt to force nonprofit advocacy organizations that are not political committees and that do not spend a majority of their time and resources on candidate-related activity to reveal their donors, something they are not required to do by federal law or IRS regulations. The fundamental rights of association, privacy, and free speech of donors to advocacy organizations are protected by the First Amendment, as the U.S. Supreme Court held in NAACP v. Alabama, 357 U.S. 449 (1958).

Mandatory disclosure of donor lists will expose the donors to harassment and intimidation for their political and social beliefs in associating with particular membership organizations. The white supremacists of the Jim Crow era knew this, and the proponents of this rule seek the ability to use the same tactics. The FEC has no statutory authority to mandate such disclosure of organizations that are not political committees. Therefore, the proposed rule must be rejected.

Comments provided by :  
Bullock, Kenneth

=====

=====

It is unnecessary, and more importantly, unhealthy to the body politic, to divulge the kind of information you propose to reveal for non-profits. The Supreme Court has already ruled that the First Amendment applies to political speech in Citizens United. Why would you propose to expose people who may choose to express their First Amendment rights privately on issues that are not popular with activists of all stripes? If the basis for abortion rights is some ill-defined "right to privacy" slipping around furtively in the penumbra of the Constitution, surely donors to various groups exercising free speech should have the right to a little privacy, too!

Comments provided by :  
Crowson, Allan

=====



Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Garza\_Rose\_10\_26\_2015\_22\_09\_52\_CommentText.txt

=====

Do not require donors to disclose their identity.

Comments provided by :  
Garza, Rose

=====

=====

Harassment of financial donors to conservative causes has become one of the standard tactics of the militant left. Speech regulations issued by the Federal Election Commission are therefore a necessary component of snuffing out financial support for conservative causes through harassment campaigns.

A half-century ago, liberal groups understood and respected this. The landmark case of NAACP vs. Alabama saw the Supreme Court protect the NAACP from having to disclose supporter information because of the harassment campaigns that would follow.

I find your political motivations disgusting.

Do not pass these new rules in a purely political ploy to undermine the Supreme Courts ruling in the citizens united case.

The unintended consequences will come back to haunt you.

Comments provided by :  
Bogdan, Peter

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Ruggless\_Derek\_10\_26\_2015\_22\_16\_36\_CommentText.txt

=====

Citizens United was the Supreme Court case that ruled the First Amendment applies to everyone: unions, individuals, and corporations supporting their interests through free speech.

Remember this?

Comments provided by :  
Ruggless, Derek

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_O'Keefe\_Rebecca\_10\_26\_2015\_22\_20\_37\_CommentText.txt

=====

Please do not force primarily charitable organizations to release the names of their donors. Harassment campaigns against those donors, whether of the left or the right, are extremely destructive to the First Amendment rights of all people.

Comments provided by :  
O'Keefe, Rebecca

=====

=====

Please respect the rights of donors to contribute to causes that they care about without being harassed. People have lost their jobs and had their reputations besmirched by people who disagree with them on completely unrelated issues. The wealthy will always find a way to have a voice in politics whether above or below the table. Please do not strip away the rights of the poor to give even a little to causes that they support. Most cannot afford to loose their jobs through intimidation at the workplace. People and organizations in power can destroy the rights of those with whom they disagree. This fear applies to all political affiliations, because pendulums swing. Those who would choose to abuse power today, may become the victims in retaliatory strikes tomorrow.

Comments provided by :  
Goodwin, Marilee

=====

=====

I oppose the petition because it is an attempt to force nonprofit advocacy organizations that are not political committees and that do not spend a majority of their time and resources on candidate-related activity to reveal their donors, something they are not required to do by federal law or IRS regulations. In fact, the fundamental rights of association, privacy, and free speech of such organizations and their donors are protected by the First Amendment, as the U.S. Supreme Court held in NAACP v. Alabama, 357 U.S. 449 (1958).

It is quite likely that such mandated disclosure has no purpose other than to try to open up the donors of such organizations to harassment and intimidation for their political and social beliefs in associating with particular membership organizations. The FEC has no statutory authority to mandate such disclosure of organizations that are not political committees.

Comments provided by :  
Shinn, David

=====

=====

This action by the FEC is a purposeful effort to violate political freedom of speech.

This petition is an attempt to force nonprofit advocacy organizations that are not political committees and that do not spend a majority of their time and resources on candidate-related activity to reveal their donors, something they are not required to do by federal law or IRS regulations. In fact, the fundamental rights of association, privacy, and free speech of such organizations and their donors are protected by the First Amendment, as the U.S. Supreme Court held in NAACP v. Alabama, 357 U.S. 449 (1958).

Such mandated disclosure has no purpose other than to try to open up the donors of such organizations to harassment and intimidation for their political and social beliefs in associating with particular membership organizations. The FEC has no statutory authority to mandate such disclosure of organizations that are not political committees.

Comments provided by :  
offermann, jeff

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Silverman\_Robert\_10\_26\_2015\_22\_27\_23\_CommentText.txt

=====

The latest effort to force the disclosure of non-profit donor names is a disgrace. It is an obvious effort by the Left to go after conservatives. It is vile. Don't do it.

The First Amendment does not say I lose my rights when I join a club, or a corporation, or make a donation. The Supreme Court agrees. You cannot constrain my freedom of speech.

Comments provided by :  
Silverman, Robert

=====



Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_dineen\_john\_10\_26\_2015\_22\_32\_14\_CommentText.txt

=====

Forcing nonprofits to disclose their donors is, I believe, both unconstitutional and illegal under the rules the FEC uses to oversee election activities. The SCOTUS has long ago decided against full disclosure of donors in NAACP VS Alabama.

The intent of those who support disclosure is exactly the same as it was in the abovementioned case; that is to intimidate and discourage donations to causes they oppose.

I sincerely hope you will resoundingly reject this blatant attempt to revive a form of discrimination long thought to be resolved

Comments provided by :  
dineen, john

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Benedict\_Paul\_10\_26\_2015\_22\_33\_04\_CommentText.txt

=====

Requiring disclosure of donors infringes on the 1st amendent rights of citizens.

Disclosure subjects donors to harassment and other forms of suppression.

The FEC should stop any rule making to require disclosure.

Comments provided by :  
Benedict, Paul

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Podeszwa\_Michael\_10\_26\_2015\_22\_31\_46\_CommentText.txt

=====

Would you please stop. This is yet another attempt in face of First Amendment to attempt to harass and scare donors of organizations for their speech. The FEC has no authority to do this.

Comments provided by :  
Podeszwa, Michael

=====

=====

This petition is an attempt to force nonprofit advocacy organizations that are not political committees and that do not spend a majority of their time and resources on candidate-related activity to reveal their donors, something they are not required to do by federal law or IRS regulations. In fact, the fundamental rights of association, privacy, and free speech of such organizations and their donors are protected by the First Amendment, as the U.S. Supreme Court held in NAACP v. Alabama, 357 U.S. 449 (1958).

Such mandated disclosure has no purpose other than to try to open up the donors of such organizations to harassment and intimidation for their political and social beliefs in associating with particular membership organizations. The FEC has no statutory authority to mandate such disclosure of organizations that are not political committees.

Comments provided by :  
Davidson, Jerry

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Cole\_Kevin\_10\_26\_2015\_22\_39\_11\_CommentText.txt

=====

People have the right to assemble and to do so in private. Their actions need protection. The right to privacy includes the right to donate to causes they believe in without fear of harassment.

Comments provided by :  
Cole, Kevin

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Raymond\_\_Albert\_E.\_10\_26\_2015\_22\_38\_44\_CommentText.txt

=====

The Federal Election Commission must respect the first amendment to our constitution, and abandon its efforts to regulate free speech. Leave "Citizens United" alone...!

Comments provided by :  
Raymond , Albert E.

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Bishop\_Sherri\_10\_26\_2015\_22\_39\_33\_CommentText.txt

=====

I do not approve of the FEC's new proposals for non-profit donor disclosure.  
Regulation of such information by a federal entity is not within the scope of the government as noted by  
precedent.

Comments provided by :  
Bishop, Sherri

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Funk\_David\_10\_26\_2015\_22\_40\_32\_CommentText.txt

=====

The FEC has no right to mandate disclosure of donors to other than political committees. All this will do is publicize names of donors for harassment and intimidation by less than scrupulous organizations. Thank you.

Comments provided by :  
Funk, David

=====



=====

I fear that, were opposition groups to obtain the donor lists of certain political organizations, they would be likely to retaliate in the civil sphere against those who have donated to causes that are not popular in certain communities or businesses. The Supreme Court legitimately saw through the ulterior motives when the State of Alabama demanded that NAACP divulge their donor lists. Public release of the NAACP donor lists would have allowed opponents of the NAACP to target donors to the NAACP for things like blacklisting from jobs, or boycotting businesses.

We have already seen individuals (Brendan Eich, of Mozilla for example) get fired from their jobs and lose employability in his industry as a backlash for legal political donations to a popular ballot initiative that passed with a majority of the state vote. We should expect that similar tactics will be employed on both sides of our ever more polarizing society, accelerating bifurcation of our population and dissolution of civil society.

Comments provided by :  
Reckamp, Douglas

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Allen\_Mark\_and\_Kari\_10\_26\_2015\_22\_42\_42\_CommentText.txt

=====

The attempt by the FEC to undo Supreme Court legislation, both Citizens united and NAACP v Alabama, will chill a basic constitutional right enjoyed, exclusive of all countries in the world, by Americans. This attempt to find fault with one of the very rights that has made an America unmatched in freedom, prosperity, and strength can only leave one scratching their head.

Abandon your efforts to stop free speech, abandon your efforts to deny Americans their constitutional rights and abandon your efforts to deny us our privacy and expose us to every hate group out there who can not abide a difference in political opinion.

Comments provided by :  
Allen, Mark and Kari

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Norwood\_W.\_10\_26\_2015\_22\_43\_02\_CommentText.txt

=====

The FEC does not the right to force organizations properly recognized by the IRS to disclose their donors. By doing so, you submit donors to potential harassment and danger. This is a violation of the first amendment.

Comments provided by :  
Norwood, W.

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Bartelt\_Glenn\_10\_26\_2015\_22\_44\_11\_CommentText.txt

=====

I oppose forced disclosure of donors to groups making political speech for the reason that the donors can then be intimidated by their political opponents, plus be open to harassment by governmental agencies staffed by similar political opponents. The US Supreme Court has recognized First Amendment rights to anonymity in such cases. I urge you to respect free speech, and not force disclosure of identities.

Comments provided by :  
Bartelt, Glenn

=====

=====

The Federalist Papers, which were influential in the ratification of the Constitution, were published anonymously, and ought to be a pattern of the kind of reasoned discussion of the issues in any election. By requiring disclosure, you disadvantage those with principles in the face of those whose hot-tempered clinging to guns, superstition, and their own sense of offense endangers those with principles. If you want elections to degenerate into gun battles and brawls, your new rule is an excellent way to do it.

But it would be a dumb idea. Think of what would happen if someone thought that was your principled position, and their gun disagreed. We've already seen massacres at schools by this sort: let's not broaden the playing field.

Comments provided by :  
Williams, Arnold

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Burke\_Peter\_10\_26\_2015\_22\_46\_55\_CommentText.txt

=====

Do not overturn through rules Citizens United.

Your own rules could be used against you someday.

Comments provided by :

Burke, Peter

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Pew\_Curtis\_10\_26\_2015\_22\_47\_42\_CommentText.txt

=====

Anonymous ballots are an important guarantee of our freedoms. Being able to participate in free speech without necessarily revealing your identity allows people who might be subject to bullying or intimidation to have their voices heard. The proposed rules could easily have the effect of suppressing unpopular ideas and opinions. I oppose the implementation of these rules.

Comments provided by :  
Pew, Curtis

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_McGarr\_John\_10\_26\_2015\_22\_49\_30\_CommentText.txt

=====

I am strongly opposed to any attempts that require organizations to list their donors. To do so is to invite harassment and intimidation. If it was good enough for the NAACP in 1958, it is good enough for advocacy organizations today

Comments provided by :  
McGarr, John

=====



Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Froehlich\_Mark\_10\_26\_2015\_22\_51\_52\_CommentText.txt

=====

I oppose the compelled disclosure of donors information including names. The fact the Supreme Court denied this in the fifties is proof that harassment of revealed donors is a real threat and will suppress free speech. If this is implemented, the rule of law will suffer.

Comments provided by :  
Froehlich, Mark

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Green\_Brenda\_10\_26\_2015\_22\_54\_21\_CommentText.txt

=====

Stop harassing American citizens by this latest unlawful overreach Undo 'Citizens United'. You must respect the First Amendment, Freedom of Speech. The speech-regulating Left can not on it's own create laws that only apply to specific groups.

Comments provided by :  
Green, Brenda

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Shotzberger\_Robert\_10\_26\_2015\_22\_56\_43\_CommentText.txt

=====

I am totally against the FEC stiffling free speech, especially during an election year. Mind your own business.

Comments provided by :  
Shotzberger, Robert

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Sarris\_Judith\_10\_26\_2015\_22\_57\_36\_CommentText.txt

=====

This government has systematically shredded the Constitution with each of its decisions and encroachment on the freedom of individuals to speak, live and work as they wish. Do not add to that legacy by further restricting speech guaranteed by the 1st Amendment.

Comments provided by :  
Sarris, Judith

=====

=====

Dear Sir/Madam

I'd like to register my strong objection to this attempt to undo the "Citizen United" decision. This decision of the court was one of the first steps in a long time that reversed the process of reducing our freedoms. This attempt to force disclosure of donors is a direct attack on our freedom of speech - whether it's targeting individuals, corporations, unions, or any other way peaceful citizens may organize to achieve their legal ends.

Please respect our freedom,

Mordechai Ben-Zeev

Comments provided by :  
Ben-Zeev, Mordechai

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Bergman\_John\_10\_26\_2015\_23\_04\_51\_CommentText.txt

=====

Do not stifle free speech. Corporations and organizations should have the same rights as unions.

Comments provided by :  
Bergman, John

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Webber\_Matt\_10\_26\_2015\_23\_06\_03\_CommentText.txt

=====

Everyone knows your goal is to allow people to intimidate donors. Why are you so afraid of people wanting to donate to causes they support? I suppose it will help people you politically support suppress those you do not support.

Here's is a better idea. Get out of the way and let the American people participate in an open and free electoral process. We were pretty successful in running the country in the 199 years you did not exist.

Regulating how people participate in the electoral process. A great ideal. In North Korea.

Comments provided by :  
Webber, Matt

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Maron\_William\_10\_26\_2015\_23\_05\_45\_CommentText.txt

=====

These regulations violate the right to free expression and assembly. It is NONE of the government's or others business who I associate with if no laws are being broken. Donor disclosure violates both the meaning and spirit of the first amendment. Do not allow this travesty to the Constitution to go forward.

Comments provided by :  
Maron, William

=====



Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Davis\_Peter\_10\_26\_2015\_23\_08\_59\_CommentText.txt

=====

You should leave us alone to donate to the causes we wish to. Try to remember, your agency is the Federal Election Commission, not the Fascist Election Commission. Citizen United is the rule whether you like it or not. If I spend my money on a cause it is my money and my business, not yours and not some busybody down the road.

Comments provided by :  
Davis, Peter

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Ertel\_George\_10\_26\_2015\_23\_10\_41\_CommentText.txt

=====

Requiring donor disclosure would encourage haters to stalk and harass people who choose to exercise their rights to free speech and privacy. Please do not require donor disclosure.

Comments provided by :  
Ertel, George

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_norman\_ron\_10\_26\_2015\_23\_11\_08\_CommentText.txt

=====

The 1st Amendment shouldn't be touched for political chicanery like is planned. Just leave it alone, get Government out of our Constitutional Rights, this isn't Nazi Germany or the USSR.

Comments provided by :  
norman, ron

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Sceviour\_James\_10\_26\_2015\_23\_12\_59\_CommentText.txt

=====

The ruling by the United States Supreme Court was correct. If it is to be overturned or amended it should be done by an elected and not selected body.

Comments provided by :  
Sceviour, James

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_DeVoss\_Bruce\_10\_26\_2015\_23\_16\_46\_CommentText.txt

=====

In regards to the proposed regulation forcing non-profit groups to reveal the names of donors, I oppose any attempt to muzzle the speech of non-profits by making their members or donors lose anonymity which prevents them from being the targets of harrassment or threat.

I ask that the commission reject this proposal and preserve the privacy and thus th safety of donors and members of such groups.

Comments provided by :  
DeVoss, Bruce

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_weiss\_rich\_10\_26\_2015\_23\_18\_47\_CommentText.txt

=====

In order to provide true free speech the threat of retaliation would have to be procluded. By publishing names of donors free speech is not possible.

While the concept of disclosure sounds good in the real world it causes people too loose jobs, loose friends and put peer pressure that changes behavior.

Please do not create rules that would prevent honest speech or support of organizations that reflect personal beliefs.

Comments provided by :  
weiss, rich

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_McDevitt\_John\_10\_26\_2015\_23\_19\_08\_CommentText.txt

=====

As I understand your proposed new rules, you would require non-profit organizations from this point forward to publicly list their donors. I am vehemently against these new rules. It is an obvious end-run around the Citizens United finding by the U.S. Supreme Court and will act to suppress free speech. It can, in reality, endanger the lives of those listed donors by the most radical of those who disagree with them.

Please abandon the idea of going forth with these rules.

Comments provided by :  
McDevitt, John

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Willard\_Heidi\_10\_26\_2015\_23\_26\_29\_CommentText.txt

=====

Anonymity is a necessary evil to combat harassment of small but active social groups (left or right). Do not regulate their speech by forcing them to out their supporters. DO NOT pass this piece of First Amendment-killing regulation.

And think about repealing other regulations. The US citizens are drowning in the shit.

Comments provided by :  
Willard, Heidi

=====



Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_ballantyne\_george\_10\_26\_2015\_23\_28\_53\_CommentText.txt

=====

Your actions are politically motivated. There is no constitutional basis for donor's names to be revealed.

This action is the national equivalent of the Democrats' John Doe vendetta against against Governor Walker supporters in Wisconsin. Which by the way, the courts have ruled unlawful and unconstitutional.

This action is also the equivalent of Lois Lerner's overreach in denying conservatives 501 classification approval. The net result of this proposed FEC action and Lerner's IRS action is to deny the freedom of association and assembly.

There is no basis in legal precedent for this action, just as there is no basis for illegal immigrant amnesty.

Comments provided by :  
ballantyne, george

=====

=====

The fundamental rights of association, privacy, and free speech of such organizations and their donors are protected by the First Amendment, as the U.S. Supreme Court held in NAACP v. Alabama, 357 U.S. 449 (1958).

Mandated disclosure has no purpose other than to try to open up the donors of such organizations to harassment and intimidation for their political and social beliefs in associating with particular membership organizations. The FEC has no statutory authority to mandate such disclosure of organizations that are not political committees.

The FEC should most definitely NOT proceed with these anti-democratic, anti-civil-libertarian, and unconstitutional actions.

Comments provided by :  
Adams, William

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Blecke\_Robert\_10\_26\_2015\_23\_29\_57\_CommentText.txt

=====

The Commission should not proceed with rules forcing non-profit organizations to disclose donors. To do so would invite the worst kind of public harassment at best and enable politically motivated persecution at worst, a condition which would present an undue burden on the first amendment rights of those donors. And if the first amendment does not protect unpopular opinions then it has no value at all.

Comments provided by :  
Blecke, Robert

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Heck\_Henry\_10\_26\_2015\_23\_38\_09\_CommentText.txt

=====

It is my constitutional right to leverage my free speech by joining groups that speak out publicly on issues important to me. Although I must report such contributions to the IRS, privacy laws prevent other federal agencies to access that information for political purposes. Any attempt to extract that information by requiring that non-taxed entities provide that information to the government is an attempt to bypass federal privacy laws in an attempt to intimidate donors. I strenuously object to this new rule.

Comments provided by :  
Heck, Henry

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Nunnally\_Susan\_10\_26\_2015\_23\_38\_54\_CommentText.txt

=====

Please stop your attempt to regulate freedom of speech.

Comments provided by :  
Nunnally, Susan

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Farschman\_Wendy\_10\_26\_2015\_23\_44\_18\_CommentText.txt

=====

I am concerned that this proposed rule will lead to harassment of businesses and individuals who support (or oppose) various politically-charged positions. Already groups have targeted individuals in campaigns of intimidation, attempting to suppress free speech. This rule could literally endanger people's lives--not just their free speech rights.

Comments provided by :  
Farschman, Wendy

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Lewellen\_Jamie\_10\_26\_2015\_23\_45\_42\_CommentText.txt

=====

Stop trying to infringe upon our First Amendment rights. The only purpose of this petition is to get non-profits with no affiliation with the government to reveal their donors. That is illegal and unethical. Stop trying to regulate speech and infringe on our constitutional rights.

Comments provided by :  
Lewellen, Jamie

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Finkelstein\_S\_David\_10\_26\_2015\_23\_48\_38\_CommentText.txt

=====

Please do not pass this rule/reg. Citizens have a right to gather and petition the government. We should be able to support causes anonymously free from harassment of opponents.

Comments provided by :  
Finkelstein, S David

=====



=====

[T]his petition is an attempt to force nonprofit advocacy organizations that are not political committees and that do not spend a majority of their time and resources on candidate-related activity to reveal their donors, something they are not required to do by federal law or IRS regulations. In fact, the fundamental rights of association, privacy, and free speech of such organizations and their donors are protected by the First Amendment, as the U.S. Supreme Court held in NAACP v. Alabama, 357 U.S. 449 (1958).

Such mandated disclosure has no purpose other than to try to open up the donors of such organizations to harassment and intimidation for their political and social beliefs in associating with particular membership organizations. The FEC has no statutory authority to mandate such disclosure of organizations that are not political committees.

Comments provided by :  
Hodges, Mary

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Torres\_Karen\_10\_27\_2015\_00\_00\_05\_CommentText.txt

=====

Please do not require donors to be made public. Some people are so violent that they will harm some one's family for donating to the "wrong" cause.

Comments provided by :  
Torres, Karen

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Coen\_David\_10\_27\_2015\_00\_00\_36\_CommentText.txt

=====

Do not overturn Citizens United!

Comments provided by :  
Coen, David

=====

=====

DO NOT do this.

Do not force such organizations to disclose donors.

I have over a decade of experience attempting to defend citizen's rights in one small sliver of the economy -- the raising, sale, and use of animals. While my personal focus is on pets -- my wife and I breed one or two litters a year -- I've spent a good deal of time in other areas of animal use: They are ALL under attack by militant animal rights organizations.

Those people play dirty. Dirty tricks obviously -- calling the venue where an event is scheduled to 'warn' them anonymously that our side is planning violence, lying at the last minute -- say in a committee hearing or in closing arguments in a trial -- when there's no chance for rebuttal, and so on. And ANYONE connected to an organization opposing them is a target for a boycott, not just donors and suppliers but the businesses and individuals connected to those donors and suppliers.

Some of this stuff is illegal, perhaps some of it could be banned in the future but practically speaking it cannot be stopped. Our system only works smoothly if there's enough virtue on all sides that mostly good behavior prevails even when a violator wouldn't be caught.

Maybe someday we'll get back to an America when dirty tricks, secondary boycotts, threats, etc. are so disapproved that they're uncommon. We're not there now and it doesn't seem that we're headed in that direction.

DO NOT DO THIS. Let organizations continue to routinely keep their donor lists to themselves, rather than demanding they give even more ammunition to people for whom winning while destroying our country is just 'winning.'

Thanks!

Comments provided by :  
Hutchens, Walter

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_harding\_robert\_10\_27\_2015\_00\_03\_38\_CommentText.txt

=====

Please stop efforts to "undo" the Citizens United case.

Comments provided by :  
harding, robert

=====

=====

This petition is an attempt to force nonprofit advocacy organizations that are not political committees and that do not spend a majority of their time and resources on candidate-related activity to reveal their donors, something they are not required to do by federal law or IRS regulations. In fact, the fundamental rights of association, privacy, and free speech of such organizations and their donors are protected by the First Amendment, as the U.S. Supreme Court held in NAACP v. Alabama, 357 U.S. 449 (1958).

Such mandated disclosure has no purpose other than to try to open up the donors of such organizations to harassment and intimidation for their political and social beliefs in associating with particular membership organizations. The FEC has no statutory authority to mandate such disclosure of organizations that are not political committees.

Respectfully,

Douglas Schweitzer

Comments provided by :  
Schweitzer, Douglas

=====

=====

I cannot remember where I heard this but someone asked a question if there was any period of time in history where you would like to return my answer would have been watching the process of how the signers of the Constitution got together to formulate the beginnings of laws & their nature. I can imagine sitting next to these signers during their time and comparing what every American is faced with today. Most signers would have agreed with Citizen's United in many ways but probably they were wise in their fears. But now the fears have become it's own reality and now our 1st Ammendment is being attacked from all sides. We are at a cross road now "is free speech really free?" At what cost are my liberties and freedoms? What are those burdens? What is the price I pay for that and those who do not really believe in the 1st Ammendment? What about my privacy and why should I mind if others know? And if those that wanted to know who I voted for or causes? So now I am back with the original signers and they asked me a question as to how I felt about my name being printed for everyone to see. The signers asked me how could I have stopped it from happening...my only answer to them and all of you at the FCC ...did I really matter at all? FCC the ball is in your court now only you know the ending or beginning.

Comments provided by :  
Rogers, Lynn

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Livingston\_Bryan\_10\_27\_2015\_00\_12\_15\_CommentText.txt

=====

I strongly oppose any regulation or rule that abridges the First Amendment. Disclosure of the identity of donors exposes them to organized campaigns of intimidation, which have sadly become a feature of our political culture. A rule that forces donor information into the public domain will have a chilling effect on the exercise of free speech.

Comments provided by :  
Livingston, Bryan

=====



Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Girard\_Frank\_\_10\_27\_2015\_00\_13\_24\_CommentText.txt

=====

Apparently, this rule making is trying to say that the First amendment only applies to certain kinds of free speech, not political free speech. What more important kind of free speech is there? The right to a say in who is elected (ALSO THE RIGHT to criticize the government) to represent "We The People". What speech is more important than that? There is a good reason FREE SPEECH IS THE FIRST AMENDMENT

Comments provided by :  
Girard, Frank

=====

=====

Citizens United was properly decided by the Supreme Court. Individuals should expect privacy in their donations to political groups. This is particularly true in the Internet Age, when privacy is minimal and repeatedly abused by entities public and private. Moreover, this is a particularly politically polarized age when even the President himself announces he has partisan political enemies, when known political affiliations invite attacks.

The desire by government entities to reveal individual donors is clearly of partisan interest, as can be seen with the IRS scandals involving Lois Lerner, her malicious partisan activities targeting "conservative" groups has been rewarded with an early retirement and full exoneration. Lerner, and her enablers, used taxpayers' funds to launch invasive discriminatory partisan attacks against fellow citizens engaged in legal peaceful activities.

Forcing donors' identities to be revealed will invariably be used as a partisan tool to ruin lives and reputations, openly and clandestinely. Individuals lacking the seemingly infinite financial resources of the government will be ruined financially if forced to fight the government to clear their names in the case of false accusations, intentional or not.

Undermining Citizen's United damages the political health of the United States. It opens the door to questioning and eventually banning private voting. It gives the government yet more unjustified, unwanted, and unwarranted power to involve itself in the private actions of law-abiding citizens who will be increasingly intimidated and less secure and less free in their actions, associations, movements, and thoughts.

Let the Supreme Court's ruling stand unmolested.

Comments provided by :  
Glick, Christopher

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Lewis\_DJ\_10\_27\_2015\_00\_33\_36\_CommentText.txt

=====

It seems to me that the sole justification for forced disclosure of donors would be the government's belief that donors deserve public censorship for activity that SCOTUS ruled constitutional. I wonder what the government's position might be if a different SCOTUS ruling - say Roe Wade - were attacked in the same way.

Comments provided by :  
Lewis, DJ

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_SLAUGHTER\_PAUL\_10\_27\_2015\_00\_33\_34\_CommentText.txt

=====

I hope you leftist bureaucrats understand that you will not always control the power of big government.

What goes around comes around.

Comments provided by :  
SLAUGHTER, PAUL

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Wetzel\_Nathaniel\_10\_27\_2015\_00\_43\_45\_CommentText.txt

=====

I do not agree with this rule. The causes that people wish to support should only be between that person and the cause. This is a witch hunt in search of those that give to the "wrong" type of cause. Please do not enforce this rule. Thank you.

Comments provided by :  
Wetzel, Nathaniel

=====

=====

I strongly disagree with the FEC mandating the disclosure of donors to non profit groups. This gives government more opportunity to collect information on people who don't think a certain way. We have already seen the IRS, the scariest branch of the US Government abuse its power once again by going after conservative groups. Then, the DOJ, basically gave Lois Lerner a pass on all of that to avoid embarrassing the administration. Now, the FEC wants the power to disclose donors. This will endanger the lives and/or livelihood of honest Americans who want to support (usually) conservative based non profits. It will give the radical leftist groups more targets to physically intimidate as we have seen, time and time again. What the FEC is doing is trying to cower a segment of the American population. This is disgraceful!!!!!!

Comments provided by :  
Keffer, Lauren

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Krohn\_Jaci\_10\_27\_2015\_00\_50\_37\_CommentText.txt

=====

This rule is just meant to allow liberals to harass conservatives. A law was passed to protect members of the NAACP from releasing their private information to avoid retaliation. The FEC is opening up a can of worms by allowing the names of citizens to be openly posted so they can be shamed or made to lose their jobs (like Brandon Eich). How about printing the names of all the members of labor unions who are forced to donate to democrats, so they can be attacked.

Comments provided by :  
Krohn, Jaci

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Houseman\_Heath\_10\_27\_2015\_01\_11\_37\_CommentText.txt

=====

Dear FCC,

Please respect the First Amendment and stop trying to undo Citizens United. Please stop your efforts to regulate free speech. Please. Stop. And let freedom ring.

Thank you,

Heath Houseman.

Comments provided by :  
Houseman, Heath

=====



Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_McGill\_Brenda\_10\_27\_2015\_01\_16\_48\_CommentText.txt

=====

I am absolutely OPPOSED to this rule. DO NOT implement it!

Comments provided by :  
McGill, Brenda

=====

=====

I highly recommend the FEC respect the First Amendment of the Constitution.

I strongly support the comments submitted by the Public Interest Legal Foundation:

"[T]his petition is an attempt to force nonprofit advocacy organizations that are not political committees and that do not spend a majority of their time and resources on candidate-related activity to reveal their donors, something they are not required to do by federal law or IRS regulations. In fact, the fundamental rights of association, privacy, and free speech of such organizations and their donors are protected by the First Amendment, as the U.S. Supreme Court held in NAACP v. Alabama, 357 U.S. 449 (1958).

Such mandated disclosure has no purpose other than to try to open up the donors of such organizations to harassment and intimidation for their political and social beliefs in associating with particular membership organizations. The FEC has no statutory authority to mandate such disclosure of organizations that are not political committees."

Comments provided by :  
Stearns, Jeremy

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_McKnight\_Roxanne\_10\_27\_2015\_01\_22\_51\_CommentText.txt

=====

I am writing to express my disapproval of the government's forcing nonprofit groups to reveal their donors, because doing so opens the donors to harassment and intimidation by their political opponents. Protect free speech by stopping this vindictive proposal.

Comments provided by :  
McKnight, Roxanne

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Hirschi\_Richard\_10\_27\_2015\_01\_26\_56\_CommentText.txt

=====

I oppose any and all measures intended to require that the identities of contributors to political causes be made public. Requirements of this nature are an abridgment of the First Amendment, and they will certainly lead to many of these contributors being subjected to harassment and intimidation.

Comments provided by :  
Hirschi, Richard

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Moyer\_Trícia\_10\_27\_2015\_01\_32\_24\_CommentText.txt

=====

Please immediately dismiss both REG 2015-03 and REG 2015-04, and do not take them up at all for consideration.

These petitions seek to overturn a previous Supreme Court decision, seek to have the FEC perform an act for which it does not have authority, and open the door to harassment of any donor, no matter what side of the aisle they are from.

The FEC has NO statutory authority to mandate such disclosure of donors to organizations that are not political committees.

Reject REG 2015-03 and REG 2015-04 by summarily dismissing them.

Comments provided by :  
Moyer, Trícia

=====

=====

Please respect the rights of donors to contribute to causes that they care about without being harassed. People have lost their jobs and had their reputations besmirched by people who disagree with them on completely unrelated issues. The wealthy will always find a way to have a voice in politics whether above or below the table. Please do not strip away the rights of the poor to give even a little to causes that they support. Most cannot afford to lose their jobs through intimidation at the workplace. People and organizations in power can destroy the rights of those with whom they disagree. This fear applies to all political affiliations, because pendulums swing. Those who would choose to abuse power today, may become the victims in retaliatory strikes tomorrow.

Comments provided by :  
Ortmann, John

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_McKee\_Voney\_10\_27\_2015\_02\_02\_47\_CommentText.txt

=====

I want the FCC to cease any action against the ruling of the Supreme Court on Citizens United. Donor names shall not be released, ever!

Voney J. McKee

Comments provided by :  
McKee, Voney

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Rezabek\_Richard\_10\_27\_2015\_02\_50\_26\_CommentText.txt

=====

I object to this attempt to force organizations to disclose donor information. There have been many recent occurrences of these donor lists being used to harass and intimidate citizens.

Comments provided by :  
Rezabek, Richard

=====



=====

The rights of donors to contribute to the causes they care about without being harassed should be respected. People have lost their jobs and had their reputations besmirched by people who disagree with them on completely unrelated issues. The wealthy will always find a way to have a voice in politics whether on the level or not. Please do not strip away the rights of the poor to give even a little to causes that they support. No one should have to face being forced out of their job through political intimidation at the workplace.

Comments provided by :  
Madachik, Mark

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_laney\_john\_10\_27\_2015\_04\_47\_50\_CommentText.txt

=====

According to NAACP v. Alabama, 357 U.S. 449 this rule will be challenged in the courts. I guess the only thing I can say is FEC have you no shame?

Comments provided by :  
laney, john

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Thome\_Dennis\_10\_27\_2015\_04\_47\_49\_CommentText.txt

=====

I am against any attempts to infringe upon the Free Speech Rights guaranteed by the Citizens Untied Supreme Court decision.

Comments provided by :  
Thome, Dennis

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Koch\_John\_10\_27\_2015\_05\_01\_59\_CommentText.txt

=====

FEC should not make rules restricting the money or timing of contributions to candidates for federal office. Rather, they should be developing rules that protect the franchise of the individual from fraudulent dilution.

Comments provided by :  
Koch, John

=====

=====

To whom it may concern,

I find it despicable that the government will find any way to clamp down on free speech. Disclosing donor information will bring nothing but threats and harassment to the donor. I point to Bob McNair, owner of the Houston Texans and his quick about face in opposition to the hero referendum. A very prominent case example is NAACP vs Alabama. Americans have a right to voice political opinions with the fear of full force of government be it IRS, FBI, or your agency. The way I see it the main targets will be republicans, christians, conservatives. Keep the first amendment free even if it is ugly to some.

Sincerely,

A. Hernandez

Comments provided by :  
Hernandez, A.

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Stewart\_James\_10\_27\_2015\_05\_53\_38\_CommentText.txt

=====

Let freedom ring, stop this nonsense aimed at silencing our rights of association and speech. Protect Americans privacy to peacefully associate with whomever they want to..

Comments provided by :  
Stewart, James

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_McDonnell\_Marie\_10\_27\_2015\_05\_59\_09\_CommentText.txt

=====

No to this!

Comments provided by :  
McDonnell, Marie

=====

=====

Please respect the rights of donors to contribute to causes that they care about without being harassed. People have lost their jobs and had their reputations besmirched by people who disagree with them on completely unrelated issues. The wealthy will always find a way to have a voice in politics whether above or below the table. Please do not strip away the rights of the poor to give even a little to causes that they support. Most cannot afford to loose their jobs through intimidation at the workplace. People and organizations in power can destroy the rights of those with whom they disagree. This fear applies to all political affiliations, because pendulums swing. Those who would choose to abuse power today, may become the victims in retaliatory strikes tomorrow.

I copied this comment from a poster (Lark) on PJ Media because it says what I want to say.

I will add. Just stop doing what you have no authority to do.

Comments provided by :  
keisling, sandra

=====



=====

i oppose Reg 2015-04 to force nonprofit advocacy organizations that are not political committees and that do not spend a majority of their time and resources on candidate-related activity to reveal their donors, something they are not required to do by federal law or IRS regulations. In fact, the fundamental rights of association, privacy, and free speech of such organizations and their donors are protected by the First Amendment, as the U.S. Supreme Court held in NAACP v. Alabama, 357 U.S. 449 (1958).

Such mandated disclosure has no purpose other than to try to open up the donors of such organizations to harassment and intimidation for their political and social beliefs in associating with particular membership organizations. The FEC has no statutory authority to mandate such disclosure of organizations that are not political committees.

Comments provided by :  
Burke, Terry

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Dougherty\_Karen\_10\_27\_2015\_06\_25\_05\_CommentText.txt

=====

I oppose the proposed rule as inconsistent with the First Amendment as interpreted by the Supreme Court in the Citizens Unitrd case.

Comments provided by :  
Dougherty, Karen

=====

=====

Free speech is protected by the First Amendment, and it is the job of the federal government to support the Constitution. Forcing non-profit groups to disclose donor names will open donors to harassment, and it is clear that that is the intent on the part of those who are pushing to have donor names disclosed. That harassment will discourage free speech, abrogating the First Amendment and so the government should not enable it.

Comments provided by :  
Stenbo Sapolsky, Karen

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Saunders\_John\_10\_27\_2015\_06\_28\_32\_CommentText.txt

=====

On proposed REG 2015-3 and REG 2015-4:

The FEC should NOT adopt these.

Comments provided by :  
Saunders, John

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Ward\_Norman\_10\_27\_2015\_06\_42\_14\_CommentText.txt

=====

If your desire is to change the law as it relates to our first amendment rights, then I would suggest that you take this matter up with the legislators in Congress. They, alone, are the only ones who can legally do what you are trying to do.

Comments provided by :  
Ward, Norman

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Stephens\_Susan\_10\_27\_2015\_06\_43\_54\_CommentText.txt

=====

It is obvious that the attempt to force non-profit organizations to reveal and disclose the name of donors violates the 1st Amendment. Please do not allow your agency to be used for political purposes.

Comments provided by :  
Stephens, Susan

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_taylor\_caroline\_10\_27\_2015\_06\_50\_10\_CommentText.txt

=====

I urge you to protect the privacy of individuals who donate to non-profits by not mandating publicly listing donors to such groups. Respecting the private donations of us all is identical to respecting our voices in supporting an issue or cause. These are not often political donations....but publications of one's private financial support can lead to intimidation, false assumptions, and the squelching of free speech through a form of public disclosure.

Comments provided by :  
taylor, caroline

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Barton\_Deborah\_10\_27\_2015\_06\_54\_26\_CommentText.txt

=====

A standard tactic of the political left is to harrass political donors of their opponents on the right. Why would a government agency like the Federal Election Commission place their seal of approval on and encourage that tactic by 'forcing' disclosure of donor information? I urge you to leave our First Ammendment freedoms intact by rejecting this unconstitutional regulation!

Comments provided by :  
Barton, Deborah

=====



=====

Please respect the rights of donors to contribute to causes that they care about without being harassed. People have lost their jobs and had their reputations besmirched by people who disagree with them on completely unrelated issues. The wealthy will always find a way to have a voice in politics whether above or below the table. Please do not strip away the rights of the poor to give even a little to causes that they support. Most cannot afford to loose their jobs through intimidation at the workplace. People and organizations in power can destroy the rights of those with whom they disagree. This fear applies to all political affiliations, because pendulums swing. Those who would choose to abuse power today, may become the victims in retaliatory strikes tomorrow.

Comments provided by :  
Scandole, Chris

=====

=====

Non Profit organizations that are advocacy groups are not political organizations and I don't believe that there is any law or regulations that would require them to disclose the names of donors. I see this as a way to bypass a Supreme Court decision and to be used as a way to harass those with opinions that this administration disagrees with. Lois Lehrner got away with this kind of behavior and for the FEC to legitimize this behavior goes against all logic, especially since you shouldn't even have the power or right to do this.

Comments provided by :  
Denton, Dennis

=====

=====

I oppose this new regulation. Donations to such organizations must remain private to ensure the First Amendment rights of the donors. I couldn't say it better than the Public Interest Legal Foundation:

[T]his petition is an attempt to force nonprofit advocacy organizations that are not political committees and that do not spend a majority of their time and resources on candidate-related activity to reveal their donors, something they are not required to do by federal law or IRS regulations. In fact, the fundamental rights of association, privacy, and free speech of such organizations and their donors are protected by the First Amendment, as the U.S. Supreme Court held in NAACP v. Alabama, 357 U.S. 449 (1958).

Such mandated disclosure has no purpose other than to try to open up the donors of such organizations to harassment and intimidation for their political and social beliefs in associating with particular membership organizations. The FEC has no statutory authority to mandate such disclosure of organizations that are not political committees.

Comments provided by :  
Fritts, Linda

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Wright\_Peter\_10\_27\_2015\_07\_22\_51\_CommentText.txt

=====

What part of "Freedom of speech" don't you understand?

Comments provided by :  
Wright, Peter

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Patrinice\_S\_10\_27\_2015\_07\_24\_13\_CommentText.txt

=====

DO NOT use your statutory authority in an attempt to overturn the Supreme Court ruling on Citizens United. To do so is a bastardization of your authority. Political freedom is an important part of what our Republic is all about.

Comments provided by :  
Patrinice, S

=====

=====

Enough! Creating more governmental regulation that infringes on free speech has got to stop. It is obvious that the purpose of these new rulings will be used to intimidate and bully according to political biases. It is obviously clear that those in power want to regulate speech to promote their own agendas. This goes against the very meaning of "free speech." We have seen what those in power are capable of with the IRS scandal that quite possibly swayed an election. Yet, the government found no fault there. Those who want to cram these new regulations down our throats would do well to remember that in time they may be on the receiving end of their own contrivance.

Comments provided by :  
Hayes, Jan

=====

=====

Please honor both the content and intent of the First Amendment of the US Constitution, and the Supreme Court's ruling on the case of "Citizen's United", and do not force non-profit organizations to disclose their lists of donors. This would constitute a clear violation of their rights under the First Amendment, and a dramatic overreach of bureaucratic regulation.

Please do not allow the political preferences of whichever party is in power to override Democratic process and the will of the People, by using Executive Fiat to rewrite existing laws that have served so well for 200 years.

Comments provided by :  
James, Thomas

=====

=====

The Supreme Court ruled correctly on Citizen United claiming the right of free speech for all people and groups. Now you want to force organizations to reveal donors' names. That will invade their privacy and stifle donations primarily to conservative organizations because of the radical actions taken by the left when they do not approve of others with a different opinion. There is no justification that you can possible have to expose people to hate and possible violence because of their wish to donate to a particular group.

Comments provided by :  
Nunn, Helena

=====



Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Metcalf\_Bruce\_10\_27\_2015\_08\_01\_11\_CommentText.txt

=====

Do not restrict free speech.

Comments provided by :  
Metcalf, Bruce

=====

=====

Please do not force the donor lists to Citizens United to be made public.

I have never donated to them and don't care to do so, but this is exactly how I believe my husband and I were targeted for an audit in 2010. We had donated to many pro-life groups and to Leadership Institute (whose donor lists were scrutinized by the IRS). The IRS complaint against us was that we donated too much a proportion of our income. After the audit, we owed nothing, and there was nothing amiss. It was just a way to harass us for donating to these particular groups (Conservative). It took three months out of my life to go through all the paperwork, assemble all the letters attesting to our donations, etc. These were donations of \$250 - \$500 - nothing large. We are middle income people with strong beliefs in life and freedom.

To use the government to punish citizens when their thoughts disagree with whatever Administration is in power is certainly not to be encouraged.

Comments provided by :  
Dwyer, Linda

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_knox\_linda\_10\_27\_2015\_08\_14\_49\_CommentText.txt

=====

I am against forcing organizations to reveal the names of their donors, This is not required by any federal agency and is not necessary. It might be seen as an attempt by the FCC to silence groups in violation of free speech. Our right to support and express our opinion should be protected not eroded by coercion and those who need to be in control, it seems, in an almost pathological way.

Comments provided by :  
knox, linda

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Hainline\_Keith\_10\_27\_2015\_08\_16\_07\_CommentText.txt

=====

I am very much opposed to any rule which the federal agencies may try to implement which is contradictory to decisions made by the Supreme Court, such as the Citizens United case.

Comments provided by :  
Hainline, Keith

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Montague\_Lisa\_10\_27\_2015\_08\_22\_54\_CommentText.txt

=====

I urge you to halt the unlawful action being taken to reveal donors whose free speech is protected by the Citizens United ruling by the Supreme Court, a co- equal branch of government, something which the Obama administration ignores regularly.

Comments provided by :  
Montague, Lisa

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Brown\_Harold\_\_10\_27\_2015\_08\_26\_04\_CommentText.txt

=====

Citizens United leveled the political playing field. Unions do not have to reveal their donors/members and neither should any entity regardless of their politics.

I implore the FEC not to change the Citizens United law allowing all political groups to raise money without revealing their membership lists.

Comments provided by :  
Brown, Harold

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Allen\_Robert\_10\_27\_2015\_08\_29\_01\_CommentText.txt

=====

I request that the SEC honor the First Amendment & cease any further action to amend, modify or vacate the Supreme Courts Citizens United decision.

Comments provided by :  
Allen, Robert

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Winder\_Miriam\_10\_27\_2015\_08\_30\_28\_CommentText.txt

=====

This is a redundant regulation put forth so that the FEC can specifically target certain groups.

The Supreme Court has already spoken in 'Citizens United' and this regulation is spurious.

Comments provided by :  
Winder, Miriam

=====



Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Hicks\_Jeff\_10\_27\_2015\_08\_36\_00\_CommentText.txt

=====

Cease and desist all efforts this end run around the first amendment by attempting to force organizations such as "Citizens United" to expose their contributor lists.

Comments provided by :  
Hicks, Jeff

=====

=====

I stand for free speech. I stand against any and all attempts to impose the regulation of free speech based on gender, race, religion, political beliefs or party, economic advantage or disadvantage, education level, and any other standard not directly and expressly given to both individuals, corporations, and government entities by the Constitution of the United States. I strongly urge you to cease meddling beyond your Constitutional authority.

Comments provided by :  
Donaldson, Sheryl

=====

=====

Please keep free speech free and unencumbered. It does not matter if the speech is from a corporation, labor organization or others. The way to counter speech that you do not agree with is with MORE speech not shutting down a person or group that you do not agree with. The independent spending is speech - please keep it available!!

The foundation of the United States includes the RIGHT of people to speak freely and dispute what the government might say or believe without concern or fear that the government will punish or harm the speaker in any way. Anonymous speech is free speech and should be available especially because the press can shut people down by shaming them if the press does not agree with the anonymous speaker. It is one of the few tools that the "little person" has against the powerful press.

I oppose proposed rules that would force nonprofits or any organization to reveal their donors as the price for the organization's speech.

Comments provided by :  
Russell, Patrick

=====

=====

I DISAGREE with this regulation. My primary reason is that I should not have to worry about an audit because I donated money to an organization that disagrees with the opinion of an over zealous IRS agent.

Once the information of donors for groups that are often vilified by the media, Universities and even some government agencies is made public there is nothing to protect citizens from the thought police making false claims against them.

The same people that complained about McCarthy are the very ones pushing to have his type of black listing return. And will be more than happy to do so to advance their cause.

In a world becoming less and less private let us at least keep our politics private.

Comments provided by :  
Benhumea, Alicia

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Ashley\_Earl\_10\_27\_2015\_08\_42\_29\_CommentText.txt

=====

I believe the intention behind the MYL petition to force disclosure of non-profit donors is to stop them from donating by subjecting them to harassment. I have seen this happen in the past and I believe it stifles public expression / free speech in this way.

Neither do I feel the Federal Election Commission has the jurisdiction to place such a requirement on these groups as contained in the Citizens United decision.

Please do not enact rules that would produce these effects.

Sincerely,  
Earl W. Ashley

Comments provided by :  
Ashley, Earl

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Janning\_Fred\_10\_27\_2015\_08\_49\_53\_CommentText.txt

=====

I am totally against any and all federal regulations that prohibit my freedom of speech or representation.

Comments provided by :  
Janning, Fred

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Day\_Ken\_10\_27\_2015\_08\_50\_56\_CommentText.txt

=====

Please take actions to uphold the Citizens United decision. Free speech is essential in our society and individuals and groups should be allowed to express their views without fear of retaliation or violence. Keeping supporter/donor lists confidential is a civil-rights era tradition going back to kill attempts to intimidate supporters of civil rights.  
Do the right thing.

Comments provided by :  
Day, Ken

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Rockenhaus\_Eric\_10\_27\_2015\_08\_52\_03\_CommentText.txt

=====

Reg. 2015-04 is an attempt to regulate free speech. Forcing non-profit organizations to divulge the names of their donors can and will facilitate harassment of the donors by dissenting parties. This proposed regulation would a subtle attack on the first amendment and free speech as outlined in the Supreme Court ruling of NAACP vs. Alabama.

Comments provided by :  
Rockenhaus, Eric

=====



Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Henry\_Michael\_10\_27\_2015\_08\_54\_48\_CommentText.txt

=====

I strongly advise against requiring the disclosure of donors because this will serve only to suppress free speech, which is a constitutional right. If this were merely a matter of public information I would not object but in our current political climate such disclosure, particularly of donors to conservative organizations, will simply open up the donors to harassment. There is plenty of evidence for this. Therefore I strongly object to this regulation.

Comments provided by :  
Henry, Michael

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Murphy\_Denis\_10\_27\_2015\_08\_56\_37\_CommentText.txt

=====

Freedom of speech is protected in the US Constitution. Harassment of individuals who voice their opinion is not. Divulging a person's private information in order to enable harassment should not be allowed. I respectfully submit these comments for review, and to voice my opinion.

Comments provided by :  
Murphy, Denis

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Abrams\_Michelle\_10\_27\_2015\_09\_10\_27\_CommentText.txt

=====

I oppose new federal powers over political freedom.

Stop the progressive left from taking away our freedoms - not to mention the Constitution.

Comments provided by :  
Abrams, Michelle

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Lain\_Robert\_10\_27\_2015\_09\_18\_00\_CommentText.txt

=====

I wish to register my wholehearted opposition to the proposed rule to force non-profit organizations to disclose the names of their donors. It is a thinly veiled effort to enable harassment campaigns against donors to unpopular yet perfectly appropriate public causes. The FEC is wrong to even be considering this rule, as it is a blatant attempt to chill political speech, far outside of its proper role, and utterly contrary to the principles of free expression our government is supposed to protect.

Comments provided by :  
Lain, Robert

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Elliot\_Steve\_10\_27\_2015\_09\_28\_34\_CommentText.txt

=====

Do not stop free speech. Forcing donors to be revealed is prohibiting free speech. Some people don't want to be know specifically but will support a representative. This should be allowed for many reasons. When one political side tries to hush another side you are borderline tyranny. The supreme court has decided this issue. This kind of issue is only for the court to decide.

Comments provided by :  
Elliot, Steve

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Pundt\_Jeffrey\_10\_27\_2015\_09\_30\_54\_CommentText.txt

=====

It is not your authority to regulate free speech and not up to the FEC decide if something is offensive in your opinion or fair that is up to the courts and they have said Citizens United Stands!

Stop trying to push a regulation in violation of the 1st Amendment!

Comments provided by :  
Pundt, Jeffrey

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Sutton\_Randy\_10\_27\_2015\_09\_42\_32\_CommentText.txt

=====

Requiring disclosure of the names of supporters to organizations that are not related to candidate advocacy or direct support of specific candidates will only aid the enemies of such organizations to organize harassment campaigns against the supporters and thus chill free speech.

Comments provided by :  
Sutton, Randy

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_pardo\_Elisa\_10\_27\_2015\_09\_46\_04\_CommentText.txt

=====

There is clear precedent to stop this action which quite obviously threatens those who choose to exercise their right to political speech and would make their lives and livelihood difficult. NAACP vs. Alabama, in which the Supreme Court protected the NAACP from having to disclose supporter information because of the harassment campaigns that would follow. Case closed.

Comments provided by :  
pardo, Elisa

=====



=====

This petition is an attempt to force nonprofit advocacy organizations that are not political committees and that do not spend a majority of their time and resources on candidate-related activity to reveal their donors, something they are not required to do by federal law or IRS regulations. In fact, the fundamental rights of association, privacy, and free speech of such organizations and their donors are protected by the First Amendment, as the U.S. Supreme Court held in NAACP v. Alabama, 357 U.S. 449 (1958).

Such mandated disclosure has no purpose other than to try to open up the donors of such organizations to harassment and intimidation for their political and social beliefs in associating with particular membership organizations. The FEC has no statutory authority to mandate such disclosure of organizations that are not political committees.

Comments provided by :  
Burr, Frederic W.

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Cox\_Richard\_10\_27\_2015\_09\_52\_42\_CommentText.txt

=====

I believe there should not be any infringement on the right of any individual or group of individuals to contribute to Citizens United.

Comments provided by :  
Cox, Richard

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Lorey\_Richard\_10\_27\_2015\_09\_56\_47\_CommentText.txt

=====

There is absolutely no reasonable basis to oppose the First Amendment of the Constitution of the United States of America. Anyone who want to amend it is not a true American.

Comments provided by :  
Lorey, Richard

=====

=====

The rights of citizens are many. One of the many implied in the Constitution is the right to contribute to any political or social cause they deem fit. And to make those contributions without fear of retribution vis a vis the landmark case of NAACP vs. Alabama which saw the Supreme Court protect the NAACP from having to disclose supporter information because of the harassment campaigns that would follow.

How is this any different? It isn't.

The government's only role in campaign contributions should be to insure only American citizens make campaign contributions.

Comments provided by :  
McAlpin, Michael

=====

=====

I absolutely oppose the attack on the first amendment that attempts to counter the ruling by the Supreme Court in Citizens United. In a highly charged political environment where those expressing traditional views are attacked and attempts to intimidate and force them from their jobs because they offer accepted views .that run counter to the opinions of those who would silence them cannot be aided by forcing such disclosure. Our ability to band together to petition our government and even support candidates should not be further impeded.

Comments provided by :  
Gravitt, Alan

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Gould\_William\_\_10\_27\_2015\_10\_07\_13\_CommentText.txt

=====

The proposed rule to require disclosure of donors will chill free speech. There is a consistent pattern of activist groups using disclosure requirements to subject donors to boycotts, economic pressure, and harassment. People have been hounded out of their livelihoods for donating to an unpopular cause.

Comments provided by :  
Gould, William

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Marr\_Craig\_10\_27\_2015\_10\_09\_09\_CommentText.txt

=====

I think the Supreme Court has been pretty clear on this. The First Amendment applies to ALL!

Stop trying to usurp the constitution we are a nation of laws not the decision of the administration who happens to be in power or the federal bureaucracy.

Comments provided by :

Marr, Craig

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Welch\_Michael\_10\_27\_2015\_10\_13\_25\_CommentText.txt

=====

Do not force disclosure of names of contributors to political campaigns or causes. This information can be used, as it has been many times in the past, to identify citizens so that they can be harassed and intimidated for expressing their support for their political beliefs.

Comments provided by :  
Welch, Michael

=====



Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Brooke\_Patrick\_10\_27\_2015\_10\_13\_32\_CommentText.txt

=====

I am opposed to any action, regulation or legislation that would curtail full First Amendment rights. I oppose regulations that would require the disclosure of donors to political organizations and not-for-profits organizations. The harassment and intimidation of those donors as retribution for their private support of that organization must be prevented.

Comments provided by :  
Brooke, Patrick

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_holmstrom\_carl\_10\_27\_2015\_10\_27\_39\_CommentText.txt

=====

we need more time to comment on rules.

Comments provided by :  
holmstrom, carl

=====

=====

The FEC is taking their orders directly from the Obama administration and could care less about the US Constitution. Such actions that use coercion and compulsion to further one's agenda to usurp power that does not belong to them is guilty of treason and should be compelled to pay the price of such unlawful actions. The United States is a republic, not a theocracy or dictatorship and those that support such actions should be stripped of their citizenship and shipped to N.Korea. Obey the US Constitution or leave.

Comments provided by :  
Rushing, Don

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Wells\_Susan\_10\_27\_2015\_10\_30\_34\_CommentText.txt

=====

I respectfully ask the FEC to STOP its nefarious desire to regulate free speech and other protected individual freedoms granted by the U.S. Constitution and the Bill of Rights. These freedoms, including free speech, are the hallmarks of the American way of life and should be protected by and for every individual and organization.

Comments provided by :  
Wells, Susan

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Sullivan\_David\_10\_27\_2015\_10\_31\_08\_CommentText.txt

=====

Desist from any actions or restrictions against the free speech of Citizens United.

Comments provided by :  
Sullivan, David

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_MINITER\_John\_10\_27\_2015\_10\_31\_56\_CommentText.txt

=====

It is requested that you end any effort to compromise the First Amendment to the US Constitution by your rule making. Such efforts are clearly politically partisan and violate the position of trust granted to you by the people.

Comments provided by :  
MINITER, John

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Naslund\_Randy\_10\_27\_2015\_10\_32\_40\_CommentText.txt

=====

I implore the FEC to abandon all of its efforts to hinder, harness, and regulate free speech.

Comments provided by :  
Naslund, Randy

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Davis\_Doug\_10\_27\_2015\_10\_32\_33\_CommentText.txt

=====

Leave Citizens United as is and respect the first amendment!

Comments provided by :  
Davis, Doug

=====



Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Baker\_S.\_10\_27\_2015\_10\_33\_20\_CommentText.txt

=====

I respectfully ask/demand that you stop immediately all efforts to destroy and or minimize the 1st Amendment to the United States Constitution.

Comments provided by :  
Baker, S.

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Lamm\_Friedrich\_10\_27\_2015\_10\_33\_17\_CommentText.txt

=====

Please leave the Citizens United decisions alone.

Comments provided by :  
Lamm, Friedrich

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Johnson\_Pamela\_10\_27\_2015\_10\_33\_56\_CommentText.txt

=====

I passionately uphold the first amendment rights. Persecution of donor money is the only obvious reason for this kind of activity.

We have already seen what happens to prominent donors who choose to give to conservative causes, this cannot be tolerated . Loss of Liberty is a loss for all citizens .

Comments provided by :

Johnson, Pamela

=====

=====

Dear Commission--

I am against any rule change that requires the disclosure of donors to political committees. The goal of such a change is not the empowerment of the citizen, but the intimidation of citizens.

The speech-regulating Left has long been in favor of forced donor disclosure, because it facilitates their most fanatical followers unleashing abuse on those donors. And this really happens. These fanatics regard politics as religious war, and they will hold back from nothing.

Just this summer I read two fine books about the American Revolution, one called "Washington's Crossing" and the other "1776." I listened to them on audio disks. After almost 30 hours of listening to two detailed histories of that time, I know much better than I ever did how much liberty motivated the farmers and mechanics of that time to defend their country against abusive power-grabs by abusive men, who happened at that time to be running England.

This proposed rule change is an abusive power-grab whose aim is to diminish the freedom of certain people to participate in public debate. To repeat what I said before, this is an attempt to gain legal power abuse people because of their expression of their belief. The founding fathers--and by that I mean the farmers with muskets in the woods waiting to face the Redcoats--would not have stood for this.

Please stand with our traditions--and do not allow this power-grab. As I said, it's an attempt to diminish the liberty of citizens.

Comments provided by :  
Maguire, John

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Garner\_J.\_10\_27\_2015\_10\_35\_12\_CommentText.txt

=====

I am strongly opposed to any efforts to undermine the Citizens United case which protects the free speech and free association rights of individuals, unions and corporations. This is an outrageous overreach by the FEC. Please stop all efforts to undermine the First Ammendment rights we all share.

Comments provided by :  
Garner, J.

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Levy\_Janet\_10\_27\_2015\_10\_36\_11\_CommentText.txt

=====

There should be no regulation of free speech, an obvious violation of the U.S. Constitution. Non-profits should NOT have to disclose the names of donors and potentially subject them to harassment for their views.

Citizens United should stand as is.

Comments provided by :  
Levy, Janet

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Rutzebeck\_Lief\_10\_27\_2015\_10\_39\_00\_CommentText.txt

=====

Please don't subvert the Constitution of the United States to further a political agenda.

Remember the concept of 'Unintended Consequences'. If you take this action and the other party gets the majority how will this affect you?

Any benefit you may think you get will be turned around on you.

Please be American citizens and uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States.

Comments provided by :  
Rutzebeck, Lief

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Heimes\_Taylor\_Pat\_10\_27\_2015\_10\_41\_38\_CommentText.txt

=====

The Federal Election Commission is considering rules which could force non-profit organizations to disclose donors. I DO NOT AGREE THAT THE FEC SHOULD PROCEED WITH CHANGING WHAT THE SUPREME COURT HAS DECIDED.

The fundamental rights of association, privacy, and free speech of such organizations and their donors are protected by the First Amendment.

Comments provided by :  
Heimes-Taylor, Pat

=====



Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Vorderbruggen\_Mark\_10\_27\_2015\_10\_42\_36\_CommentText.txt

=====

The current efforts by the FEC to reveal donor information must be stopped. Revealing this information will result in damages to individuals, as shown by recent past actions, causing a chilling effect on the population. What a sad country this would bring about. I wonder what sort of government retaliation will come my way for speaking up against this measure... :-(

Comments provided by :  
Vorderbruggen, Mark

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_burnett\_kyle\_10\_27\_2015\_10\_45\_33\_CommentText.txt

=====

People must be free to contribute to candidates and organizations without fear of reprisal from those who disagree. The ability for different people to join their contributions is essential in having an impact on social and political issues. This effort by the administration, thru the FEC, to eliminate privacy in giving is nothing more than an effort to squash dissent from "progressive" orthodoxy thru personal attacks, economic sanctions, IRS audits, and other governmental interference.

Comments provided by :  
burnett, kyle

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Wysmuller\_Thomas\_10\_27\_2015\_10\_45\_52\_CommentText.txt

=====

The spirit of NAACP vs. Alabama should prevail, and this proposed rule must be quashed.

Comments provided by :  
Wysmuller, Thomas

=====

=====

There are no laws requiring that donors to non-profit advocacy organizations be revealed. The Supreme Court has ruled that giving money to such organizations is a First Amendment Right. There are people/groups that deliberately go out & attempt to vilify people for exercising their rights. The FEC's attempt to make such harassment easier is criminal. I should not have to worry about being tormented by those who disagree with me because I donate to certain organizations. Please do NOT pass these new regulations.

Comments provided by :  
Rowe, Kim

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Gaito\_Craig\_10\_27\_2015\_10\_48\_51\_CommentText.txt

=====

Do not challenge or ammend citizens united decision. Donations to any organization or cause should be private matter and not up to public scrutiny.

Comments provided by :

Gaito, Craig

=====

=====

This petition is nothing but an attempt to force nonprofit organizations to reveal their donors. That is something that they ARE NOT required to do by federal law or by IRS regulation.

In fact, the fundamental rights of association, privacy, and free speech of such organizations and their donors are protected by the First Amendment, as the U.S. Supreme Court held in NAACP v. Alabama, 357 U.S. 449 (1958).

This petition serves no purpose other than to enable opposition parties to harass and intimidate donors. You, the FEC, have absolutely no statutory authority to mandate such disclosure of groups or organizations that are not political committees.

Do you know how many regulations there should be on free speech? NONE!

Do you know how many regulations there should be on political contributions? NONE!

We have a 1st amendment right to say what we want and that means individuals, unions, corporations, fraternal and political organizations, ad infinitum.

The only thing the FEC should be doing is ensuring that only qualified citizens vote and that those votes are accurately counted.

Comments provided by :  
DAVIS, HUGH

=====

=====

The FCC and the rest of the Federal Government need to stop waging regulatory and legislative war on the American people.

Enough already.

Malignant career parasites in the Federal Government are using the government as a weapon against the American people for your own personal and political benefit and you think if you blow your public service smoke rings somehow the BS you blow isn't.

Anyone over the age of 40 can see it.

Comments provided by :

Villano, Michael

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Davis\_Charles\_10\_27\_2015\_10\_59\_24\_CommentText.txt

=====

I am against this poor excuse of trying to do "what's right" with REG 2015-04. Your attempt is nothing but an attack on those organizations that don't agree with your political and ideological agenda. While doing so, your hypocrisy is evident when you find ways to protect your like minded organizations. Let's stop using our government agencies to attack political enemies.

Comments provided by :  
Davis, Charles

=====



=====

This petition is an attempt to force nonprofit advocacy organizations that are not political committees and that do not spend a majority of their time and resources on candidate-related activity to reveal their donors, something they are not required to do by federal law or IRS regulations. In fact, the fundamental rights of association, privacy, and free speech of such organizations and their donors are protected by the First Amendment, as the U.S. Supreme Court held in NAACP v. Alabama, 357 U.S. 449 (1958).

Such mandated disclosure has no purpose other than to try to open up the donors of such organizations to harassment and intimidation for their political and social beliefs in associating with particular membership organizations. The FEC has no statutory authority to mandate such disclosure of organizations that are not political committees.

Comments provided by :  
Auty, Kimberly

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Miller\_Chris\_10\_27\_2015\_11\_03\_33\_CommentText.txt

=====

Leave our First Amendment rights ALONE FEC! It is none of your business to know who donates to what.  
All that does is it set up the donor for attacks to those that oppose what the donor is doing.

Comments provided by :  
Miller, Chris

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Lemon\_J.\_10\_27\_2015\_11\_06\_37\_CommentText.txt

=====

Freedom and liberty are the cornerstone of our country, why do you progressive communist types continue to try to place limitations on it? This is simply a Citizens United work around. Our founding fathers would be rolling in their grave if they saw how perverted our country has become. My comments will make no difference, this has already been decided by those of great tolerance.

Comments provided by :  
Lemon, J.

=====

=====

Please respect the rights of donors to contribute to causes that they care about without being harassed. People have lost their jobs and had their reputations besmirched by people who disagree with them on completely unrelated issues. The wealthy will always find a way to have a voice in politics whether above or below the table. Please do not strip away the rights of the poor to give even a little to causes that they support. Most cannot afford to lose their jobs through intimidation at the workplace. People and organizations in power can destroy the rights of those with whom they disagree. This fear applies to all political affiliations, because pendulums swing. Those who would choose to abuse power today, may become the victims in retaliatory strikes tomorrow.

Comments provided by :  
Maderer, Doug

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Picou\_Todd\_\_10\_27\_2015\_11\_08\_12\_CommentText.txt

=====

I strongly object to the FEC forcing non profits to list their donors. Just as the Supreme Court ruled in NAACP v Alabama, these donors have a right to not be harassed. The FEC should protect the First Amendment and follow the Supreme courts rulings and not try to undermine them.

Comments provided by :  
Picou, Todd

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Kuffner\_Millie\_10\_27\_2015\_11\_11\_28\_CommentText.txt

=====

I do not want progressive groups to get the names of donors to conservative causes.

We know the pattern of intimidation used by them to punish donors.

They engage in public campaigns to embarrass and release private information.

A CEO of an internet company was forced to resign because it was disclosed he'd given a \$1000 to a traditional marriage group.

It is an attempt to end run the law and get information deemed private and then use it to persecute groups in opposition to their own.

Coming right before an election coming up its designed to discourage and scare off donors. That's as political as it can get.

Comments provided by :  
Kuffner, Millie

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Doucet\_Paul\_10\_27\_2015\_11\_14\_10\_CommentText.txt

=====

I am opposed to this proposed rule. It not only violates our rights to free speech and free association, it will serve to enable harassment of donors to such groups.

Comments provided by :  
Doucet, Paul

=====

=====

[T]his petition is an attempt to force nonprofit advocacy organizations that are not political committees and that do not spend a majority of their time and resources on candidate-related activity to reveal their donors, something they are not required to do by federal law or IRS regulations. In fact, the fundamental rights of association, privacy, and free speech of such organizations and their donors are protected by the First Amendment,as the U.S. Supreme Court held in NAACP v. Alabama, 357 U.S. 449 (1958).

Comments provided by :  
Ross, Alexander

=====



=====

This petition is an attempt to force nonprofit advocacy organizations that are not political committees and that do not spend a majority of their time and resources on candidate-related activity to reveal their donors, something they are not required to do by federal law or IRS regulations. In fact, the fundamental rights of association, privacy, and free speech of such organizations and their donors are protected by the First Amendment as the U.S. Supreme Court held in NAACP v. Alabama, 357 U.S. 449 (1958).

Such mandated disclosure has no purpose other than to try to open up the donors of such organizations to harassment and intimidation for their political and social beliefs in associating with particular membership organizations. The FEC has no statutory authority to mandate such disclosure of organizations that are not political committees.

This needs to stop.

Comments provided by :  
Pagan, Tonya

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Salsbury\_Betty\_10\_27\_2015\_11\_19\_17\_CommentText.txt

=====

Do not require non-profit organizations to produce their donor lists to you.

Comments provided by :  
Salsbury, Betty

=====

=====

Citizens United applies not only to corporations, but to labor unions as well Harassment of financial donors to conservative causes has become one of the standard tactics of the militant left. Speech regulations issued by the Federal Election Commission are therefore a necessary component of snuffing out financial support for conservative causes through harassment campaigns.

A half-century ago, liberal groups understood and respected this. The landmark case of NAACP vs. Alabama saw the Supreme Court protect the NAACP from having to disclose supporter information because of the harassment campaigns that would follow. I expect you to respect the Constitution and the First Amendment rights of ALL Americans.

Comments provided by :  
Fernwood, Thomas

=====

=====

This petition is an attempt to force nonprofit advocacy organizations that are not political committees and that do not spend a majority of their time and resources on candidate-related activity to reveal their donors, something they are not required to do by federal law or IRS regulations. In fact, the fundamental rights of association, privacy, and free speech of such organizations and their donors are protected by the First Amendment, as the U.S. Supreme Court held in NAACP v. Alabama, 357 U.S. 449 (1958).

Such mandated disclosure has no purpose other than to try to open up the donors of such organizations to harassment and intimidation for their political and social beliefs in associating with particular membership organizations. The FEC has no statutory authority to mandate such disclosure of organizations that are not political committees.

As such, these rules represent an unconstitutional attack on protected speech and should not be implemented in any form or fashion.

Comments provided by :  
Kotten, Kenneth

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_COOPER\_LISA\_10\_27\_2015\_11\_41\_50\_CommentText.txt

=====

The FEC has no legal authority to demand names of donors, for ANY reason. The corruptness of the Federal Government has already gone too far. The FEC cannot be allowed to trample the rights of US citizens.

We, Americans, must stand up for our rights, and our constitution.

FEC Back off!!!!!!!!!!

Comments provided by :

COOPER, LISA

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Croft\_John\_10\_27\_2015\_11\_42\_28\_CommentText.txt

=====

Forcing the disclosure of contributors to non-profit political groups goes against a previous Supreme Court decision concerning the Alabama NAACP in the 1960's.

There seems to be no good reason to do this.

Comments provided by :  
Croft, John

=====

=====

[T]his petition is an attempt to force nonprofit advocacy organizations that are not political committees and that do not spend a majority of their time and resources on candidate-related activity to reveal their donors, something they are not required to do by federal law or IRS regulations. In fact, the fundamental rights of association, privacy, and free speech of such organizations and their donors are protected by the First Amendment, as the U.S. Supreme Court held in NAACP v. Alabama, 357 U.S. 449 (1958).

Such mandated disclosure has no purpose other than to try to open up the donors of such organizations to harassment and intimidation for their political and social beliefs in associating with particular membership organizations. The FEC has no statutory authority to mandate such disclosure of organizations that are not political committees.

Comments provided by :  
Wedel, Ryan

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Clark\_Randall\_10\_27\_2015\_11\_47\_26\_CommentText.txt

=====

I agree with the comments of the Public Interest Legal Foundation and I strongly oppose the FEC implementing rules which could force non-profit organizations to disclose the names of donors.

Comments provided by :  
Clark, Randall

=====



=====

This proposed regulation is simply an attempt to get around the Supreme Court's Citizens United decision and starve 501(C)(4)s by forcing them to reveal their donors – which is akin to demanding that election ballots not be secret. This is fundamentally anti-American, as these organizations are not required to do so by law (passed by elected representatives as opposed to the partisan appointed majority of FEC commissioners).

The proposed regulation substantively undermines every American's fundamental free speech and freedom of association rights as well as the privacy rights of such organizations and their donors.

The proposed forced disclosure of donors obviously has no other purpose other than to open donors of 501(C)(4)s to political harassment and intimidation for their beliefs. The FEC simply has no authority to require any such disclosure by organizations that are not political committees. That this is even being contemplated shows the intentional disregard for citizens rights this administration exemplifies.

Comments provided by :  
Jennings, Brendan

=====

=====  
Amendment I of the United States Constitution states:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances."

The Federal Election Commission is considering rules which could force non-profit organizations — such as a pro-life organization — to disclose the names of donors. The speech-regulating Left has long been in favor of forced donor disclosure, because it facilitates their most fanatical followers unleashing abuse on those donors. See what happened to the owner of the Houston Texans when he supported an effort to block a transgender referendum in Houston.

Harassment of financial donors to conservative causes has become one of the standard tactics of the militant left. Speech regulations issued by the Federal Election Commission are therefore a necessary component of snuffing out financial support for conservative causes through harassment campaigns. A half-century ago, liberal groups understood and respected this. The landmark case of NAACP vs. Alabama saw the Supreme Court protect the NAACP from having to disclose supporter information because of the harassment campaigns that would follow.

Such proposal as if being made by the FEC infringes, if not outright violates, the constitutional rights guaranteed by our constitution. It is blatantly racketeering of the citizens' right to free speech and to petition our government.

Any such over-regulation will be turned down by the Supreme Court as it already has. There is no need to even attempt to violate the constitutional rights of the free citizens of the United States.

This illustrates one of the reasons to call a convention of states to reign in the abusive attempted power of all aspects of the federal government. It needs to be cut down in its focus of arbitrary decisions over the life and freedoms of all citizens, cut back in size, cutt back in wasteful, needless spending, and allow the states and all citizens the veto over egregious unlawful rulings.

Comments provided by :  
Wistrand, Gerald

=====

=====

It is clear that from the earliest days of the Republic that the right of Americans to engage in speech on matters of public concern (including both issues before the government and candidates for office), both individually and as a part of larger groups of like-minded individuals. Such speech is clearly protected by the First Amendment to the United States Constitution. What's more, that speech is also clearly protected whether the speaker is clearly identified or speaks anonymously through the use of a pseudonym or as part of an organization to which one has donated. The public debate over the ratification of the Constitution was enriched by anonymous and pseudonymous articles and pamphlets which have become known collectively as the Federalist Papers and the Anti-Federalist Papers published under such names as Publius, Brutus, Americanus, Centinel, and a host of other pen names -- and the true identities of some of the authors never became public.

At other times in our history, the corporate speech of groups concerned with certain issues has been key to many political and social advances, though the identities of individual members and donors has been withheld by the larger group. During the civil rights era in the middle third of the twentieth century, the NAACP often commented on political issues (as it does to this day). Various states, in an effort silence the group, sought to unmask its members and donors and subject them to harassment under the guise of the public having a "right to know" who was behind a group seeking to influence laws and elections. As the U.S. Supreme Court emphatically held in NAACP v. Alabama, 357 U.S. 449 (1958), such groups their members, and their donors are not required to choose between their right to privacy and their right to speak freely simply because they choose to corporately enter the public arena by forming, joining, and financially supporting organizations that speak on public matters. These regulations ride roughshod over those rights. The mere fact that today's disfavored speakers are identified as "conservative" and those seeking to unmask them are "liberal", "progressive", or advocates for "openness" or "good government" does not undercut the reasoning and principles at the heart of that decision which in its original context protected civil rights advocates from racist groups such as the Ku Klux Klan. Nor does it matter that the NAACP was respected and popular while the impacted groups today may have less public support and court decisions protecting their speech have been unpopular in certain quarters. The Constitution and the laws of the United States and the several states may make no such distinction between the rights of such groups, and it is beyond the scope of regulators such as the FEC to do so.

Ultimately, the regulations at issue here are a mishmash of redundancies and constitutional abominations. Independent spending by corporations and labor organizations and the identities of the donors behind such spending is already required under the law. Foreign nationals are already forbidden from making donations directly or indirectly. Coercion of employees and members is already forbidden, as is coordination with campaigns. Therefore the provisions of REG 2015-04 seeking to prohibit such things are unnecessary. The rest of REG 2015-04 is directed at undermining the constitutional holding of the Supreme Court decision in Citizens United v. FEC, 588 US 310, which is clearly beyond the authority of the FEC as a matter of both statutory and constitutional law. It is therefore constitutionally, legally, and morally imperative that the FEC reject the proposed regulations.

Comments provided by :  
Aydt, Gregory

=====

=====

Please respect the rights of donors to contribute to causes that they care about without being harassed.  
People have lost their jobs and had their reputations besmirched by people who disagree with them on completely unrelated issues.  
The wealthy will always find a way to have a voice in politics whether above or below the table.  
Please do not strip away the rights of the poor to give even a little to causes that they support.  
Most cannot afford to loose their jobs through intimidation at the workplace.  
People and organizations in power can destroy the rights of those with whom they disagree.  
This fear applies to all political affiliations, because pendulums swing.  
Those who would choose to abuse power today, may become the victims in retaliatory strikes tomorrow.

Furthermore:

The petition on which I am commenting is an attempt to force nonprofit advocacy organizations that are not political committees and that do not spend a majority of their time and resources on candidate-related activity to reveal their donors, something they are not required to do by federal law or IRS regulations.  
In fact, the fundamental rights of association, privacy, and free speech of such organizations and their donors are protected by the First Amendment, as the U.S. Supreme Court held in NAACP v. Alabama, 357 U.S. 449 (1958).

The First Amendment protects the rights of those who challenge authority, as the NAACP did then, and as conservative groups do now, as there is generally no need to protect the voice of authority, which, when backed by the power of government, can readily act to stifle dissent from Government policies.

Thank you. Jo

Comments provided by :  
Sa, J

=====

=====

People need to be allowed to support causes without being forced out of their jobs. Brendan Eich, former CEO of Mozilla, was forced to resign because his name was illegally associated with a cause for traditional marriage. Californians agreed with Eich, and passed the law. A homosexual judge struck it down. A few years later, Mozilla's board disagreed with Eich's position and forced him to retire. This was because a campaign was launched against him. There are other similar cases. The American government can no longer exist, if people can not afford to support their candidates and causes. To be free, the American people need to be able to afford to advocate their cause. Citizens United should not be required to list their donors.

Comments provided by :  
Doll, Joseph

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Troy\_III\_William\_10\_27\_2015\_12\_11\_06\_CommentText.txt

=====

This is an ill-considered rule which will burden the free association rights of many donors to lawful organizations.

Comments provided by :  
Troy III, William

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Price\_James\_10\_27\_2015\_12\_12\_32\_CommentText.txt

=====

The FEC has no legal or constitutional right issue REG 2015-04 ! Keep your nose out of our personal bussines.

Comments provided by :  
Price, James

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Jacobsen\_Ried\_10\_27\_2015\_12\_12\_54\_CommentText.txt

=====

I do not understand why the FEC is considering requiring the disclosure of names. This is contrary to previous court decisions allowing union and election vote identification to remain secret.

This rule is unneeded and should not be allowed to pass.

Comments provided by :  
Jacobsen, Ried

=====



Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Roe\_Delbert\_10\_27\_2015\_12\_13\_18\_CommentText.txt

=====

I am not in favor of this attempt to further regulate free speech. Do not do this!

Comments provided by :  
Roe, Delbert

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Darling,\_Jr.\_Rex\_10\_27\_2015\_12\_14\_23\_CommentText.txt

=====

I am outraged at this attempt to expose supporters of these organizations just so union thugs can be bussed in to stand on the lawns of pvt citizens and threaten their families (as happened in N.J.) or expose individuals to retribution at their place of work. The actions being contemplated are thug statist pressure tactics that have NO PLACE in a true Republic. DO NOT enact these measures!

Comments provided by :

Darling, Jr., Rex

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Adams\_Veronica\_10\_27\_2015\_12\_20\_52\_CommentText.txt

=====

I don't support forcing non-profit organizations to disclose the names of donors. This exposes donors to harassment from individuals and organizations that want to trample their First Amendment rights.

Veronica Adams

-Last of the Freedom Loving Americans

Comments provided by :

Adams, Veronica

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_yerger\_rucks\_10\_27\_2015\_12\_20\_53\_CommentText.txt

=====

Requiring the disclosure of donors to organizations such as political action committees would be a violation of the fundamental rights of association, privacy, and free speech of such organizations and their donors as protected by the First Amendment. Cf. NAACP v. Alabama, 357 U.S. 449 (1958).

Comments provided by :  
yerger, rucks

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Holmes\_Liz\_10\_27\_2015\_12\_24\_32\_CommentText.txt

=====

Harassment of financial donors to conservative causes has become one of the standard tactics of the militant left. Please respect the First Amendment to our American Constitution. I oppose new federal powers over our political freedom. DO NOT UNDO THE CITIZENS UNITED CASE.

Comments provided by :  
Holmes, Liz

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Wanamaker\_Roger\_10\_27\_2015\_12\_24\_26\_CommentText.txt

=====

I don't believe rules should be changed to required donors names be disclosed for non profit organizations.

Comments provided by :  
Wanamaker, Roger

=====

=====

Please respect the 1st Amendment to the Constitution and specifically the concept of free speech.

The Supreme Court has ruled that political donations are protected speech. Requiring groups to disclose their donor lists would open said donors to harassment, even physical harm from individuals or groups holding opposing views.

This would serve to discourage and chill free speech by making individuals hesitant to make donations for fear of ending up on an "enemies list". We have already seen individuals lose their livelihood and have their families threatened for exercising their constitutional rights. Some may have even been subject to IRS audits because of their political beliefs.

This rule would significantly erode one of our most cherished constitutional protections.

The right of an individual to express his/her opinion, even if it is unpopular, or even heinous is protected. The United States is governed by the rule of law, not of men.

This rule serves only the rule of the mob, or of tyrants.

Comments provided by :  
Carlson, Patricia

=====

=====

I am concerned about the prospective decision to require nonprofit groups to reveal individual donors.

In NAACP vs. Alabama the court ruled that just such an action would effectively subject private citizens to hardship for expressing their views via the financial support of an organization aligned with them. Recent history demonstrates (Mozilla v. Brendan Eich, the IRS issues per Lois Lerner, et al.) that the willingness to stifle free speech is alive and well and made easier due to the proliferation of online avenues that enable the "public shaming" that destroys lives and livelihoods.

Your consideration of such an action at this time is of concern because it shows that you no longer respect the rights of private citizens to support causes that they care about without being harassed.

Rather than curtailing the influence of a few, your action will curtail the voice of countless average Americans, a voice that continues to be stomped out by a burgeoning "mob" mentality.

Too bad people don't study history, like the French Revolution. If actions such as this become the rule (which now trumps law), we are bound to find ourselves repeating some very ugly times.

Comments provided by :  
Kester, Pamela

=====



Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Sass\_\_Will\_10\_27\_2015\_12\_28\_59\_CommentText.txt

=====

When this nation was founded, it was founded under the principles of Due Process and Freedom. King George wanted to stamp out Thomas Paine's Common Sense, The Catholic Church wanted to stamp out Luther's Pamphlets.

All thought time, the govt has sought to overthrow the will of the people by any means necessary.

Time will judge us if we stood for what is right and what is wrong.

Why are you not Pro-Choice when it comes to Free Speech but seek to control that speech.

Why do you not shut down Newspapers? Why do you not shut down hateful speech if that speech is from a "protected group".

I am astonished that this is even an issue...after all Roe v Wade is law...why do you seek to overturn a ruling by the Supreme Court.

This is the Law of the Land.

Comments provided by :

Sass, Will

=====

=====

This petition is an attempt to force nonprofit advocacy organizations that are not political committees and that do not spend a majority of their time and resources on candidate-related activity to reveal their donors, something they are not required to do by federal law or IRS regulations. In fact, the fundamental rights of association, privacy, and free speech of such organizations and their donors are protected by the First Amendment, as the U.S. Supreme Court held in NAACP v. Alabama, 357 U.S. 449 (1958).

Such mandated disclosure has no purpose other than to try to open up the donors of such organizations to harassment and intimidation for their political and social beliefs in associating with particular membership organizations. The FEC has no statutory authority to mandate such disclosure of organizations that are not political committees.

Comments provided by :  
Whelan, Kathlene

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Marcellus\_Regina\_10\_27\_2015\_12\_31\_21\_CommentText.txt

=====

Please do not undo the Citizens United ruling by forcing non-profit organizations to reveal a list of donors.  
This is not required by federal law or by IRS regulations.

Comments provided by :  
Marcellus, Regina

=====

=====

As a US citizen, I am asking the Federal Election Commission to abandon immediately, any and all efforts to go around the Citizens United ruling to regulate speech. Of particular interest is the fact that rule changes being considered by the FEC could force some non-profit groups to make their donor lists public. There is no compelling reason to do this, and it is not required by any law passed by Congress. In fact, it was declared illegal in the case of NAACP v. Alabama, 357 U.S. 449 (1958). The end result of such a rule is an attack on free speech, as it could result in the stifling of donations to the non-profits. It would become worse for donors if they are targeted by extremists with differing opinions of the non-profit. The only purpose of such a rule would be to shut down opposing opinions. This is clearly wrong for the USA.

Comments provided by :  
Passaro, Donna

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Harbin\_Daniel\_10\_27\_2015\_12\_33\_42\_CommentText.txt

=====

The disclosure of donors in public information will foster a pogrom on these donors and in fact anyone disclosed. This is basically an invitation to a witch hunt, persecuting innocent people for their beliefs.

Comments provided by :  
Harbin, Daniel

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_miller\_arthur\_10\_27\_2015\_12\_34\_18\_CommentText.txt

=====

Please respect the 1st amendment, and abandon this attempt to regulate free speech.    thank you

Comments provided by :  
miller, arthur

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Artinger\_Carl\_10\_27\_2015\_12\_37\_06\_CommentText.txt

=====

I am opposed to requiring names of donors to Political Action Committees.

Donations to PACs should be confidential and anonymous.

Please do not create regulations that require disclosusre of Donor information.

Thanks.

Comments provided by :  
Artinger, Carl

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Ritter\_Roger\_10\_27\_2015\_12\_41\_07\_CommentText.txt

=====

I oppose Reg. 2015-04. Anonymity has long been a feature of political donation and commentary in the US, and is fully protected by existing law and court decisions. A regulation requiring that essentially non-political groups reveal their donor lists is in contradiction to current law, and should not be mandated or enforced.

Comments provided by :  
Ritter, Roger

=====



Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Vasarhelyi\_Jane\_10\_27\_2015\_12\_48\_00\_CommentText.txt

=====

Hello:

I am writing to OPPOSE the proposed rule-making which would force non-profit organizations to disclose the names of donors.

Yours truly,  
Jane Vasarhelyi

Comments provided by :  
Vasarhelyi, Jane

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Steinacker\_Dale\_10\_27\_2015\_12\_54\_51\_CommentText.txt

=====

As a former college newspaper editor and a Political science major, I am a strong supporter of the right of people to participate in the political system without the risk of intimidation.

I see a need for the ability for unpopular causes (like civil rights in southern states in the early 50's) to get support without the donors being identified.

I strongly oppose any attempt to limit Citizens United or give any government agency the ability to demand the names of donors.

Comments provided by :  
Steinacker, Dale

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Schultze\_George\_10\_27\_2015\_12\_57\_26\_CommentText.txt

=====

This is an unnecessary infringement on our right to privacy, and will only be used for the harassment of those who donate to issues and causes with opposing views or beliefs. This will create another unneeded regulatory burden on the PACs. What other reason might the FEC have for this information?

Comments provided by :  
Schultze, George

=====

=====

This rulemaking is a blatant attempt to make it easier to harass and suppress those whose beliefs offend the increasingly narrow cultural niche of the secular elite and the left in general whenever the unanionted organize to express and advance such beliefs.

If Disney, Viacom, NBS Universal or the Washington Post choose to advance a political view it's fine but if a group of private citizens (e.g., Citizens United) do the same then they must be slapped down. And the FEC wants to deliver their names and addresses to those will do the slapping.

We saw in the refusal of federal law enforcement to investigate blatant political abuse by the IRS the truth that federal enforcement employees can no longer be trusted to be impartial now that they (including, if not especially Lois Lerner's former co-workers at the FEC) see themselves as a partisan interest group. The very fact that this rulemaking cites Citizens United makes it pretty clear who FEC staff will go after (and who they won't).

This rule is expressly intended be used to punish opponents of expanded government power or other now-heretical positions. It is designed to aid the ugliest punitive tendencies of the hard left.

Comments provided by :  
Tobin, George

=====

=====

It is apparent to all that this FEC proposal is linked to efforts to bypass the Citizens United case. The First Amendment is simple enough that almost everyone outside government gets it and it is clear this proposed agency rule impinges on that fundamental right. It is NOT the place of an agency, which is not representative of any voter constituency, to tinker with this fundamental part of the Bill of Rights. Nor is it the place of unelected agency members to insert their political agendas into the voting or elective process. That is more the realm of third world dictatorships, not a representative democracy. Please focus on keeping the voting process clean at the voting booth. That is where the action is and that is where your agency's efforts should be focused like the proverbial laser. Leave important voting legislation to those who are elected. And if they disregard voter wishes they will be accountable, unlike agency appointees.

Comments provided by :  
Falconer, Russell

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Mayer\_William\_H\_10\_27\_2015\_12\_59\_32\_CommentText.txt

=====

I urge the FEC to cease and desist any all attempts to target conservative groups and corporations exercising their rights as guaranteed by the Citizens United ruling.

Comments provided by :

Mayer, William H

=====

=====

Does the FEC wish to enable harassment of contributors to conservative nonprofits? That's what would happen if the proposed regulation to require disclosure of the names of donors to nonprofit groups that are engaged in some political activities. Please do not take this step that would infringe on the First Amendment rights of contributors to keep their names protected from targeting by opponents of conservative groups. For the life of me, I can't understand why the FEC would want to wade into this controversy. It is unAmerican to push through such a regulation, especially in light of the Citizens United decision. Americans are still reeling from the IRS scandal. Please don't add to the distrust citizens already harbor toward the federal government. Thank you for considering these comments.

Comments provided by :  
Brvenik, Mary

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Churchwell\_Logan\_10\_27\_2015\_13\_01\_53\_CommentText.txt

=====

These petitions should be dismissed. The FEC risks adopting redundant regulations that would carry the agency well beyond its statutory authority for the purpose of overturning Citizens United v. FEC, 558 U.S. 310 (2010).

Comments provided by :  
Churchwell, Logan

=====



=====

I strongly oppose Federal election requirements that expose the names of donors to organizations that espouse positions and beliefs about the direction of the nation. It is the content of the statements of such organizations that needs to be heard and debated, not the names of the individuals or organizations supporting the statements. To me, it is McCarthy-like -- 'I have here the names of...' -- in the strongest sense to cause the privacy of persons to be invaded.

Comments provided by :  
Wolverton, Lincoln

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_O'Brien\_Mark\_10\_27\_2015\_13\_04\_24\_CommentText.txt

=====

Do not require that independent groups disclose donors as this will expose said donors to harassment.  
Thank you.

Comments provided by :  
O'Brien, Mark

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_lion\_sean\_10\_27\_2015\_13\_04\_17\_CommentText.txt

=====

Do not allow any rules to be issued regarding the disclosure of donor identities in an effort to get around the Citizens United decision. The ruling by the supreme court is clear on this issue. All first amendment voices must be heard.

Comments provided by :  
lion, sean

=====

=====

As the electorate becomes increasingly contentious and fractured, and as the internet has given rise to a generation of people who do not understand civil discourse, we must insure that our freedom of speech and associations are protected. We have seen how in the course of the last few years the disclosing of donations to political causes has created a "witch hunt" environment. The rapidly changing social mores rebounding on people whose views were once unexceptional, now pilloried as unforgivable. The targets are doxxed, harrassed, fired, forced to resign, slandered, and intimidated. Some people are ruined, some feel forced to retract their political speech in fear for their lives, loved ones, and livelihoods.

Do not change the rules of disclosure.

Comments provided by :  
Sinclair, Taleena

=====

=====

Reg 2015-04 is an outrageous, unconstitutional attempt to force nonprofit advocacy organizations that are not political committees and that do not spend a majority of their time and resources on candidate-related activity to reveal their donors, something they are not required to do by federal law or IRS regulations. In fact, the fundamental rights of association, privacy, and free speech of such organizations and their donors are protected by the First Amendment, as the U.S. Supreme Court held in NAACP v. Alabama, 357 U.S. 449 (1958).

Such mandated disclosure has no purpose other than to try to open up the donors of such organizations to harassment and intimidation for their political and social beliefs in associating with particular membership organizations. The FEC has no statutory authority to mandate such disclosure of organizations that are not political committees.

Comments provided by :  
Weiss-Morris, Loretta

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Caselton\_Marilyn\_10\_27\_2015\_13\_14\_26\_CommentText.txt

=====

The Supreme Court ruled the First Amendment applies to everyone: unions, individuals, and corporations supporting their interests through free speech.

Forcing Citizens United to reveal their donors violates the speech rights of these donors. It also exposes them to harassment by those who disagree with them. This rule is not just unconstitutional, it puts real people at risk

Comments provided by :  
Caselton, Marilyn

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Farcasiu\_Simina\_10\_27\_2015\_13\_34\_27\_CommentText.txt

=====

Please do not attempt to subvert Citizens United; specifically, do not promulgate regulations purporting to force nonprofit organizations to disclose the identity of their donors.

Comments provided by :  
Farcasiu, Simina

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Fuller\_Dalen\_10\_27\_2015\_13\_40\_22\_CommentText.txt

=====

I am writing on behalf of the decision you will be making regarding Citizens United (keeping donors information private). I am urging you to keep the ruling the Supreme Court made as is.

Thank you

Comments provided by :  
Fuller, Dalen

=====



Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_McLaughlin\_John\_10\_27\_2015\_13\_42\_06\_CommentText.txt

=====

Do not move forward with plans to require non profits to list doners. This will have the effect of nullifying the First Amendment for many of these groups. Harrasment of these doners has occured in the past. This law. if passed would open a floodgate personal retaliation against donors, not just the group.

Comments provided by :  
McLaughlin, John

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Roberson\_John\_10\_27\_2015\_14\_02\_09\_CommentText.txt

=====

Please do not restrict the Freedom of speech guaranteed to "Citizens United" under the Constitution of the United States of America.

Comments provided by :  
Roberson, John

=====

=====

More than a half century ago the in the landmark case of NAACP vs. Alabama the citizens of the USA saw the Supreme Court protect the NAACP from having to disclose supporter information because of the harassment campaigns that would follow.

Numerous times different sides have hounded their opponent's donors in attempts to cause both emotional and fiscal harm. Harassment of financial donors to conservative causes has become one of the standard tactics of the militant left. The speech regulations issued by the Federal Election Commission are therefore a necessary component of snuffing out financial support for conservative causes through the accompanying harassment campaigns.

We have free speech for a reason. We have the first amendment for a reason. It is to stop the overweening government from seizing more and more power.

The FEC must NOT regulate speech. They MUST embrace the freedom of no-holds political speech.

This end-run around Citizens United shows deep and partisan bias as it impacts one side of the political argument much more and therefore causes them greater harm.

This rulemaking must be abandoned. This rule must NOT be approved.

Comments provided by :  
Wells, Guy

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Gregory\_Pamela\_10\_27\_2015\_14\_12\_31\_CommentText.txt

=====

I have heard that President Barack Obama's Federal Election Commission (FEC) "is considering rules which would force non-profit organizations — such as a pro-life organization — to disclose the names of donors," reported PJ Media.

I am so against this and against this Government grabbing power away from the people. This country was founded on the people ruling the government not the other way around! Lets restore our Nation before it is completely destroy!

Most concerned Legal Citizen of these United States of America!  
Pamela G. Gregory

Comments provided by :  
Gregory, Pamela

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Canning\_John\_10\_27\_2015\_14\_13\_34\_CommentText.txt

=====

I strongly request you not consider rules which would force non-profit organizations — such as a pro-life organization — to disclose the names of donors.

Comments provided by :  
Canning, John

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Waddell\_Martha\_10\_27\_2015\_14\_13\_47\_CommentText.txt

=====

The FEC should STOP efforts to regulate free speech, specifically disclosing names of donors to non-profit organizations. If this is allowed to happen, you are allowing for the abuse of said donors by the fanatical followers of those that are opposed.  
SHAME ON YOU!

Comments provided by :  
Waddell, Martha

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Carrigan\_Steve\_10\_27\_2015\_14\_18\_16\_CommentText.txt

=====

Such mandated disclosure has no purpose other than to try to open up the donors of such organizations to harassment and intimidation for their political and social beliefs in associating with particular membership organizations. The FEC has no statutory authority to mandate such disclosure of organizations that are not political committees.

Comments provided by :  
Carrigan, Steve

=====

=====

I am utterly opposed to the proposed rules requiring disclosure of donor lists.

They are an attempt to force nonprofit advocacy organizations that are not political committees and that do not spend a majority of their time and resources on candidate-related activity to reveal their donors, something they are not required to do by federal law or IRS regulations. In fact, the fundamental rights of association, privacy, and free speech of such organizations and their donors are protected by the First Amendment, as the U.S. Supreme Court held in NAACP v. Alabama, 357 U.S. 449 (1958).

Such mandated disclosure has no purpose other than to try to open up the donors of such organizations to harassment and intimidation for their political and social beliefs in associating with particular membership organizations. The FEC has no statutory authority to mandate such disclosure of organizations that are not political committees.

Comments provided by :  
Kollmorgen, Dan

=====



=====

Changing the rules on REG 2015-04 Independent Spending by Corporations, Labor Organizations, Foreign Nationals, and Certain Political Committees (Citizens United) will invite hostile harassment of individuals and groups that donate to a full spectrum of political groups.

This petition is an attempt to force nonprofit advocacy organizations that are not political committees and that do not spend a majority of their time and resources on candidate-related activity to reveal their donors, something they are not required to do by federal law or IRS regulations. In fact, the fundamental rights of association, privacy, and free speech of such organizations and their donors are protected by the First Amendment, as the U.S. Supreme Court held in NAACP v. Alabama, 357 U.S. 449 (1958).

Such mandated disclosure has no purpose other than to try to open up the donors of such organizations to harassment and intimidation for their political and social beliefs in associating with particular membership organizations. The FEC has no statutory authority to mandate such disclosure of organizations that are not political committees.

Please keep donor identities private.

DK

Comments provided by :  
Koss, Daryl

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Rogers\_Dan\_10\_27\_2015\_14\_41\_56\_CommentText.txt

=====

This regulation clearly violates the 1st Amendment to our constitution that you swore to uphold while serving our nation. I oppose this regulation no matter the context or framing by the author's to regulate speech.

Comments provided by :  
Rogers, Dan

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Rembowski\_Jeff\_10\_27\_2015\_14\_41\_36\_CommentText.txt

=====

Please do not go through with this. I only allows bigotry and hatred to be spread while people are just trying to help other people anonymously. Leave things well enough alone!!!

Comments provided by :  
Rembowski, Jeff

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Shockley\_Mike\_10\_27\_2015\_14\_49\_13\_CommentText.txt

=====

Thank you for taking the time to review comments regarding political contributions. The freedom of anyone and any organization to contribute to individuals or groups for any reason is protected by the first amendment. The Supreme Court of the US has already produced a ruling codifying this right and any attempts to circumvent the will of the people is rightly viewed as intentional infringement of their rights.

Please do not implement regulations that impinge anyone's free speech rights.

Thank you and have a blessed day.

Comments provided by :  
Shockley, Mike

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Mondosanto\_Arigo\_10\_27\_2015\_14\_50\_23\_CommentText.txt

=====

The FEC has no mandate or constitutional authority to require non-profit advocacy organizations from releasing donor lists.

Comments provided by :  
Mondosanto, Arigo

=====

=====

This petition is an attempt to force nonprofit advocacy organizations that are not political committees and that do not spend a majority of their time and resources on candidate-related activity to reveal their donors, something they are not required to do by federal law or IRS regulations. In fact, the fundamental rights of association, privacy, and free speech of such organizations and their donors are protected by the First Amendment, as the U.S. Supreme Court held in NAACP v. Alabama, 357 U.S. 449 (1958).

Such mandated disclosure has no purpose other than to try to open up the donors of such organizations to harassment and intimidation for their political and social beliefs in associating with particular membership organizations. The FEC has no statutory authority to mandate such disclosure of organizations that are not political committees.

Comments provided by :  
Kelly, William

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Jones\_Robert\_10\_27\_2015\_14\_55\_57\_CommentText.txt

=====

Donors names to ANY private group should remain private so that the donors themselves are not subject to harassment from opposition. This is a basic protection under the First Amendment which has been upheld in the U.S. Supreme Court, NAACP v. Alabama, 357 U.S. 449 (1958).

Disclosure of donors has no other purpose than to try to expose the donors to harassment and intimidation for their political and social beliefs in associating with particular membership organizations.

Comments provided by :  
Jones, Robert

=====

=====

I agree with the following from the Public Interest Legal Foundation:

This petition is an attempt to force nonprofit advocacy organizations that are not political committees and that do not spend a majority of their time and resources on candidate-related activity to reveal their donors, something they are not required to do by federal law or IRS regulations. In fact, the fundamental rights of association, privacy, and free speech of such organizations and their donors are protected by the First Amendment, as the U.S. Supreme Court held in NAACP v. Alabama, 357 U.S. 449 (1958).

Such mandated disclosure has no purpose other than to try to open up the donors of such organizations to harassment and intimidation for their political and social beliefs in associating with particular membership organizations. The FEC has no statutory authority to mandate such disclosure of organizations that are not political committees.

Comments provided by :  
Cromwell, Mark

=====



Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Livingston\_Beth\_10\_27\_2015\_15\_12\_20\_CommentText.txt

=====

Stop this before we all lose our rights.

Comments provided by :  
Livingston, Beth

=====

=====

You need to leave non-profit corporations alone. Your proposal will result in more harassment of those who disagree with the crazy liberal and progressive proposals that are destroying this country. And, since you ARE a government entity, you probably are not aware of the laws regarding harassment, so let me introduce you to them.

Cyberstalking. Cyberstalking is the use of the Internet, email or other electronic communications to stalk, and generally refers to a pattern of threatening or malicious behaviors. Cyberstalking may be considered the most dangerous of the three types of Internet harassment, based on a posing credible threat of harm. Sanctions range from misdemeanors to felonies.

Cyberharassment. Cyberharassment differs from cyberstalking in that it may generally be defined as not involving a credible threat. Cyberharassment usually pertains to threatening or harassing email messages, instant messages, or to blog entries or websites dedicated solely to tormenting an individual. Some states approach cyberharrassment by including language addressing electronic communications in general harassment statutes, while others have created stand-alone cyberharassment statutes.

So you really want to see all of this administrations brainless, insane supporters end up in jail?

Comments provided by :  
Saunders, Heather

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Stanard\_B.\_10\_27\_2015\_15\_27\_10\_CommentText.txt

=====

The FEC has no authority to skirt the law. This dangerous change must not be allowed.

Comments provided by :  
Stanard, B.

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_kruse\_jean\_10\_27\_2015\_15\_28\_44\_CommentText.txt

=====

Non-profit advocacy groups are not required by federal law or IRS regulations to reveal their donors. The FEC has no statutory authority to make this mandate. Do not violate the free speech and privacy rights of donors and open them to harassment and intimidation.

Comments provided by :  
kruse, jean

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Ewald\_Mel\_10\_27\_2015\_15\_29\_54\_CommentText.txt

=====

The First Amendment is clear and allows no room for regulation of speech, particularly political speech. Attempts to circumvent the "Citizens United" ruling will be seen for what they are. Members of the Federal Election Commission who exceed their authority in pursuit of this political, unconstitutional agenda will be held to account.

Comments provided by :  
Ewald, Mel

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Elwyn\_Patricia\_10\_27\_2015\_15\_35\_08\_CommentText.txt

=====

Please, please, please STOP all your regulations and let us live in our country as we used to do--without all the spying, red tape, and political propaganda.

I can't believe what our country has become!

Way past time to stop all the nonsense!

Comments provided by :

Elwyn, Patricia

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Rehwinkle\_Ed\_10\_27\_2015\_15\_36\_25\_CommentText.txt

=====

It's important to maintain the privacy of donors to political causes, just as it's important to maintain the anonymity of a person's vote. Please keep donor lists private.

Comments provided by :  
Rehwinkle, Ed

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Reynolds\_John\_10\_27\_2015\_15\_39\_38\_CommentText.txt

=====

Do not proceed with plans to require donor information relative to independent contributors as proposed in REG 2015-04. This type of infringement on free speech should not be tolerated. What are you thinking???

Comments provided by :  
Reynolds, John

=====



Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Murphy\_Michael\_10\_27\_2015\_15\_50\_33\_CommentText.txt

=====

Unless the FCC can provide a Constitutional or statutory basis for the authority to take this action they  
MUST not do it.

Comments provided by :  
Murphy, Michael

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Blank\_Charles\_10\_27\_2015\_15\_56\_22\_CommentText.txt

=====

My 1st amendment rights are important to me and I want to be able to express my support to any organization I wish without being tracked or identified. When government tracking occurs, abuses soon follow.

Comments provided by :  
Blank, Charles

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Long\_Rosa\_10\_27\_2015\_16\_05\_34\_CommentText.txt

=====

Please stop taking our freedoms away. Stop trying to undo Citizens United and cease your efforts to regulate our rights to FREE speech. Stop it NOW!

Comments provided by :  
Long, Rosa

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Wolf\_Brian\_10\_27\_2015\_16\_07\_14\_CommentText.txt

=====

Please preserve the will of the people and the Supreme court decision regarding Citizens United and our rights to free speech.

Comments provided by :  
Wolf, Brian

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Lee\_Charles\_10\_27\_2015\_16\_09\_17\_CommentText.txt

=====

The proposed rule change will create opportunities for harassment of donors by others who disagree. This could include present employers, neighbors, and even those who do not have a relationship with the donor. Such a change could result in an applicant for a job to be discriminated against based on the cause. Please do not change the rule and interfere with my ability to donate to causes without being targeted or harassed.

Comments provided by :  
Lee, Charles

=====

=====

The Federal Election Commission is considering rules which could force non-profit organizations — such as a pro-life organization — to disclose the names of donors. The speech-regulating Left has long been in favor of forced donor disclosure, because it facilitates their most fanatical followers unleashing abuse on those donors. See what happened to the owner of the Houston Texans when he supported an effort to block a transgender referendum in Houston.

Harassment of financial donors to conservative causes has become one of the standard tactics of the militant left. Speech regulations issued by the Federal Election Commission are therefore a necessary component of snuffing out financial support for conservative causes through harassment campaigns.

A half-century ago, liberal groups understood and respected this. The landmark case of NAACP vs. Alabama saw the Supreme Court protect the NAACP from having to disclose supporter information because of the harassment campaign that would follow.

Now with perfect hypocrisy, the PAC that issued the petition which triggered the FEC to consider rulemaking which would force disclosure of information does not disclose the full name of its leader. On the page detailing who runs Make Your Laws PAC, Inc, the founder, treasurer and director is listed merely as “Sai”.

The Public Interest Legal Foundation has already submitted comments to the FEC opposing new federal powers over political freedom. Those comments can be found here. I also oppose more power for Washington bureaucrats to pry private information from groups who speak out.

I want this stopped; Washington stops listening late on Tuesday, October 27 2015!

Comments provided by :  
Giargiari, Robert C

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Blase\_William\_10\_27\_2015\_16\_33\_13\_CommentText.txt

=====

The Useful Idiots of the Left only wish to have personal donor information publicly available so that they can slander, threaten, harass and intimidate their political enemies. This is not only Un-American, it is treasonous. Every American has the right to contribute to political causes without the fear they will be slandered and harassed, no doubt by anonymous leftist operatives.

Comments provided by :  
Blase, William

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Wiatrowski\_Sandra\_10\_27\_2015\_16\_36\_37\_CommentText.txt

=====

Corporations, unions and other organizations such as these act upon the wishes of their members and should be recognized as their agents. Individuals have every right to expect that the product of their labors be utilized in manners that further their ability to pursue their happiness. SCOTUS found rightly in the Citizens United matter and this issue need not be ligated again.

Comments provided by :  
Wiatrowski, Sandra

=====



=====

Gentlemen:

I am asking the FEC to please respect the First Amendment to the Constitution and stop the people who are trying to force non-profit organizations, such as pro-life organizations, to disclose the names of donors, and to abandon these efforts to regulate speech.

jean Ricketts

Comments provided by :  
Ricketts, Marjorie Jean

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Sonnellitter\_Robert\_10\_27\_2015\_16\_45\_17\_CommentText.txt

=====

Dear Sirs/Madams:

Please do not make REG 2015-04 because I believe it would discourage people from exercising their free speech rights.

Comments provided by :  
Sonnellitter, Robert

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Black\_Eugene\_10\_27\_2015\_16\_53\_38\_CommentText.txt

=====

This proposed regulation is a BALD-FACED attempt to undo the Supreme Court's decision on Citizens United. The LEFTISTS in the present administration do not line large organizations -- OTHER THAN UNIONS, that is -- having a voice in American politics.

If this decision is taken, I shall do everything in my power to undermine it, including encouraging my Congressional Representatives and Senators to pass legislation setting it aside.

Comments provided by :  
Black, Eugene

=====

=====

Mandated disclosure that the FEC proposes has no real purpose other than to identify the donors of certain organizations to harassment and intimidation because of their political and/or social beliefs.

The FEC does not now, nor should they ever possess the authority to mandate disclosure of the names of those who choose to donate to organizations that may not be in agreement with those presently holding high elected office, or their subordinates.

Comments provided by :  
Anderson, Paul

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Vickers\_Lloyd\_10\_27\_2015\_17\_07\_23\_CommentText.txt

=====

Obama is trying yet another way to persecute Conservatives.  
The Left wants to know who their enemies, as they see it, without invading  
the privacy of their donors.

Comments provided by :  
Vickers, Lloyd

=====

=====

I want to urge that you respect the First Amendment rights of all American people. There rights belong to all organizations and individuals to support candidates and political ideals of all stripes. It is not reasonable for the Federal Government through it agencies to attempt to intimidate people with unpopular points of view from supporting people and ideas they choose. Corporations, Labor Organizations and Political Committees must be protected by you at all costs. I do not believe that Foreign Nationals should have any standing in the Politics of the American people.

Comments provided by :  
O'Connor, Helen

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Orham\_David\_10\_27\_2015\_17\_45\_59\_CommentText.txt

=====

I am writing to confirm comments submitted by the Public Interest Legal Foundation to this proposed rule. Donors to non-profit corporations should not fear that their personal data will be released for public consumption.

I ask you to not pursue the publishing and implementation of this proposed rule.

Comments provided by :

Orham, David

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Alexander\_Suzanne\_10\_27\_2015\_17\_53\_00\_CommentText.txt

=====

Please respect the First Amendment and stop trying to regulate free speech.

Comments provided by :  
Alexander, Suzanne

=====



=====

To Whom It May Concern at the FEC,

I am objecting to any change in procedure regarding reporting of donors. The First Amendment guarantees freedom of speech. The Supreme Court has agreed it applies to all in their Citizens United ruling. You must protect the privacy of all and the right to free speech.  
Again, I OBJECT to any changes regarding this decision.

Sincerely,  
Glenroy Schissler

Comments provided by :  
Schissler, Glenroy

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_McKinney\_Kelly\_10\_27\_2015\_18\_08\_47\_CommentText.txt

=====

I am asking that you DO NOT move forward with revealing donor disclosure list.

Comments provided by :  
McKinney, Kelly

=====

=====

Our democratic republic is in jeopardy if money is equivalent to speech. That leaves the less fortunate with less voice in a land where all persons are created equal. There are countless examples of money corrupting politics on all sides of the political spectrum, and our country is moving to make that influence invisible to the people the politicians are supposed to be representing. You can secretly influence politicians and the public by giving to pseudo "educational organizations" that skirt campaign reporting by omitting 2 small words "vote for" or "vote against". Politicians are coordinating with these groups making them an extension of their campaign. How can this be what our founders wanted?

On top of this, the "education" these organizations proliferate are borderline libelous with the truth far from the impression the ads would imply. They are plain and simple campaign ads without the disclosure that they are campaign ads and without knowing who is making the statement and their motives. For some of the organizations they promote a name that would imply they are concerned citizens like anyone else, when in fact they are powerful groups and individuals that have vested interest in the outcome of the election.

Please do something to regulate secret influence on our political process.

Comments provided by :  
Collier, Craig

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Wallace\_Virginia\_10\_27\_2015\_18\_26\_40\_CommentText.txt

=====

Stop this. Citizens United and all conservative groups have the right to free speech without disclosing their donors!!

Comments provided by :  
Wallace, Virginia

=====

=====

This petition is an attempt to force nonprofit advocacy organizations that are not political committees and that do not spend a majority of their time and resources on candidate-related activity to reveal their donors, something they are not required to do by federal law or IRS regulations. In fact, the fundamental rights of association, privacy, and free speech of such organizations and their donors are protected by the First Amendment. In addition, such mandated disclosure has no purpose other than to try to open up the donors of such organizations to harassment and intimidation for their political and social beliefs in associating with particular membership organizations. The FEC has no statutory authority to mandate such disclosure of organizations that are not political committees.

Comments provided by :  
Torson, Pamela

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Cooley\_Roy\_10\_27\_2015\_18\_52\_04\_CommentText.txt

=====

People should be able to donate anonymously. We have a fundamental right to privacy.

Comments provided by :  
Cooley, Roy

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Ellis\_James\_10\_27\_2015\_18\_55\_38\_CommentText.txt

=====

Comments regarding speech regulation.

I am requesting that the FEC stop and abandon any efforts to regulate speech or require non-profit organizations to disclose their financial donors or volunteers.

Comments provided by :

Ellis, James

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_DeShane\_Renée\_10\_27\_2015\_18\_55\_15\_CommentText.txt

=====

The Supreme Court has already ruled that corporations, which are made up of people, have a right to spend money on the candidate of their choice. Unions are made up of people and they spend money on the candidates they prefer so why not other groups? This action you are wanting to take is unlawful.

Comments provided by :  
DeShane, Ren  e

=====



=====

I am against the proposed FEC rules to force non-profit organizations — such as a pro-life organization — to disclose the names of donors. The Left has long been in favor of forced donor disclosure, because it facilitates their most fanatical followers unleashing abuse on those donors, leading to loss of jobs, exclusion from working in the government, or contributing their talents to society. The strategy unfairly targets individuals by an outsized larger group. The result of the proposed rules will be to inhibit the free exercise of association and speech. It is provocative and potentially destructive of liberty and the social fabric.

Comments provided by :  
Ortwerth, Eric

=====

=====

President Obama and the Southern Poverty Law Center have engaged in war against Christians. They have instigated attacks on faith based organizations by mentally unstable people.

When the FEC would force the disclosure of donors especially if the organization is Christian or a church, we have an increased concern that the organization will be physically attacked. This is born out by experience. Previously, we have had attacks on Focus on the Family and New Life Church in Colorado Springs, CO. Both the church and individual donors could be targeted. Further, this proposed regulation violates the Free Exercise of Religion. You would try to suppress people citing the Holy Bible to support policy prescriptions. The original Federalist Papers were not published under the names of their authors. What is different now? History and law makes this regulation unlawful, vengeful, and dictatorial.

As we have seen with mobs in Ferguson, MO we can have mobs attacking people.

Exodus 23 New International Version (NIV)

Laws of Justice and Mercy

23 “Do not spread false reports. Do not help a guilty person by being a malicious witness.

2 “Do not follow the crowd in doing wrong.

This seems more like an attempt to create a mob to attack people than an attempt to create fairness.

<http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/southern-poverty-law-center-website-triggered-frc-shooting/article/2520748>

<http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs12129-014-9411-x>

<http://www.nydailynews.com/news/national/shooting-oregon-umpqua-community-college-article-1.2381711>

<http://www.wsj.com/articles/mass-shootings-and-a-mental-health-disgrace-1444346679>

Comments provided by :  
Allen, Richard

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Johnston\_Cynthia\_10\_27\_2015\_19\_32\_10\_CommentText.txt

=====

The First Amendment for free speech is clear. It is a partisan ploy to undo Citizens United or put into place regulations that have the same effect. Stand for the Constitution and the American people and not the Democrat party, please.

Comments provided by :  
Johnston, Cynthia

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Burdo\_James\_10\_27\_2015\_19\_45\_20\_CommentText.txt

=====

I am strongly opposed to this regulation. The harassment Brendan Eich received for his contribution shows the danger of forced disclosure.

Comments provided by :  
Burdo, James

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Meyer\_Gail\_10\_27\_2015\_19\_47\_21\_CommentText.txt

=====

Please abandon your efforts to regulate speech. The First Amendment of our Bill of Rights needs to stand without your embellishment. Please leave it alone!

Comments provided by :  
Meyer, Gail

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Williams\_Randolph\_10\_27\_2015\_19\_51\_18\_CommentText.txt

=====

The tyranny & arrogance of this whole administration is way past time for IMPEACHMENT. Quit using the Constitution as your TP. You are not allowed to write law. That's what the Congress is there for. Thank you very much.

Comments provided by :  
Williams, Randolph

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Leake\_John\_10\_27\_2015\_19\_54\_08\_CommentText.txt

=====

I am firmly opposed to disclosure of donations to a group such as Citizens United. The proposed rule is in direct conflict with the Supreme Court decision. The proposed rule is a direct affront to privacy of donations.

Comments provided by :  
Leake, John

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Levy\_Brenda\_10\_27\_2015\_20\_09\_53\_CommentText.txt

=====

Please do not force non-profit organizations to disclose the names of their donors. These organizations are not political committees and do not spend a majority of their time on promoting candidates. Forcing them to disclose the names of their donors would violate their rights of association, free speech and privacy.

Comments provided by :  
Levy, Brenda

=====



Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Campana\_Anthony\_10\_27\_2015\_20\_16\_04\_CommentText.txt

=====

Sirs,

Respect the First Amendment, as clarified by the Supreme Court in Citizens United. No regulation is necessary.

Anthony J Campana

Comments provided by :  
Campana, Anthony

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_McLemore\_Mary\_10\_27\_2015\_20\_18\_42\_CommentText.txt

=====

The Federal Election Commission's push to force non-profit organizations — such as a pro-life organization — to disclose the names of donors. This will allow opponents to harass and intimidate and slander those donors.

It is the height of hypocrisy that the PAC that issued the petition which triggered the FEC to consider rule-making which would force disclosure of information does not disclose the full name of its leader.

We need more free speech, not less, and I urge you to drop your consideration of this rule.

Comments provided by :  
McLemore, Mary

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Petrie\_Michael\_10\_27\_2015\_20\_28\_03\_CommentText.txt

=====

I believe that requiring disclosure of personal info of donors to non-profit organizations not supporting political candidates would be unwise. While this may seem to make sense, experience shows that the personal info of donors can be used by crazy people to make the donors' lives a living hell. Some of these crazy people are powerful, too, and they can ruin a donor's life.

Take, for example, former CEO of Mozilla Brendan Eich. A number of years ago, he donated some money in support of California's Proposition 8, which outlawed gay marriage. When he became CEO, some activists discovered the donation, and they ultimately succeeded in getting him to resign.

The ability to access donor info is the ability to ruin lives. Please pull this regulation. Thank you.

Comments provided by :  
Petrie, Michael

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Cooke\_Mike\_10\_27\_2015\_20\_32\_56\_CommentText.txt

=====

I strongly reject to the FEC's attempt to force organizations of any type to supply the FEC with lists of donors. This 1st amendment protects us from this type of intrusion. If the effort to do this is successful it can and will cut both ways when another administration is chosen. Please do not pursue this.

Mike Cooke

Comments provided by :  
Cooke, Mike

=====

=====

This petition is an attempt to force nonprofit advocacy organizations that are not political committees and that do not spend a majority of their time and resources on candidate-related activity to reveal their donors, something they are not required to do by federal law or IRS regulations. In fact, the fundamental rights of association, privacy, and free speech of such organizations and their donors are protected by the First Amendment, as the U.S. Supreme Court held in NAACP v. Alabama, 357 U.S. 449 (1958).

Such mandated disclosure has no purpose other than to try to open up the donors of such organizations to harassment and intimidation for their political and social beliefs in associating with particular membership organizations. The FEC has no statutory authority to mandate such disclosure of organizations that are not political committees.

Comments provided by :  
Smith, Roger

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Crumpton\_\_Samuel\_\_10\_27\_2015\_20\_38\_35\_CommentText.txt

=====

Please cease efforts to expose donors to Citizens United. Such disclosure exposes those simply exercising their rights to political opponents in a manner inconsistent with equal protection under the law and smacks of tyranny.

Comments provided by :  
Crumpton , Samuel

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Logsdon\_Kate\_10\_27\_2015\_20\_38\_56\_CommentText.txt

=====

Tell the FCC to back off trying to undo Citizens United and respect American 1st Amendment rights!!!!

And shame on them for trying to undo our rights.

Comments provided by :  
Logsdon, Kate

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Wolf\_Stephen\_10\_27\_2015\_20\_44\_15\_CommentText.txt

=====

Cease and desist your efforts to subvert our first amendment rights and Supreme Court confirmed right to not disclose names of political action committee donors. You will regret the day you do.

Comments provided by :  
Wolf, Stephen

=====



=====

In Wisconsin we have learned first-hand how fragile the 1st Amendment has become.

In Wisconsin, prosecutors conducted pre-dawn raids on the homes of their political opposition, in a - largely successful - operation to intimidate and silence people with whom they had a difference in political opinion.

Since the 1950's, the Supreme Court (NAACP vs. Alabama) has protected independent interest groups like the NAACP from being forced to disclose the names of supporters. In Alabama, supporters feared - with good reason - violence and intimidation.

In Wisconsin, the intimidation is much more recent. Under the threat of exposure by overzealous prosecutors, donations and thus politically protected speech, was crushed, silenced during a critical time in the run-up to an election.

Citizens United stands for our rights as citizens to join forces and speak out without fear of intimidation. Everyone should have this right - on all sides of the political spectrum. Without free participation, the "sifting and winnowing" of ideas will fail.

Corporations are the means by which groups of people are able to freely exercise their views.

I urge you to step back and consider how you might see the Wisconsin example, had the political parties been reversed.

Comments provided by :  
Andrews, Greg

=====

=====

To whom it may concern,

I understand your agency is taking comments on a petition to force nonprofit advocacy organizations to reveal their donors. This is not currently required by federal law or IRS regulations. I believe this action is an attack on my fundamental rights of association, privacy, and free speech which are protected by the First Amendment.

My donation to any organization is speaking for my convictions. My convictions are my business. The agency may try to justify this action looking for 1 or 2 abusers but in reality this petition would open up donors to attack by people and groups that obtain the donor lists, the IRS being a prime example.

If this petition goes through, I believe this information will be accessible by scurrilous people and organizations for the purpose of religious and political persecution as they seek to destroy individuals for organizing around certain social issues. This unacceptable, illegal behavior will be unleashed on the people our government is supposed to protect by upholding the Constitution, I therefore respectfully ask your agency not to issue this ruling / regulation.

Comments provided by :  
Crull, Constance

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Mead\_Bill\_10\_27\_2015\_21\_06\_52\_CommentText.txt

=====

Please, stop meddling with free speech, even around the edges for political gain by and for the government against the people. If you are intending to limit corporate and "right wing" endeavours but, ignore unions then what you are attempting is partisan. That is below the fold for federal employees no matter your zeal.

Comments provided by :  
Mead, Bill

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Bolinger\_Randy\_10\_27\_2015\_21\_08\_35\_CommentText.txt

=====

No more intrusion on free speech. Enough is enough.

.gov had a completely different, and correct, approach and attitude when the NAACP was pressed to disclose their contributors back in the 60's.

Comments provided by :

Bolinger, Randy

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Leininger\_Deborah\_10\_27\_2015\_21\_10\_56\_CommentText.txt

=====

I ask the FEC to stop their efforts to regulate speech by undoing the Citizens United case. By doing so would force non-for-profit organizations to disclose the names of their donors. Please respect the First Amendment.

Comments provided by :  
Leininger, Deborah

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Davis\_John\_10\_27\_2015\_21\_23\_02\_CommentText.txt

=====

Do not mandate disclosure of donors to any nonprofit organization. That opens the door to harassment.  
Freedom of speech includes the freedom to be anonymous.

Comments provided by :  
Davis, John

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Russell\_Jay\_10\_27\_2015\_21\_53\_07\_CommentText.txt

=====

If you require people who donate to be made public they will be targeted by groups who want to intimidate them. The example being those who donated to prop 8 in California. Do not undo the Citizens United ruling - you are harming free speech.

Comments provided by :  
Russell, Jay

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Richey\_Diane\_10\_27\_2015\_22\_02\_27\_CommentText.txt

=====

Freedom of speech is the basis of the American society and election process. Do not change the citizens united ruling or limit the freedom of any speech.

Comments provided by :  
Richey, Diane

=====



Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Andrews\_Paula\_10\_27\_2015\_22\_04\_39\_CommentText.txt

=====

This rule flies in the face of first amendment freedom and is a blatant attempt to open up contributors to attacks of political and ideological opponents. The FEC has no authority to make or enforce this rule on organizations that are not political committees.

Comments provided by :  
Andrews, Paula

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_witt\_michael\_10\_27\_2015\_22\_12\_04\_CommentText.txt

=====

you will hang from the tree of liberty until dead.

Comments provided by :  
witt, michael

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Sigman\_David\_10\_27\_2015\_22\_14\_08\_CommentText.txt

=====

I stand on the side of freedom of speech and the first amendment. The Supreme Court decided Citizen's United and it isn't the place of the government to try to end run court decisions.

Comments provided by :  
Sigman, David

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Swirsky\_Joan\_10\_27\_2015\_22\_15\_52\_CommentText.txt

=====

Please do not undo theCitizen'sUnited ruling which preserves and protects free speech.

Comments provided by :

Swirsky, Joan

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Maris\_Nicholas\_10\_27\_2015\_22\_15\_59\_CommentText.txt

=====

Greetings, I wish it to be known that I oppose any and all efforts by the FEC to undo the Citizens United decision.

Comments provided by :  
Maris, Nicholas

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Eli\_Tom\_10\_27\_2015\_22\_20\_42\_CommentText.txt

=====

Administrators of this bill could pick and choose which organizations to investigate for a list of donors, for any number of reasons. Opportunity to pick and choose leads to bias. Bias leads to harassment.

Stop. This. Insidious. Bill.

Comments provided by :

Eli, Tom

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Lapham\_Nancy\_10\_27\_2015\_22\_27\_48\_CommentText.txt

=====

I am a concerned citizen who has just become aware that your ruling could open my private information up to people with whom I do not wish and who have no legitimate reason to have.  
As long as I am a law abiding citizen, it should be up to me who receives any of my personal information of any nature.

Thank You for Doing and Keeping Personal Information....Personal.

Mrs Nancy Lapham

Comments provided by :  
Lapham, Nancy

=====

=====

It is immoral, unethical, and illegal to cite private donors in any way. Conservatives would not do this to the liberals were they in power and it is sickening to me as a young person that elected officials would conduct themselves in such distasteful manner all in the name of politics. I do understand that these articles have a certain amount of spin involved. I also understand that both conservative and liberal bloggers are guilty of bias in the writing.

It should also go without saying that the FEC should allow donors for nonprofits to remain anonymous because and thinking adult could see that this is clearly a partisan act behalf of the left. And would only serve to stir up another political scandal. If Washington on hasn't already figured this out then I'll be happy to tell you:

Americans are tired of political scandals. We want trustworthy representatives. This is not the actions of trustworthy representatives.

Comments provided by :  
Carroll, Clayton

=====



Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Costello\_James\_10\_27\_2015\_22\_49\_29\_CommentText.txt

=====

Do not move forward with this regulation. Citizens should be free to contribute without fearing retribution.

Comments provided by :  
Costello, James

=====

=====

I second the commentary of the Public Interest Legal Foundation:  
[[http://publicinterestlegal.org/files/PILF\\_FEC\\_Comments.pdf](http://publicinterestlegal.org/files/PILF_FEC_Comments.pdf)]

Summarized

"...

[T]his petition is an attempt to force nonprofit advocacy organizations that are not political committees and that do not spend a majority of their time and resources on candidate-related activity to reveal their donors, something they are not required to do by federal law or IRS regulations. In fact, the fundamental rights of association, privacy, and free speech of such organizations and their donors are protected by the First Amendment, as the U.S. Supreme Court held in NAACP v. Alabama, 357 U.S. 449 (1958).

Such mandated disclosure has no purpose other than to try to open up the donors of such organizations to harassment and intimidation for their political and social beliefs in associating with particular membership organizations. The FEC has no statutory authority to mandate such disclosure of organizations that are not political committees.

..."

Comments provided by :  
Ahlquist, Paul

=====

Attachment: REG\_2015\_04\_Pratt\_R\_10\_27\_2015\_23\_24\_49\_CommentText.txt

=====

Go ahead, FEC members, try overturning Citizens United with illegal and illegitimate rules. We'll be coming for you after we dispose of the IRS commissioner.

Comments provided by :  
Pratt, R

=====

=====

The FEC was well represented by Lois Lerner!

Your sole objective under the Obama administration is to limit the free speech of those opposed to your master's despotism.

The Supreme Court of the United States has rendered a decision on this matter which you continue to defy.

If the issue before you was related to a challenge to FEC rules governing the politics of Obamacare you would crow it was "decided law".

Lawlessness has a price and that price will come back to haunt Democrats.

If it is perfectly acceptable for Democrats to weaponized the government against it's opponents you will one day find that Republicans will turn the tables and the power of government on you!

I look forward to the day that you learn this lesson, your virulent anti-Americanism richly deserves comeuppance!

Comments provided by :  
Brower, Robert

=====