

Of course the people should know where campaign finances come from. Transparent elections should be the norm.

Comments provided by :
bedinger, Mikel

Please require complete disclosure of who is contributing money to political campaigns. If money equals free speech then we should know who is doing the talking. Also there needs to be full disclosure of how the individuals, groups, PACs etc... get their money, full and complete transparency!

Comments provided by :
Blaisdell, Gary

All political campaign contributions should be public information and transparent so all can see and know who is backing whom for political office.

Comments provided by :
Bornman, Louis

Please allow transparency of all donations provided directly and indirectly to our elected officials. Even better would be if the wealthy weren't allowed greater financial influence over politicians than the poor. While the wealthy are allowed to contribute more to politicians, the poor and middle class will always receive less favorable legislation.

Comments provided by :
Curtner, Scott

This is deplorable and uncalled for! There is not a public utility that I know of that has the best interest of the consumer in mind at any time. They are self serving and unconcerned with customer service. Monopolies are never a good thing, and this will create one.

This is the one last vestige of pure freedom left in America, please do not take it away. We have lost cable TV, please allow the common man the freedom of the internet.....PLEASE!

Comments provided by :

Millard, James

We the people should know who is buying our representatives.

Comments provided by :
Smith, Mike

Take the country back. Take the money out of politics!

Comments provided by :
Szilagyi, Wayne

As a citizen I strongly feel that full disclosure of the contributors and the amounts contributed to campaigns is essential for the survival of our democratic system.

Comments provided by :
Adams, Mike

Transparency should always be the default setting!

Comments provided by :
Adams, Wanda

To ensure transparency and full participation of the American people, disclosing donor information to the public is paramount. The primacy of the vote, ensuring the public voice is heard in steering its government, is the foundation of our country and the reason for its genesis. Increasing private campaign financing is crowding out the voice of the layperson and engendering a system of implicit quid pro quo between large corporate donors and the politicians they support. While not a remedy, disclosing donors would allow the American people to know who would be either in line with their interests or wholly beholden to the public as their representatives. Please push forward the plan to disclose donors and donor groups as they fund campaigns.

Comments provided by :
Aligbe, Chuk

I support transparency on all donations given to politicians or parties. Without it the fundamental integrity of our representative system is undermined.

Comments provided by :
Allen, Scott

I am advocating that campaign funds are made fully public. Any citizen should know where a candidate is getting money. No secrets.

Comments provided by :
Almady , Michelle

Please stop the "dark money". Elections should not be bought. I want to see full disclosure of where the money is coming from.

Comments provided by :
Alterwitz, Ken

I want to know who is ultimately responsible for the funding of campaign ads, mailers, robocalls and other propaganda designed to sway voters . It is not sufficient to simply state the name of the organization as it is usually given a name which hides the true identity and goals of the donors. It is important for voters like me to be able to truly evaluate the source of the "information" and funds behind political actions and ads. I urge you to create rules which will cause their true funding sources to be disclosed both on your website and on the materials which are sent or broadcast to voters.

Comments provided by :
Altintop, Carrie

Americans have a right to know where donations come from, how much is being donated.

Comments provided by :
AMPELIOTIS, RUTH

I think transparency is a good thing. All of us should know where the money is coming from.

Comments provided by :
Archuleta, Micki

i am entitled to my freedom of speech and expression, all americans are entitled to such. so therefore i am expressing my belief that the internet shall be free and unregulated. we will not be silenced nor will we stand for obama to threaten or plan to take our God given rights and freedoms away. what makes me proud to be an american is my guarantee to the United States Constitution and Bill of Rights set by our founding forefathers. i will use my constitutional rights and say NO to this proposition by obama and his fellow politicians. thank you and God bless, happy holidays to all.

Comments provided by :
ashley, eric

Transparency is operating in such a way that it is easy for others to see what actions are performed.

Comments provided by :
AUSTIN, ANTHONY

Campaign advertising funder identities must be disclosed. Allowing anonymous donations to contribute to the flooding of so-called issue advertisements threatens to undermine representative democracy. While persons and entities are entitled to 'free speech' a la the Citizens United decision, they are not entitled to hide the obvious financial interests they have in election outcomes by concealing their identities behind shadow organizations.

Comments provided by :

Auten, Richard

I believe it's important and necessary for us to know who is funding candidates and by how much.

Comments provided by :
Ayala, JoAnn

It is the right of citizens to know who provided campaign funding, how much and for which candidate/s.

Dr. Babcock

Comments provided by :
Babcock, Virginia

Dear FEC - I want to know the identities of the individuals and groups who pay for television ads, mailers, robocalls and other methods of gaining my vote. I think you should revise your rules so the names and amounts of all donors are immediately and easily available on the internet. I am concerned about individuals from other countries deliberately trying to disrupt our political system. How can we guard against that influence if we don't know the names of the people who donate?

I also think that your rules should be revised so that the amount that can be donated is limited and reduced. The modest amount of money that I can contribute to issues important to me as a middle class American is overwhelmed by the money that richer individuals and groups can contribute. This is not democracy and I urge you to revise your rules to establish a more democratic system.

While I understand that your current process is not directly related to the Supreme Court's decision about Citizens United, you should know that I disagree with the decision strongly. I do not think that corporations should benefit from free speech at least in relation to elections, only individual human beings have this right. Our current system turns dollars into votes, and those who have less money have fewer votes. I think this is un-American and undemocratic.

Regards,
Elizabeth A. Bagwell, PhD

Comments provided by :
Bagwell, Elizabeth

YES - Please enforce as detailed and specifically as possible a complete Public Disclosure of ALL campaign monies being spent on each and every separate political interest being voted upon.

Thank you.

JoAnn Baker Paul

Comments provided by :
Baker Paul, JoAnn

I believe strongly that we need to know who is funding campaigns. I know that transparency and full disclosure is better for our democracy. I want to know which interests are spending what to influence votes.

Thank you.

Comments provided by :
Bakove, MJ

I value my right to vote, and I do my best to educate myself on candidates and issues before I cast my vote. As a conscientious voter, I strongly believe campaign reform is necessary, and a major move in that direction would be **MANDATED PUBLIC DISCLOSURE of ALL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS** for every candidate and proposition.

Comments provided by :
Banville, Jennifer

Given the recent Citizens United ruling, I feel that it is even more imperative that the political spending of companies is publicly disclosed. As money is now equated with speech, I believe it is even more important that citizens be informed and able to make clear decisions on which companies should be allowed to "speak" for them and with funds received from them.

Comments provided by :
Barisch, Stephanie

RE: New rules concerning the public disclosure of campaign money.

Yes, absolutely. The public has a right to know the source of a candidate's campaign financing. If a candidate claims to stand on my side of an important issue, I'd like to know if the bulk of their campaign money came from donors who stand on the opposite side. Whose interests will they serve? The people who voted for them or the people who will pay for their re-election campaign? We have a right to know.

Comments provided by :

Barnes, Diane

I would like ALL contributions be readily and EASILY available and ACCESSIBLE to all constituents !!!!

Comments provided by :
Barnes, Diane

I firmly believe that the Citizens United finding by the SCOTUS was bad for the USA.

We need to get unlimited money out of politics. Either stricter regulations are needed on PACs or on the amount of donations that can be made by any entity (legal or personal) need to follow the same limitations.

The unbridled spending of the last election cycle is proof that the process is FAR out of hand.

Please do something to stop this insanity as soon as you can.

Thank you.

Comments provided by :

Bartlett, Gaylene

Yes, I think it would be nice to know which companies own our politicians. Without limitations on campaign funding, government has become little more than a contention of privately-owned corporate interest groups. I think any transparency in this unregulated, opaque, money-driven system would be a step in the right direction.

Comments provided by :
Barton, Nova

Please, please, please make it be that all campaign contributions be transparent to the general public. We have a right to know who is contributing to whom/which causes. Thank you.

Comments provided by :
Bath, Jennifer

The election system is broken. Special interest groups have overwhelmed the process with money and disinformation. The public needs to know what individuals and special interests are behind these dollars. Knowing would help people understand positions by who benefits the most. Transparency in where these dollars are coming from is desperately needed if the greater good is to prevail. If the process continues as is, the future of democracy in the US is in peril.

Comments provided by :
battalen, irene

I would like to see legislation requiring full disclosure of sources and amounts of all campaign contributions over \$1000.00 for any federal election. If contributions are personal it should be disclosed if the contribution is on behalf of any group or affiliation.

Comments provided by :
Beamesderfer, Thomas

I want to know exactly who contributes to political campaigns and how much they are contributing. In fact, there should be a ban on Corporations buying political influence to benefit themselves.

Comments provided by :
Beauchamp, Jon

Our government is supposed to work for us not against us. This administration seems to have forgot they work for the people, not that they work to take freedoms away from the people.

The government needs to quit trying to squash the constitution. It was written for people just like the ones in office right now. We have Presidents in this country not dictators. The democrats are trying to make it where they decide everything we do. I am one American that is proud to be an American and do not wish to have any more of my liberties stripped from me.

Thank you
Jamie

Comments provided by :
Beck, Jamie

I believe that all donations to public officials or anyone seeking public office should be completely transparent. If it is a PAC, contributors to the PAC should be public knowledge as well as the amount of the contribution.

Comments provided by :
becker, bruce

I strongly support any measure that would increase the transparency of campaign funding. All amounts and their contributors should be publicly identified. The information should include employer political action committee affiliation. Funds contributed through PACs should include names and addresses of the PAC's members and contributors.

Comments provided by :
Bell, Patti

Please make available the source of campaign donations

Comments provided by :
bellucci, Jo

We the People . . . NEED to know what person, company, union, corporation, interest group, party, think tank, pac, etc. is donating money to any political party or candidate. We also NEED to know how much they are donating.

Comments provided by :
Benter, Ray

All money spent on public elections should be public information. Always.

I wish only public money would be spent as well, or put caps on all kinds of spending, but the public information factor should be a no-brainer, obvious factor.

Comments provided by :

Bestevonn, Mathias

We absolutely have the right to know who is buying our congress.

Comments provided by :
bishop, Chiquita

Speaking of political comment, it has been said that "dissent is patriotic". This has long been a fundamental tenet of our country's history. Then why do we need to illogically depend on some human-bureaucrat or government commission to decide for or against any political viewpoint? Only the individual should decide...and has the full right to decide...for himself or herself. Government has no right to intrude. Furthermore, government has no power to remove such a right from an individual.

A perfect illustration of how this seemingly innocent little issue can explode is the present IRS scandal. Bureaucrats have biases. Constitutional laws protect individuals from the biases of government officials.

I am perfectly able to decide for myself whether to believe certain political viewpoints...offensive to government or not. I do not need our government to filter information according to certain biases, and then decide for me.

Comments provided by :

Bixby, Alan

All amounts and their contributors should be publicly identified. The information should include employer or other affiliation that is important, such as political action committee. All funds contributed through PACs should include name and address of the PAC's members and contributors, as well as their employees names and addresses, whether paid or volunteer.

Comments provided by :
Blackleu, Susan

It is essential that all donors to any political party or organization that provides funds in support of any candidate or issue in any election -- local, state or Federal -- be disclosed to the public. Otherwise, organizations or individuals are not held accountable for their donations and are thereby allow to subvert democratic elections for private purposes.

Comments provided by :
Blackmun, Robert

The public has a right to know who has contributed and how much they have contributed to any political party or candidate. The Citizens United ruling by the Supreme Court is a threat to our democracy.

Comments provided by :
Blakefield, Katherine

I am tired of big money buying our country by buying our politicians. If we can't stop the huge influx of money from special interests into politics, then I, at least, want to know which politicians sell their votes and which companies buy them. Then I can try to vote out the politicians, and boycott the companies. Stop the Oligarchy!

Comments provided by :
Bloom, Connie

I would like to know what interests are spending money, and how much, to influence voting opinion.

Comments provided by :
Boden, Terrence

The only way for our representative government to function properly, indeed for it to fulfill its core purpose in any way, is to guarantee transparency of campaign funding and to provide easy access to that information to voters.

Comments provided by :
Bonadio, Joseph

please, lets get money out of politics- or at least try and control it.

Comments provided by :
boone, connie

I urge the Commission to vote "No" on FEC regulation of Internet content. Regulations on money spent on elections is a legitimate function of the FEC but political speech must remain free of government regulations. The internet is the place where individual citizens or small groups can express their political opinions so content should not be regulated by the FEC or any other government agency. Freedom of speech was incorporated in the First Amendment specifically to protect political speech.

Comments provided by :
Borgarding, Donald

Campaign Funds.

Unfair to average citizen.

Money not free speech.

Taxpayer rights ?sold? to wealthy players.

Campaign donations pay 1000 to one.

So citizens rights are being sold off.

Voters influenced by ads are misinformed.

Media should refuse ads and hold forums.

Live for TV;

Written for newspapers and magazines;

Audio for radio.

Use of statements in official voter info need to be better used.

Hopefully complete with ALL candidates contributing.

PS This survey should have been widely advertised or better notification.

Comments provided by :

Borgquist, Richard

I believe that it is important to know who the politicians are actually beholden to. They can say anything that they want in campaign speeches, but knowing where there money comes from would really help me to know who they support.

Comments provided by :
Boulware, Sonnie

Simple put, we should know where the money is coming from and going to. Additionally, the names of all parties involved. The money created by Citizens United corrupts our political system, allowing Democracy to take a back seat to the wishes and greed of a few. The American people are being subjugated by Wall Street and Corporate America. Please have enough guts to stand up for the whole of America by allowing transparency and exposing the corruption that usurps our constitution through back room transactions.

Comments provided by :
Bourdon, Lester

As an individual concerned citizen, I urge the commission to adopt full disclosure and enforce strict limits on all political contributions at the federal level. Failure to do so will further erode the trust of the people.

In the preamble to our Constitution, it states "We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

In modern America, our highly concentrated wealth threatens our union, justice, tranquility, general welfare, and liberty. Such concentration erodes the trust of our citizens in the basic fairness of our representative democracy. This concentration has DOUBLED in just the last 30 years (from 19% of wealth in the hands of just 1% of the people in 1980 to 40% of wealth in 2010, and rising). Numerous studies have shown that wealth concentration in societies is associated with the decline of quality of life. See "The Spirit Level" and "Capital in the 21st Century" for two recent studies showing this connection.

To lessen the corrupting influence of concentrated wealth and the resulting lack of trust in our institutions, the congress created the Federal Election Commission (FEC) and has repeatedly legislated public finance laws, limits on individual contributions, and full disclosure of donors. Most presidents and members of congress in the last five decades were elected with all three of these fairness protections in place. As these safeguards were weakened, the rate of voter participation has steadily dropped - reflecting the lower citizen confidence that voting is meaningful.

Full disclosure of all political contributions is a minimum condition to protect election integrity within the bounds of Supreme Court decisions. Any loopholes to such full disclosure (as with LLCs to disguise the donor names, soft money to 527 groups, super PACs and 501(c)(4) social welfare groups) give license to those who wish to influence our elections in secret. As secret donors become more influential, the ordinary citizen has good reason to distrust our election results.

To the extent the FEC fails to assure full disclosure of donors, you will have failed in the primary mission of the commission, "to disclose campaign finance information."

Comments provided by :
Boynton, Melbourne

The first step to solving all the problems of the world - or at least the ones with political solutions, which is almost all of them - is to clean up our campaigns. Transparency is an important part of that, although removing all the money is the ultimate goal.

Comments provided by :
Bqtzdorf, Nick

As a voter I believe it is very informative to me to know who is funding the candidates that I'm about to vote for. It will let me know if they really have my and my country's best interests at heart or of those who are donating to their campaign. I personally believe that as a nation we need to change our method of campaigning. There are several European countries with much higher turnout than us. I think that banning the use of tv and radio for commercials would be a step in the right direction. Only debates and round robin discussions should be allowed on tv and radio. I also believe that we need a more representative election commission that reflects a more independent philosophy of the electorate. Us independents are not currently represented. The difficulty for third parties and independents to get on ballots is counter intuitive to the ideas of our founding fathers.

Comments provided by :
Bracknell, Brent

I believe it is important to know who is spending money to convince me to vote for a person. Weather it be a corporation or private citizen I want to know who the driving person is. It can be of vital concern.

Comments provided by :
Bradshaw, Lael

for gawds sake give us a voice in our government

Comments provided by :
Bragg, Gregg

On public disclosure of campaign monies, voters should always know which interests are spending how much on whom and in what places to win over their votes.

Comments provided by :
Brant, Amy

The citizens of the USA need to know who is contributing funds to influence political campaigns to insure fair elections.

Comments provided by :
Brill, James

We must have FULL disclosure when campaigns are funded. Anyone or any entity, including those who contribute to PACs, must say who is behind the contribution, and this must be made public.

I am for public financing altogether. Disallowing all individuals, group or other entities from making contributions would be far better than what we have now.

If individuals are still allowed to make contributions, all "artificial" entities should be barred from contributing to political campaigns. These would include business corporations and unions, as well.

Churches contributing in any way to political campaigns should lose their tax-free status.

Comments provided by :
Brown, Drollene

An uninformed voter places too much power in the hands of the self-serving and corrupt.

Comments provided by :
Brown, Gary

I care very much about the issue of money in electoral politics. I would desire more transparency in funding, including who is providing funds, including special interest groups and PACs, and the amount that is being provided. Thank you!

Comments provided by :
Brown, Gerald

I would prefer that each candidate gets the same amount of public money to use for campaign purposes. Votes should not be for sale to the candidate that can spend the most. But if that is not going to change, we at least need to be aware of who is influencing the election and eventually the candidates.

Comments provided by :
Brown, Jennifer

If corporations, billionaires and labor unions want to broadcast messages to influence my vote, they should be required to say who they are. Please require full disclosure of corporate, union and wealthy funding sources behind express advocacy ads and electioneering communications.

Comments provided by :
Brown, Nathanael

The practice of hidden money funding political candidates goes against everything in a Democratic society, and what is especially insulting is that I am sure you know this as well. To require a consensus before taking action against this practice is ridiculous. Stop it and do your job with a reverence for your position.

Sincerely annoyed,

Tim Brown

Comments provided by :
Brown, Tim

I feel it is absolutely vital that the voting public know which interests are spending how much money to win votes, regardless of the political stance of those interests. This is information that voters need to help them decide what they want to vote for, or what they want to vote against. Those that are against disclosing this information are hiding something they don't want the voters to know, period.

Comments provided by :
Broz, Leslie

Please require donors to all kinds of political or election to reveal their identities and amounts of donations, especially those who give through 3rd party organizations and seem to be protected from revealing themselves because of Citizens United and other court decisions. Elections, to be fair and effective, must inform voters who supports or opposes candidates or issues. Any thing that impedes, discourages, or prevents this kind of disclosure undermines the validity and value of the electoral process and creates mistrust of government. Only the FEC can be an effective voice for common people (and voters). Congress is in the pockets of the rich--both individuals and corporations. Presidents, no matter how well-intentioned, cannot propose or pass required legislation. The Courts seem to be lost in the seas of controversy and ideology rather than grounded in watching out for the best interests of real people.

Comments provided by :
Brubaker, Dave

I favor the fullest disclosure possible. I believe transparency is crucial to a system in which all voters can make decisions based on as much information as needed. Also, disclosure helps to even the scales, holding those with a lot of money accountable to those who do not.

Comments provided by :
Bryant, Frank

Please make public which interests are donating how much to whose campaigns. Getting ALL the relevant information to the voters is absolutely crucial to having a democracy which reflects the true interests of the populace. Of course, I am laboring under the assumption that the purpose of voting - and of having a democratic central government - is to serve the wishes of the populace.

If it isn't, please kindly disregard the above.

Comments provided by :
Brzozowski, Aaron

There should be no question that we, the people, have every right to know where the money that supports candidates running for public office comes from. Our government seems to be for sale today; at least we should know who is buying! I honestly don't recognize my country today. Citizens United was the death knell for democracy. He with the money owns the election now. I want to know who is buying!

Comments provided by :
Buchanan, Mary

There should be serious limits on campaign spending. In truth, all campaigns ought to be publicly financed after a candidate can show a reasonable level of support. It is the cheapest route because politicians spend too much time fund raising vs governing and they have to reward the big givers in order to stay in office.

This is a critical issue for a democracy. It is no longer one man, one vote.

So, pushing for what we can get at this point in time, all donors should be public with some idea of the level of their support. And a way should be found to trace these sub-entities that give to the root company or individual that is financing the show.

I want my democracy back.

Comments provided by :
Bumgardner, Larry

We need full public disclosure of any political campaign spending!
And an end to the sale of our politicians.

Comments provided by :
Bundarin, Paul

I strongly support any measure that would add transparency to the money that is spent on political campaigns.

Comments provided by :
Burckhalter, Robert

I want to know who is buying my politicians...

Comments provided by :
Burke, Mac

Keep government hands off the Internet!

Comments provided by :
Burkheimer, Mary

Everything disclosed.
Transparency is the objective.

Comments provided by :
Burrell, Mary

Until we achieve real campaign finance reform, all campaign contributions should be made trackable and as transparent as possible. If money is equal to "speech", then the voting public needs to know who is speaking out through political support.

All amounts and their contributors should be publicly identified. The information should include employer or other affiliation that is important, such as political action committee. All funds contributed through PACs should include name and address of the PAC's members and contributors, as well as their employees names and addresses, whether paid or volunteer.

Comments provided by :
Burtner, Matthew

Thanks to the steady redefinition over time of what constitutes personhood, powerful entities with deep pockets, directly and/or indirectly, can now contributed unlimited amounts to campaigns and candidates with, in many if not most cases, little or no oversight.

Voters have a right to know where candidates' campaign funding comes from, such that more oversight and scrutiny are needed rather than less. As a second step, all subsequent earmarking (unless it can be eliminated altogether) should be additionally scrutinized to ensure that large campaign contributors do not benefit from same.

Comments provided by :
Burton, Elizabeth

Of course we should have disclosure.

Comments provided by :
Butler, Jeff

I should absolutely be informed as to who are political donors.

Comments provided by :
Butscha, Greg

I feel it is very important to have the public be aware of where interest group money is flowing in our political system.
Light needs to shine on the dark money!

Comments provided by :
Buynak Jr., Raymond

If we can not remove outside money, i.e. public funded elections, then ALL money, no matter the amount, should be required to be annotated to donor, whether individual or corporate or 501(C)3's...that ARE NOT public welfare organizations and do not resemble them in the least.

Comments provided by :
Calderone, Wanona

I think it is extremely important for voters to know who is paying for the political ads being presented or the groups presenting them.

The public needs to know to be able to identify if the ads are self serving or are they legitimately trying to inform the voter of a good reason why the issue is better for America.

Today, political ads lie and creators of these ads are shielded by their names like People for American Progress. Progress for what Americans? The rich at the expense of 98% of Americans.

In college I was taught that when reading anything, I needed to be aware of the writers views to properly understand where he is coming from before I lend too much credence to him.

This is why it is so important for the voter to know who are the people financing these groups.

This is simple common sense, and a requirement for our democracy to survive.

Comments provided by :
Callahan, Michael

Disclosure, transparency, call it what you will but this is a basic right for all citizens to have a voice in our country. We have to stop a small but very wealthy and highly influential group control the destiny of our lives and the "life" of our beloved America. It is so apparent at this juncture in our history that we make all people seeking public office disclose all contributions given them and those that give should be required who they are and how much they give and who they represent!

Comments provided by :
Campbell, David

Campaign expenditures should be available to all people on available websites so that all Americans can see where ALL political money is coming from in ALL campaigns. Funding from political entities should be open and we should know from where the money for politics flows. The American people are disgusted with electioneering that provides only negative advertising by unknown and hidden groups bouncing back and forth on the airwaves. If all knew who was funding this stuff, it would be easier to discard it or listen to it. Please help!

Comments provided by :
Campbell, Dorothy

I feel very strongly that we should be given full disclosure about campaign donations and that corporations are not people (that is pure silliness! and literally allows someone to vote twice) the monies given to super pac and other organizations allowing them to cover up and cloud issues and to have large corporations and wealthy individuals influence elections for their own agendas and personal gain. This creates an oligarchy and undermines the constitution and the election process thus destabilizing the govt and creating a ruling class that over rides the govt and fair treatment for all the people.

Comments provided by :
carroll, craig

I am in full support of disclosing and regulating and limiting all contributions, fundraising and affiliations regarding all campaign, initiative and legislative support.

Citizens are unable to clearly know about or standup against biased lobbying and campaign backing by powerful special interest groups and wealthy invested individuals without this information being made public and further limit reforms.

Comments provided by :
carroll, patricia

I believe on full disclosure of funding. I want to know who is paying and bribing. It's getting very hard to believe that there is ANY fairness in any aspect of American life.

Comments provided by :
Carson, Cassandra

If corporations are people, and campaign spending is freedom of speech, do the people not have a right to hear it? We need to know who these entities are "speaking to," as well as "what they're saying," in order to make informed free market decisions.

Comments provided by :
Carter, Jeffrey

Everything you Feds touch you manage to make a mess of. Leave you hands off our internet!

Comments provided by :
Cerasani, Louis

Please make any and all funding of political campaigns wholly transparent to the public. We deserve to know whose interests are paying for our legislators.

Comments provided by :
Cernohlavrk, Robert

I believe that corporations who donate money for elections of government legislators should be public information.

I do not think that Congress men and Congress women should take money, once they are elected, from lobbyists. I think that when there is an issue at stake, that Congress ought to turn to the people who voted for their election, and ask if they agree or not, just as you are doing here.

I have been told that Congress originally made that rule of law that they can be lobbied and given money as individuals, to vote or consider ideas that are favored by a corporation.

So they would have to undo their own ruling. I believe that Citizens United should be overturned by Justice Kennedy, now that he has seen what it has wrought on this country. I think that Robert Reich and Bernie Sanders have made some good observations, and that socialism is not an issue, more common sense is the issue; infrastructure, not war. I am not sure if peace can be achieved through negotiation. I am not sure about suppression of information by the press and the media. But I know that there are always individuals in government and in the private sector who can certainly speak out, and gather comments from their readers. This is where the Internet is an excellent venue for uniting citizens and hearing our comments. That is why the title "Citizens United" is a misnomer, and also a very bad idea to make corporations like people (citizens).

Elections have no meaning if the elected do not follow through on their electoral promises and intentions.

The Internet is an issue, whereas if Net Neutrality is overruled either by TPP interests, or by the large media corporations who contribute to the infrastructure of the Internet, or by the FCC, and the bad idea of fast lanes and slow lanes is implemented, making citizens pay for what they now use as a public utility for almost everything in their lives, that we will have no access to writing our Congress people unless we pay for that privilege. I understand that in the beginning of the Internet, there was a different name, and that Tom Wheeler was one of the persons who liked having it public with public access that is free and open to communication.

A comment was made that the Internet is likened to the Town Hall Meetings. What if at the Town Hall Meeting the rule was made that wealthy members could speak loudly and poorer members could only speak in a whisper?

Comments provided by :
Cerny, Suzanne

With campaign funding rising to extraordinary levels it is essential that the sources be revealed because, in effect, the entities behind these contributions are controlling the campaigns. If the people's government is allowed to be shaped by hidden agendas then it becomes the government of those agendas rather than what benefits the country as a whole.

Comments provided by :
cessaro, robert

I believe that campaign funding enables a candidate to target their constituency, model and amplify their message, and reach more potential voters. I also believe that a candidate will feel beholden to and sensitive to the needs and beliefs of individual and group contributors. I know that's part of human nature and can be a slippery slope to corruption. As a voter, I want to know where a candidate's financial support comes from before I make a decision. How else could my decision be an informed one?

Comments provided by :
Chandler, Patricia

I believe in order to understand the election system and how donations will affect elections, especially in light of Citizens United, where a corporation is given more influence over the legislation after an election, that all donors should be made apparent to all citizens. Only then will citizens understand that it is far more than 'one man, one vote'. This makes it an oligarchy than a democracy.

Comments provided by :
Christie, Martina

There needs to be a cap and public disclosure of all campaign finances. We have companies from all over the world buying elections. The government is of the people for the people and by the people yet we are making it a buying process not an election. All financing should be disclosed listing who is supplying the money. Do you not think it ridiculous that these past midterm elections the financing ran into the hundreds of millions of dollars....that is not your everyday american citizen running for an elected office that is corporations buying elected offices and politicians.

Comments provided by :
Christison, Linda

I want to see where this money and support is coming from!

Comments provided by :
Clark, Daniel

Our country is being torn apart by the unfairness of our elections. We must have a better way to judge what is being spewed in pro and con ads for every candidate. The rich people who control our elections should be unmasked so that we at least know who they are. I am disgusted at the depth our democracy has fallen to. Help us by making the donors come out of the shadows.

Comments provided by :
Clark, Judith

The most basic right we have is the right to vote. It seems more than reasonable that voters should know as much as possible about who, and what, they are voting for. Transparency is always a positive in government. An effort to limit it would only be supported by those hiding something.

Comments provided by :
Coats, Russell

All monies entering the political arena should have the source and amounts fully disclosed! Why, in America, should they be hidden????

Comments provided by :
Cole, Mervin

I want to see full disclosure of any/all campaign money that politicians receive when trying to get elected or re-elected. That way I know who is being a puppet for the millionaires, billionaires, and corporations, so I make sure I KNOW who I'm voting for.

Comments provided by :
Cole, Susan

Both the McCutcheon and Citizens United cases undermined the integrity of the voting system in the United States. Fair and open campaigns have been co-opted by a flood of "dark" money, with no accountability or responsibility. The U.S. election process has been corrupted by that money, and must be returned to We the People.

Corporations are NOT people, and money is NOT free speech!

The allowable amounts of campaign contributions MUST be capped, and ALL contributors MUST be clearly and unambiguously identified.

Comments provided by :
Coleman, Edwin

We cannot allow the government to regulate who can make political statements and what content is appropriate in said statements.

This action will enable those in power to block any opinion or position which opposes or contradicts their stated position. It effectively stifles debate and ensures that political power will remain with those currently in power. It removes the voice of the people from political discussions in direct violation of our First Amendment rights.

Comments provided by :

Conrad, Mark

Voters should know which interests are spending how much in order to attempt to win their votes. This should be mandatory for all forms of advertising, etc., clearly and easily readable.

Comments provided by :
Consbruck, Barbara

regarding new rules requiring public disclosure of campaign money, voters should know which interests are spending how much to win over their votes !

Comments provided by :
Cook, Shawn

To the FEC:

"The Federal Election Commission, considering new rules requiring public disclosure of campaign money, is asking the public whether voters should know which interests are spending how much to win over their votes." (According to Robert Reich, on Facebook, Dec. 4, 2014)

Please enact strong rules requiring disclosure of all sources of funding for all campaign-related advertizing. This should include "issue-advocacy", whether or not a political candidate is explicitly mentioned. We (the public) should be able to easily access such information on a timely basis, including chains of linkages to individuals, for-profit corporations, and unions. If the chain includes "social welfare" organizations paying for such advertizing then we should be able to see the funding sources of those organizations, all the way back to original sources.

Possibly, "original sources" of less than, say \$1000 might be exempt from the disclosure requirements, both for the sake of efficiency and to protect the anonymity of relatively poor, vulnerable individuals (e.g., from their employer).

Sincerely,

Jacqueline Coolidge

Comments provided by :
Coolidge, Jacqueline

For years, I have watched as it has become more difficult to vote, but easier for ridiculous amounts of invisible money can now legally influence elections. My country is no longer the country I was told about in school. What I want is for all elections to be publicly funded, with **strict** limits on personal donations, **all of which would be public**. We must remove anonymous money from our elections. One **human person**, one vote, and every candidate gets equal money and equal air time to make their case. Please, for the sake of future Americans, take our election process away from only the rich, and give it back to **all Americans**. Thank you.

Comments provided by :
Coshow Jr, Charles

Full and complete disclosure of campaign contributions is the correct path to an honest election.

if an individual contributes \$25 to a candidate, the name and address is recorded. The same candidate can receive Millions from a super pact and no-one is told from whom it came----total idiocy!

Comments provided by :
costello, james

Under current FEC guidelines (from a unanimous, 6-0 decision in 2006), political advertising or commentary posted on YouTube is exempt from campaign reporting requirements.

I am very concerned that Democrat FEC Vice Chair Ann Ravel apparently finds this unacceptable, and speaks unfavorably of "this effort to protect individual bloggers and online commentators."

As if free speech is unworthy of protection!

I am strongly opposed Ravel's proposed breach of our constitution's 1st & 2nd amendment rights.

Comments provided by :
Crouch, Mark

If the United States is to continue calling itself a democracy, I believe it is absolutely necessary for public office candidates to disclose where their campaign money comes from. They are public servants, and therefore the public should be able to know where the money came from that put them there. This is not an invasion of privacy, nor a government overreach, as many conservatives would like to argue. This is common sense. In a true democracy, the people or corporations with the most money should not be able to buy elections by contributing huge sums of money behind closed doors to the candidate that will return the favor by giving special treatment to the interests of that individual or corporation, even when that interest may be (and very often is) against the interests of the greater population. That is not democracy. That is oligarchy. Considering the ludicrous amount of money that is already poured into political campaigns, it should not be unreasonable to require that the people who will ultimately be governed by the decisions that their elected officials make, be knowledgeable about the resources - financial or otherwise - that were used to get that person into office in the first place.

Comments provided by :
Crowley, William

This is on the question of should voters know who is spending money to influence them. Thomas Jefferson knew at the founding of our country that this was a simple question to answer ?If a nation expects to be ignorant and free, in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be.? As citizens, we must be well informed in order to make informed decisions. Citizens cannot be expected to make well informed decisions when our pool of information is polluted with the propaganda of the rich and powerful. The information citizens consume is tainted with a foul desire to bring about an outcome that serves the few at the expense of the many. What makes this worse is that it can be done without knowing who is doing it. These people of power believe that they know what is best for us. All they know is what is best for their own selfish interests. Thomas Jefferson also wrote ?All tyranny needs to gain a foothold is for people of good conscience to remain silent,?. I am here to tell you that I will not be silent when it comes to my rights and the rights of my fellow citizens.

Comments provided by :
Cullinane, Jason

I don't want the Federal Government limiting free political speech over the internet.

Comments provided by :
Curtis, B

The future of our democracy depends on the public knowing who is spending how much money in our campaigns. Please ensure that strong rules are enacted to protect our freedom.

Comments provided by :
Curtis, Paul

Yes, voters should know which interests are spending how much to win their votes. Please consider new rules requiring public disclosure of campaign money.

Comments provided by :
Cutler, Joanna

The influence of money in the political process is pervasive. At the very least the identity and agenda of large donors should be disclosed, to enable voters to decide whether a candidate is pursuing a given policy to repay a large donor.

Comments provided by :
dailey, john

For truly effective democratic representation of the people by elected officials, it is an absolute must that all campaign funding donations to any potential candidate are part of the public record.

I would also say that not only should the "Citizens United" supreme Court decision be reversed by binding funding legislation but any superpac or other campaigning organization, regardless of affiliation with any candidate, should also have to make all donation records available for public viewing.

Finally all corporate donations should be barred for any candidate and this would and should include any labor organization or charity. The appearance of impropriety should be removed from campaign financing as well as any actual potentially illegal activity.

Comments provided by :

Dalziel, Alan

We need full transparency when it comes to funding candidates, adds, and all things political. There should be no runarounds or ways to hide the money. It is important to our democracy that all money being spent for political ends be traceable and readily observable. Thank you.

Comments provided by :
D'Angelo, Jason

There needs to be full transparency in this process. With so much money being pumped into campaigns via corporations to influence legislation that's not always (rarely?) in the interest of the citizens our elected politicians supposedly serve. At the very least, it would be nice to know who bought my congressmen/women and senators.

Comments provided by :
Danz, Jonathan

Political contributions by corporations those in leadership of corporations and contributions made by groups of people under the disguise of a group name should be required to disclose the contributors. No more 'dark money'.

Comments provided by :
Dash, Rachel

Please make funding a transparent process.

There should be no need to hide where funding for *anything* is coming from.

My statement includes ALL types of funding -- it doesn't matter what fancy name it gets -- if any person, company or ANY other entity contributes money, time, resources, services, etc. their contribution should be fully disclosed.

Comments provided by :

Davies, Richard

To whom it may concern, I strongly support any measure that would add transparency to the money that is spent on campaigns. It has been argued that money is speech and cannot be restricted under the constitution. If money is considered speech, then it should be pointed out that nowhere does the constitution guarantee that you have the right to anonymous speech. If corporations and wealthy individuals feel so convicted that they must speak with their money, let them declare themselves and their convictions openly. Thank You.

Comments provided by :
Davis, Cheri

It's clearly obvious that being able to hide who you are allows an overflow of cash that skew the facts about issues and candidates - and that wealth and unlimited business interest cash can be used dishonestly to alter public opinion - knowing the ads and information present is intentionally false - but in a time and fashion to be too late to do anything about it

If honesty as to message isn't required - and there are no limit as to how much someone can pay to mislead voters or even to sway them honestly - then disclosure is essential.

This isn't America the way it's been warped by the Supreme Court and the current crop of elected folks whose interest seem purely to keep themselves and their party in power

Comments provided by :
Davis, Chuck

If it ain't broke them don't fix it. If you want to screw something up then get the government involved. Run the country, secure our borders, stop wasting the tax payers hard earned money and stay out of our lives. Government does not Know best. I think they've proven this in the last six years.

Comments provided by :
Davis, Tammy

I urge the FEC to use its authority to vote in favor of the electorate and rule that the electorate should know which interests are spending how much to win over their votes.

Comments provided by :
Dearnaley, Carol-Ann

I want all contributors to be identified by name and amount so I may evaluate what groups are attempting to influence voter decisions.

Comments provided by :
Deming, Linda Gail

Yes, yes, yes. Public disclosure for all funds "donated" to any campaign for public office.

I'm sick of corporate bought politicians making decisions based on the lining of their pockets.

Full disclosure. Weed out the paid for liars cloaked in the form of politicians of the people, for the people.

Comments provided by :

Denmark, Alyssa

I want to know who is trying to buy my votes. I think any entity that pays for advertising or gives any support to candidates or issues should be revealed to the public in an easily accessible manner. Hidden sources attempting to manipulate the voters should not be allowed.

Comments provided by :
DeRooy, Sylvia

A democracy is not run in secrecy!

Comments provided by :
Dickinson, Matthew

I believe that voters should know which interests are spending how much to win over their votes. We need new regulations on campaign financing to ensure complete transparency of campaign donors. We also need an adequately staffed and funded entity with the legal authority to ensure effective enforcement of the regulations and prosecution of violators of same.

Comments provided by :
Dorth, Arabella

All donations should be transparent.

Comments provided by :
Douville, Raye Ellen

Bring the darkness into the light.

Comments provided by :
Dowling, Donna

I feel that there should be complete transparency with respect to efforts that are designed to influence the voting process, to that end, the names of those who donate to groups that are engaged in attempting to influence my vote should be disclosed to the public.

Comments provided by :
Driscoll, Michael J

It seems obvious as to why we would need transparency in democratic elections.

Comments provided by :
Dufford, Gary

There must be full public disclosure of ALL campaign related money. Voters must know which interest(s) by type (in full detail) are spending on winning votes during the full calendar year on an annual basis.

Comments provided by :
Dunn, Elmo

We must do everything possible to lessen the power of big money and dark money in elections!

Comments provided by :
Dutcher, Jeff

It is (and will be) difficult to maintain the semblance of a democracy with out complete transparency in the election process. This transparency must begin with the sources of funding for the candidates themselves. If we as a country are going to lift the caps on donations to election campaigns from all interests, especially corporations, that transparency is made even more necessary. I strongly support changes to the system that create trust in the electoral process.

Comments provided by :
Dyer, Andrew

It is obvious that the public should be well informed about the interests that are sponsoring campaign media messages. I see no valid or reasonable argument for doing the opposite and hiding such interests. Our elections have become incredibly expensive battles between special interests with money. The interests behind campaigns want people to think that their messages are supported by the grass roots, people just like the voters, when in reality there are very clear special interests being served. We have a basic right to know who it is that is trying to persuade us with a such campaigns.

Hiding the interests that pay for the campaigns and allowing them to be anonymous threatens the entire concept of democracy. Media campaigns are created specifically to sway opinions and the more money one has to support campaigns the more powerful that interest becomes in changing or coloring the debate. The public has the right to know who is contributing to these campaigns and what their special interests are so that voters can make well informed decisions.

Comments provided by :
Edson, Gary

We are rapidly losing representative government in this once great democratic republic.

Largely due to what I consider disastrous and improper decisions by a partisan majority on the Supreme Court, a ludicrous amount of money is being spent on campaigns. To add egregious insult, the Court has decreed that voters do not need to be informed of who the contributors are. Following are a few reasons why the public must be informed about campaign contributions:

- ?To broaden transparency, by reaching more actors;
- ?To deepen it, by creating systems that would allow one to trace funds through pass-through organizations;
- ?To define transparency to mean rapid electronic disclosure in useful formats;
- ?To insure that this applies to the US Senate, which has exempted itself from electronic disclosure laws that apply to all other federal committees; and
- ?To bring together on a single web portal all politically relevant federal disclosure items that now go to several different federal agencies.

Although Congress required more disclosure in 2001 and 2002, organizations have managed to sidestep transparency through an increased use of so-called non-profit advocacy organizations and trade associations.

We need robust protection against corruption in campaign spending. More transparency would certainly be a good first step.

Comments provided by :
Emanuel, Sherry

All campaign funding of all elected officials of every government everywhere must be fully and prominently disclosed to everyone else everywhere.

Comments provided by :
Entrekin, B

I strongly believe that the identity of all funders of political campaigns should be openly disclosed with all material that they support. The use of organizations to hide who's money goes to what candidates and issues is not helping democracy. A democracy needs transparency. If \$ is speech and thus free, it should be openly disclosed.

Sincerely,
Ethan

Comments provided by :
evans, ethan

Tired of big government. We do not need it on the internet too. Our right to freedom of speech is guaranteed by our constitution and Bill of Rights. Please stay out of internet.

Comments provided by :
Evans, Joyce

I believe that all contributors to political campaigns should be public information including the names of those who contribute to PACs or SuperPACs along with the amounts contributed.

Comments provided by :
Ewing, Daniel

GOVERNMENT, "STAY OUT OF OUR BUSINESS!" Keep the Internet free!

Comments provided by :
Exline, Lynnet

The FEC should use whatever influence it has to ensure that ALL campaign contributions be made public and that they be limited to \$1000.00.

Comments provided by :
Faucher, Roger

I am writing concerning the massive amounts of "Dark Money" that has taken control of our election process. When single large contributors can out donate millions of Americans, it warps our true democratic process of electing representatives. A full disclosure of the sources of all monies used in political campaign ads should be mandatory. Thank you

Comments provided by :
Faulkner, Kirby

If we do not know whose money it is we do not know who is "Speaking." Democracy requires knowledge.

Comments provided by :

fay, garry

All contributions given directly to candidates, or to political action committees, whether approved by the candidate or not, should be disclosed to the public. Additionally, political action committees should be required to be named in such a way that it reflects their true purpose - let's call all this a form of "Truth in Advertising."

Comments provided by :
Feldman, Michelle

I feel disclosure of campaign donations is very important. We, the public need to see who politicians are being paid by.

Comments provided by :
Fenner, Kim

I absolutely want to know who's funding politicians and what their agenda is on many different issues like the environmental impacts of their business practices.

Comments provided by :
Fischer, Dawn

I do not want to live in a country in which our laws are dictated by whoever has the most money. Election finance reform is a prerequisite to any progress toward a more egalitarian and democratic nation. If unlimited amounts of money are allowed to be spent on elections, then the very least the law can do is give us the right to know who is buying our elections.

Comments provided by :

Fisk, Dale

I am taking the time to write to you today to tell you I advocate that voters should know which interests are spending how much to win over their votes. While I would like to see Citizens United overturned, it isn't. In the meantime, we voters should at least be informed of who is spending how much to campaign for what candidates.

Thank you

Ruth Fleming

Comments provided by :
Fleming, Ruth

Donations to election campaigns should be made public. Voters need to know where the funds and influence are coming from. If congress would only wear their "sponsors" logos like race car drivers do. Of course that would spoil the silk suits.

Comments provided by :
Flint, George

I want to know who is funding political campaigns and how much they are contributing to various political campaigns.

Comments provided by :
Fontaine, N

Finding and support for all elections and candidate campaigns need to be disclosed whether they are monetary or otherwise

Comments provided by :
Foulke, Kevin

Elections should be publicly funded only. Let's get the private interest money out of our politics.

Comments provided by :
Francis, Michael

Get money out of politics. Money essential disenfranchises the citizen - we still get to vote, but moneyed interests get to pick the candidates. If people want their money to do the talking, they need to attach their names to the money - we need to know who is paying for the candidate. From out here on the voting battlefield, it is not often clear who is supporting which candidate. 73% of the money in the last election came from ten donors - tell me something crooked isn't going on. If all they want to do is support the democratic process, then any money donated can go into a general fund and be distributed to all candidates. Empower the people. Restore to us the ability to call the shots in government. Or at least reread Mark Twain - A Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court, in the chapter entitled Freeman! If you can't draw parallels between Twin's description and the way the upper treats the lower, then you're part of the upper.

Comments provided by :
Frick, Jared

The American public needs to know who is contributing to the election of our representatives. We need to be reassured and convinced that our elections are not being bought by other countries. We need to stop the money that is being funneled into our elections by corporations. This has to stop.

Comments provided by :
Friedman, Carolyn

Please require full public disclosure of all campaign funding. Transparency is one way to start getting our democracy back to the people.

Comments provided by :
Fulton, Eric

The people of America, across party lines, have lost faith in their government because it no longer represents them. Their voices go unheard, silenced by the legalized bribery of dark money and huge campaign contributions. No longer do we have a government, as Lincoln emphasized it, of the PEOPLE, by the PEOPLE, and for the PEOPLE. Our democracy has been deviously undermined and taken over to the point of becoming an oligarchy. Thomas Jefferson and the other founders of our nation have been grossly dishonored, as the rich thumb their noses at what America really stands for. The influence of big dark money goes against the very fabric of our nation's well-being and is totally and completely unAmerican, making a mockery of our most treasured values. It is time for the people to take back their government from the clutches of these evil powers.

Comments provided by :
Gabbard, Susan

Please make campaign donations from anyone more transparent!

Comments provided by :
Gadd, Kevin

I don't know if you take these comments seriously, but here goes. Money is absolutely a corrupting force on politics, and voters should know exactly who has bought their representative. My congressional representative has no interest in representing anyone in the district. He is at the beckon call of the party leadership and the multinational corporations and pacs that bought him, and that he still calls himself a member of the house of "representatives" is deeply insulting. Nearly all Americans can say this.

Comments provided by :
Gallant, Aaron

Ban ALL TELEVISION advertising for politicians running for any office.

Require all political print ads to include the complete first and last name, founders of the group paying for the ad and a reference to website or snail mail address providing access to FULL DISCLOSURE of names of those persons or corporations or PAC or any group paying for the ad. Disclosed information must include the amount each donor contributes to a specific candidate.

Comments provided by :

Garcia, Karen

If corporations, billionaires and labor unions want to broadcast messages to influence my vote, they should be required to say who they are. Please require full disclosure of corporate, union and wealthy funding sources behind express advocacy ads and electioneering communications.

Comments provided by :
Gatlin, Melissa

Any kind monetary transaction needs to be made transparent to the American public. Lack of transparency causes more dishonest behavior.

Psychological studies have proven time and time again that people in positions of higher power WITHOUT supervision tend to behave in unethical self-promotional behavior.

Not only do we need transparency but we also need to hold people ACCOUNTABLE. Without these two things we cannot have a functioning government.

Here are some links to various items concerning cheating, transparency and political corruption.

<http://www.newyorker.com/tech/elements/inside-the-cheaters-mind>

<http://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/cutting-edge-leadership/200908/how-power-corrupts-leaders>

http://info-a.wdfiles.com/local--files/resursi/Catharina%20Lindstedt.%20Daniel%20Naurin%202003%20Transparency%20Against%20Corruption%20_Accepted%20version_.pdf

Comments provided by :
Gavin, Joyce

I would like to know who is donating money for campaign commercials as the truth is often stretched to the limit. It helps to know who is behind it because often it isn't even the candidate but some special interest. It would also show if one group or person was behind financing a lot of commercials to influence the election. They have come up fancy sounding names to cover up, often not indicative of who they really are or represent. I don't want our elections being bought by a few people who are not telling the truth but selectively picking information, often out of context. Election commercial have gotten way out of hand.

Comments provided by :
gaylord, bruce

We need transparency in our election process to ensure we maintain a healthy democracy. While the Supreme Court has rules that money equals speech they have not guaranteed privacy over where that money comes from.

Comments provided by :
Gerstein, Bradley

I appreciate the work you are doing. The issues that I believe to be of utmost importance are the preservation of every individual's right to vote and the right of every individual to know exactly who is contributing to each candidate including how much the contribution is. Please insure both of these are always provided. Thank you.

Comments provided by :
Getber, Rita

Please protect, or rather help restore, the integrity of our elections and our democracy by requiring full public disclosure of all monetary sources, earmarks, affiliations, joint fundraising, etc.

Comments provided by :
Ginsberg, David

THE ONLY THING WRONG WITH THE INTERNET IS ADVERTISEMENTS ON EVERY PAGE, IN THE
MIDDLE OF ARTICLES, UNDER HEADLINES.....
DON'T FIX WHAT ISN'T BROKEN.

Comments provided by :
GODFREY, JOAN

I strongly encourage the FEC to adopt regulations for campaign spending that would make it easy for the average voter to be able to see what Unions or Corporations are supporting which candidate or paying for negative ads against a candidate. I think this is important given the amount of spending and low turnout of the 2014 election, which set record levels.

Comments provided by :
Goetze, Owen

Please ensure rules require complete disclosure of where campaign funds are coming from and who is behind the contributions.

Comments provided by :
Gondzur, Andrew

Total disclosure including all contributors donating more than 10% of funds to a single source.

Comments provided by :
Good, Phillip

As a concerned grandmother, it seems imperative that we do a better job of passing along our planet and our government for future generations. The plutocracy that is currently in power has eroded the economy, the infrastructure, and the planet! Get the plutocrats money OUT of our political system NOW! It is destroying the Land of the free and opportunities for future generations.

Comments provided by :
Goodwin, Lk

I, frankly, do not understand why this should be a question in the first place. An informed electorate is the foundation of a stable democracy. Without full and complete disclosure of names, party or organizational affiliation, and monies spent, the nation as a whole and the electorate in specific are at the mercy of special interests who seek to distort the democratic process for their own agendas. This should be apparent at a glance and, since we have endured restricted access to basic information for some time now, the consequences (inflamed and disruptive partisanship, calcification of government function, and a creeping disinterest and suspicion of governing principles on the part of a citizenry that is increasingly being shut out of participation in national affairs) should be obvious to all. I urge that full disclosure of ALL pertinent information regarding individuals or groups seeking to impact elections be made available as widely as possible, and framed in the strongest and most unambiguous language.

Comments provided by :
Gordon, Bruce

Please do not add any more regulations that would control political speech in the internet, on sites such as YouTube.

William Gordon

Comments provided by :
Gordon, William

When 24/7 fundraising by congressmen, senators, and other elected representatives becomes an integral part of governance, that is a formula for corruption. That is the very definition of corruption. I support requiring a clear and full declaration of WHO is bribing the officials -- ahem, excuse me, donating the money -- to a given candidate. That way, we can at least have an idea of who is bribing -- cough -- uh, supporting the candidate. Thanks for listening.

John C Graves

Comments provided by :
Graves, John

Our government was never for sale in the first place!

Comments provided by :
Gravina , James

All campaign contributions should require public disclosure of source of funds including all types of funders. If a funder is an entity, the entity should be required to disclose identities of the entity's controlling parties.

Comments provided by :
Gray, Lisa

Shedding light on who donates and how much is a necessary tool in fighting pay for play politics. Limiting the amount of donations is another tool in giving every day voices a chance to be heard and not drowned out by those of the rich. Allowing those with the most wealth to steer our county's policies makes a mockery of our democratic process.

Comments provided by :
Green, Ann

No more dark money, let there be light!

Comments provided by :
Green, Russ

Leave the internet alone. I want no more government control of anything.

Comments provided by :
Gregson, Deborah

as a voter I have a right to know who is backing the candidate with cash or with media/tv ads or literature. Campaigns should be publicly funded and we need to stop the billions of dollars funneled into our election process. It should not be a secret society of ultra rich people choosing who they like and pumping in huge dollars to fund their campaigns. this makes the every day person completely ineligible to run for office. Our democracy only works when we take the money out of the political process. Re write the rule and change this policy NOW!

Comments provided by :
greppi, jennifer

It is hard to imagine how this is even in question! Of course transparency is essential to fair and open elections; knowing the source of the money informs the public of the likely motivations and interests of the donor. Dark money allows for access of ANY outside donor with money to influence the electorate toward voting a desired outcome. Why should a foreign national, a multinational corporation whose interests are clearly suspect, or a radical group with secret backers have the power to influence government without accountability? My god! Just signing up to make this comment requires more personal disclosure than current election laws! How does that make any sense? It is time to pull your collective heads out of your collective butts and start putting country before money! 2/3rds of our government is not run by Koch lackeys who spend so much time begging for hand outs they have no time/motivation to govern! At the least people should know who owns the congress and what that money has cost us all.

Comments provided by :
Griffith, John

In order to make informed decisions within the context of the SCOTUS ruling that money is free speech, we have a right to know who is funding the candidate we are voting for. This knowledge will help voter's like myself know how the candidate may vote for certain legislative policies.

Comments provided by :
Guest, Edmund

Democracy requires participation of the governed. It requires an informed electorate. Propaganda machines funded by a few wealthy entities destroys democracy and any kind of representative government we try to have.

I urge you to create a system of elections that prohibits large amounts of money to influence elections at the expense of the many to reward a few.

The low turnout for voting is a result of the people believing that their vote does not matter. They are right. I am counting on you to begin to reverse that attitude by at least limiting campaign financing and increasing transparency.

Comments provided by :
gundlach, e

As a committed voter, not missing an election every since I was eligible to vote years ago, I am always interested to know who is behind the voting messages I receive each election year -- messages that intend to influence my vote. I would like to know who is spending the money, and how much is being spent, to further their message to me. As an informed voter on the issues, and knowledgeable about politics and issues, I want to know just WHO it is that is behind the written and social media messages that are trying to influence my thinking and my vote. I really don't understand why this information is NOT already available to me.

Comments provided by :
Gunsul, Diane

I support full disclosure of all campaign contributions. The public has a right to know the source of, and the amount of these donations. No more dark money.

Comments provided by :
Haas, Gail

It is absolutely imperative that our entire democratic process is transparent. Voters need to know who spending money on which elections to be able to make an informed decision.

Comments provided by :
Hadley, Douglas

In my opinion all funding for elected officials should be identified by the name of the donating person and affiliations. Full disclosure posting and advertised along with any advertisement on television or any media presentation. The American people have a right to know who they are voting for and who is paying for advertising funding also. Country of origin and all corporate affiliation should be disclosed and broadcast with any content.

D.T. Haley

Comments provided by :
Haley, David

Any voter should be able to know where any money spent in an election comes from. Anything else weakens democracy.

Comments provided by :
Hall, Michael

The donation of unlimited funds from corporations in my opinion is very wrong. I do not see how a corporation can be seen as an individual since it is formed and managed by many people. I have never seen a corporation in jail which would show it as an individual. The unlimited donation(s) makes the average voter to question the actual voting process and does my vote count? I feel that it has affected the voter turnout since it looks like the votes are being bought.

Earmarks need to be eliminated and each project stand on its own merits.

Corporate taxes need to be reduced to compete with other countries. A lower tax rate and collection of some tax is better than no tax receipt at all. Establish a National Sales tax that will bring in funds from all purchases from citizens, tourists, illegals, and every purchase.

Raise the gas tax by 5.1% to provide funding for transportation repairs and infrastructure.

Personal tax rate needs to be made a flat tax with a starting level at the poverty level. No deduction, exemptions, or loop holes. Tax is withheld and no filing for refunds etc would be required. IRS could continue audits and eventually be dissolved due to attrition and retirements.

Social Security trust fund needs to be made whole by returning "borrowed" funds.

Comments provided by :

Hall, stanley

I believe it is necessary to have transparency related to total and source of funding for campaign funding.

I support this requirement and change in current procedures.

Comments provided by :

Hallman, Joan

If I have prove who I am to cast a vote. With no history of voter fraud. We should know who is funding our politicians and how much they are giving. The general public has no idea how the money is corrupting our democracy. It is no longer one person one vote. The candidate with the most money is clearly the norm these days. Personally I would like all statewide and federal

Offices to be publicly funded. If these people work for us we should put our money where are mouths are.

If we are going to let politicians be sold to the highest bidder. That information needs to be made public to everyone.

We need to know who and how much.

Comments provided by :

hamby, Diane

voters should know which interests are spending how much to win over their votes

Comments provided by :
Hannel, Joel

All monies used for the promotion of a political candidate or any proposed legislative action must show its source in the public domain for the American political process to qualify as democracy!

Comments provided by :
Harpstrite, Richard

As a voter and a citizen of the United States I am requesting that there be no more 'dark money' allowed in US elections hereafter. Each voter should have a voice that is not over rode by corporations or wealthy individuals. I would like our democracy returned to us, the voters. Thank you. Shirley Harrington-Moore

Comments provided by :
Harrington-Moore, Shirley

All donors ,even of 100 dollars should be open to the public right away, not the next filing. The current system allows large donations in the final quarter not to be vocable until after the election. Please stop this!

Comments provided by :
Harrison, Sarah

All information required to link those donating funds and providing other direct and indirect material assistance to any person seeking or holding office should be disclosed regardless of the amount of funds or assistance provided. Such disclosures should be made in as close to real time as possible and the information made readily available to the public by some modern means such as a web site.

Comments provided by :
hausler, Glenn

America's system is broken.

We claim that voting is a right while making it difficult (or impossible) for citizens to vote, selling elections to dark money and lying our way through election after election.

We need transparency-- who is funding the candidate? Directly or indirectly.

We need limits on donations that put corporate donors on an even footing with middle class donors.

We need to make voting easier-- add online registration and voting.

We need extended voting hours and we need to make election days Federal holidays.

We need to require truth in advertising-- opinion is not fact.

Comments provided by :

Hawkins, Esther

Transparency in advocacy: Any contribution; whether directly to a campaign, a PAC, a 501(c)(4), 501(c)(6) or other advocacy group; in excess of \$100 should be a matter of public record.

Restriction of shell companies: If more than 30% of the capital expenditures that a business structure (Including, but not limited to corporations, LLCa, partnerships, or 501(c) organizations) makes are to advocacy groups, then that entity itself should be classified as an advocacy group, and its funding sources must also be disclosed as outlined above.

Comments provided by :
Wallace, Michelle

Those using their wealth to buy and use candidates will one day find they are not going to be in control because someone else will have more influence. We must put a stop to this unjust practice. There must be limits!!!!

Comments provided by :
Hawkins, Faye

I believe it's very important to have full disclosure on online rulemaking. As a small business person I am very concerned about anything that limits our ability to compete in our industry. Large corporations are beginning to be monopolies in that everything is making it easier for them to take all the business at the expense of smaller brick and mortar stores in communities.

Comments provided by :
Hawley, Bonnie

I think that individual limits on contributions to candidates should be limited morethan they are now and also donation amounts made available to the public even if bundled. In fact I am really in favor of public funding of elections. Also, I think that PAC's and other private groups should no longer be able to put ads on TV.

Comments provided by :
Heath, Edward

All candidates should be required to disclose all sources of money for campaigns. All political ads for candidates should provide full information on the sponsor and source of funds to pay for the ad. Any ad on a specific political/policy issue should also disclose who paid for it and all sources of funds.

Comments provided by :
Heckert, Karen

It is very important for us, as voters in America, to know who is influencing our elections and what their interests are. Financial disclosure is essential for voters to make an informed decision.

Comments provided by :
Heerey, Alan

Since money has become so important in elections, voters should know who the big donors are to candidates, propositions and referenda, parties, and political ad campaigns and how much they have contributed. The information should be easy to find, easy to interpret. This transparency is especially important because there seems to be no political will to impose limits. Unlimited spending, anonymous donors, and fundraising organizations with deceptive names erode democracy. If we won't level the playing field, the least we must do is to bring the players out in the open. Anyone who hides contributions can't be trusted. We need to know what we're getting when we vote.

Comments provided by :
Heifferon, Nancy

All amounts and their contributors should be publicly identified. The information should include employer or other affiliation that is important, such as political action committee. All funds contributed through PACs should include name and address of the PAC's members and contributors, as well as their employees names and addresses, whether paid or volunteer. End the smoke and mirrors of "dark money'.....

Comments provided by :

Hein, Kerry

I absolutely believe that the American Public deserves to know what individual, company, corporation or organization is contributing to all elections. Companies and corporations should have to disclose all officers and boards of directors. Organizations should have to list all members of that organization. Elections should not be able to be sold to the highest bidder.

May God give you guidance when making your decision.

Comments provided by :
Hendrie, Mary Jean

Of course the public should have that information. As a Democratic nation, citizens should have all info about contributions having impact on elections. we need to have access to all information concerning voting.

Comments provided by :
Henley, Peggy

Full disclosure for all money contributed to public officials by private individuals, PACs, special interest groups, just say all donations.

Comments provided by :
Henyon, Susan

No candidate federal or state should hide where their money is coming from to run for office. It should be state or federal money with candidates who are going to be in the election (after primaries) so there is an even playing field. No one has any more money than another candidate.

Comments provided by :
higham, sandy

Please -- US citizens have a right to disclosure about campaign contributions.

Thank you.

Blanche Hill

Comments provided by :
Hill, Blanche

The current effort by the FEC Chair Ann Ravel and her Obama administration friends to silence their opposition is not acceptable. EVERYONE's First Amendment rights must be protected. We must not allow a political party to silence the voices of those who believe differently from them. STOP these attempts to close down free speech on the internet. Political speech must continue to be free and unhindered. When we don't protect the words of other even when we don't agree will lead us to a society that is not free. It becomes a government by and for the government and not the people. Stop this move against free speech on the internet.

Elizabeth Hill

Comments provided by :
Hill, Elizabeth

Political advertisements, in and of themselves, may not appear to some to vary in value based on money spent. However, money buys both influence and time. The ability to increase the exposure of any particular message **/disproportionately/** is certainly a function of money. Money is directly related to how widely and how often any message is seen and in what media that message is viewed. Every study regarding exposure to messages, whether political or commercial marketing, very clearly demonstrates the efficacy - the essential requirement - for such exposure and repetition.

It should be absolutely required that ANYONE donating to candidates and or political action committees on behalf of candidates should reveal who they are and how much they donated. This is more necessary than ever after Citizens United and McCutcheon. This is not a new phenomenon, but one well documented and goes back at least to Joe McGinnis's book "The Selling of the President." It has simply become a more codified and egregious practice as it has evolved and as the lobbyist influences on legislatures and, it would appear, the Court have become more flagrant than ever.

Comments provided by :
Hillery, Robert

Disclosure is not taking it far enough but it is a step in the right direction.

Comments provided by :

Hillier, Brett

For the future of our Republic, the future of democracy, the future of our country we have the right to know who is in who's pockets.

Comments provided by :
Himebaugh, JoAnne

One of the few things that Alan Keyes proposed that made complete sense was his idea on campaign finance reform. It had three points:

- 1) All contributions are public knowledge.
- 2) There is no limit to the amount that can be given.
- 3) You can only contribute to people that you are able to vote for.

This protects First Amendment rights and stops contributions from PACs, Corporations, and Unions.

Comments provided by :

Hinds, Gregory

I am of the opinion that the identity of the donor of political campaign contributions of any and all types, should be readily available to the general public. The recent supreme court opinion that this is not required makes it very difficult to identify the person or persons responsible for same which is not a proper action in a democratic society such as we have.

If persons donating large sums of money to fund certain political campaigns is allowed to continue, it makes an objective evaluation of motives impossible and makes the average voter an insignificant entity in any political campaign. Those of significant means should not be allowed to sway the outcome of any political campaign.

Comments provided by :
Hinkle, Donald

ALL donations given to city, county, state, and national candidates SHOULD be made PUBLIC !!

Pat Hinkle, valued and registered voter !!!!

Comments provided by :
hinkle, pat

It is important to me that candidates for office should not be financed by moneyed people and companies. We should be selecting people, like ourselves, that will represent our views. We have gotten so far away from that, that it is no wonder that people don't vote anymore. Why should they?? Every candidate should be using the same amount of money and no more. It was very disappointing to hear that in the last election and before, that candidates did not solicit advertising their positions and still adds were on TV - unfortunately they were extremely negative!! My background is being interested in politics, but I don't want to see one more add on TV for any side. All this money that is being spent could be used for programs for the people who most need it. Buying elections just makes the "regular person" disinterested in elections.

Comments provided by :
Hippler, Clydora

Please give ordinary people a fighting chance to reach our congress reps. by other means than financial.

Comments provided by :
Hoffman, J.S.

To all:

I absolutely want the right to see the real names of every major donor to a political candidate or on behalf of a candidate or a political campaign through a independent 501(c)(4) campaign agency.

Comments provided by :

Hooker, John

We deserve to know where money is being spent in elections. If corporations or the wealthy want to spend millions on electing politicians, we need to know who they are. Transparency is critical in helping voters elect honest politicians who will fight for their beliefs and interests.

Comments provided by :
Hott, Lyndon

With the Citizens United decision, the Supreme Court let rich folks give as much as they want to political campaigns, but current rules say the Super PAC organizations don't have to disclose those donors, so how do we know who is supporting what?

We need to know who is paying for these.

Comments provided by :
Houghton, Cindy

The public should absolutely know who is giving money and how much they are giving to any candidate for office. Anyone who gives money for legitimate reasons should have no objection to have their name and the amount known. I think that only crooks or people who know they may harm their own business interests or personal reputation by donating would object to having their name and amount of money donated known.

Comments provided by :

Howe, Janet

Regarding Disclosure as a Public Agent

As an state employee, I am required to disclose the source and use of my funds in operating federal grants and programs. This is considered important because it ensures transparency. Although it is a hassle and sometimes I would prefer that we could simply take in additional funds as we see fit without the added paperwork, I feel that disclosure not only improves our public standing but prevents progress down a slippery slope of deception and poor accounting practices. It is hypocritical that those who intend to take elected office are not held to a similar standard of forthright honesty. Please consider creating clear and thorough disclosure laws regarding campaign finance.

Sincerely,
Samantha Howe, PhD

Comments provided by :
Howe, Samantha

I want publicly funded elections with a firm allocation of taxes for each prospective candidate for advertising, informative website, and debates. no more donors, no more PACS, no more corporations buying our candidates. I want candidates vetted with a thorough criminal background check, psychological test, an exam showing thorough knowledge of economics, domestic and foreign policy and geography, legislative vs executive processes, and a resume with a proven record of success, improving business processes or quality of life for communities.

Comments provided by :
Howington, Teresa

I believe the FEC should require public disclosure of campaign money. Voters should get to know which interests are spending how much to win over votes. As a democracy, we should know who is backing the people we are choosing to represent us, to ensure that our representation election process is as fair and transparent as it can be. To ensure our democracy thrives, we need the FEC to require public disclosure of campaign money. There shouldn't be any reason for any politician to have to hide who is donating them their campaign money, unless they are doing illegitimate work. Please make the correct decision and enforce public disclosure of campaign money!

Comments provided by :
Hu, David

Dear FEC,

PLEASE limit and require full disclosure of campaign contributions that go directly to candidates and SuperPacs.

The contributions of Koch brothers are an excellent example of how money can influence our policies. These are a few of the things David Koch ran on as a part of his vice-presidential campaign in 1980:

?We urge the repeal of federal campaign finance laws, and the immediate abolition of the despotic Federal Election Commission.?

?We favor the abolition of Medicare and Medicaid programs.?

?We oppose any compulsory insurance or tax-supported plan to provide health services, including those which finance abortion services.?

?We also favor the deregulation of the medical insurance industry.?

?We favor the repeal of the fraudulent, virtually bankrupt, and increasingly oppressive Social Security system. Pending that repeal, participation in Social Security should be made voluntary.?

?We propose the abolition of the governmental Postal Service. The present system, in addition to being inefficient, encourages governmental surveillance of private correspondence. Pending abolition, we call for an end to the monopoly system and for allowing free competition in all aspects of postal service.?

?We oppose all personal and corporate income taxation, including capital gains taxes.?

?As an interim measure, all criminal and civil sanctions against tax evasion should be terminated immediately.?

?We support repeal of all law which impede the ability of any person to find employment, such as minimum wage laws.?

?We advocate the complete separation of education and State. Government schools lead to the indoctrination of children and interfere with the free choice of individuals. Government ownership, operation, regulation, and subsidy of schools and colleges should be ended.?

?We support the abolition of the Environmental Protection Agency.?

?We support abolition of the Department of Energy.?

?We call for the dissolution of all government agencies concerned with transportation, including the Department of Transportation.?

?We specifically oppose laws requiring an individual to buy or use so-called "self-protection" equipment such as safety belts, air bags, or crash helmets.?

?We advocate the abolition of the Federal Aviation Administration.?

?We advocate the abolition of the Food and Drug Administration.?

?We support an end to all subsidies for child-bearing built into our present laws, including all welfare plans and the provision of tax-supported services for children.?

?We oppose all government welfare, relief projects, and ?aid to the poor? programs. All these government programs are privacy-invading, paternalistic, demeaning, and inefficient. The proper source of help for such persons is the voluntary efforts of private groups and individuals.?

?We call for the privatization of the inland waterways, and of the distribution system that brings water to industry, agriculture and households.?

?We call for the repeal of the Occupational Safety and Health Act.?

?We call for the abolition of the Consumer Product Safety Commission.?

In 1980, his ideas were considered radical. Now he's well on his way to implementing them because he and his brother have the money to drastically influence every single election in the US - and they have been influencing most of them!

The Princeton study by Gilens and Page conclusively shows that we are in an oligarchy and not a democracy. And the biggest reason is because the Supreme court has taken away any limits to spending in politics by rich donors who can do it in secret.

Our loss of our Democracy is creating the worst inequality we've ever had, and its destroying our environment, our safety net, our health care and creating civil and social unrest. And it will only get worse until you find the courage to

put a stop to this unlimited undisclosed spending.

Sincerely, Tina Huang, Ph.D.

Comments provided by :
Huang, Tina

My right to free speech shall not be infringed by anyone!

Comments provided by :
Hund, Richard

I support any measure that would enable transparency for all money spent on campaigns. If money equals speech and cannot be restricted under the constitution, which in my opinion makes absolutely no sense, then so be it. However, there is no known guarantee of anonymity. Therefore all campaign contributions from individuals, corporations, interest groups or any other entities must be fully disclosed.

Rules should also be put in place to ensure that there are absolutely zero foreign funds used in any election. The burden of proof should be placed on the entity making the contributions.

Comments provided by :
huseby, Mark

Yes all donations should be disclosed. Those with money are buying our democracy. The one with the most money should not be able to control the process. At least if they have to disclose, I can make a choice about where I buy my products.

Comments provided by :
Huskey, Jan

I think that there is NO question that we should require transparency of who donates to candidates. We as the american public have a right to know who is funding the candidates that we vote for. I think that if people know who is actually funding the campaigns of these candidates that it would help us make a better decision as to who we should put into office. If big oil or big pharma is funding a candidate's campaign, we should be allowed to know that information. Thank you very much for your time.

Comments provided by :
Huston, Alex

Hello FEC,

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on REG 2014-01.

It is my request to you that policy be enacted making all moneys going to any Federal representative, whether in support of public cause, in electing the individual/ticket/party or any other donation, contribution or payment should be explicitly on-record and open/available to the public without delay, time restriction, exception or option.

Best Regards,
-Paul Iatesta

Comments provided by :
Iatesta, Paul

Please support universally fair elections without unjust monetary influence. Any donation of any type to any candidate, campaign, or politically influencing advertisement should be completely transparent. What is the purpose of hiding? Only unfair reasons lead sneaky stealth donations. Even better, all political offices should have a campaign cap that allows a non-wealthy person and a rich person to compete on equal financial footing.

Comments provided by :
Illige, Martha

One of the things I look at when trying to make an informed decision on Propositions in my home state of California, is what companies, institutions, etc. contribute to the campaigns for or against the proposition. It is very important to me to understand who the proposition is likely to benefit. I think this should be made available in every election including all elections at the Federal level. With the ruling on Citizens United to give corporations limitless campaign donations, it is in the very least necessary to make those contributions available to the public, whom our representatives are supposed to represent.

Comments provided by :
Iredale, Susan

full disclosure please

Comments provided by :
Irwin, Steve

I am a patriot you will never take my freedom of speech .what are you liberals afraid of being exposed well looks like you already are.

Comments provided by :
isbell, justin

I am in favor of requiring full public disclosure of all campaign contributions in any election or vote.

Comments provided by :

Isham, Brian

Act to disclose groups and to declare the amount and which group they are giving money to. The public has the right to know.

Comments provided by :
Ito Pitsch, Phyllis

It is imperative that the citizens of this country know who is contributing to political candidates & how much. We have the right to know who backs whom & what the priorities are of the contributors. Since the Supreme Court said the sky's the limit on PAC's, I want to know who is actually running this country & making the decisions. It sure isn't us voters! Our representatives no longer represent us. They represent & do the bidding of the PAC's without any consideration of the affect on the citizens of this once great country. It's all about getting elected and, once in office, making sure they get elected again. It's all a sham.

If our elected officials actually represented us, health care wouldn't be in the abismal shape it's in, people would be earning a living wage & not living from paycheck to paycheck like my family is. I can't spend to help keep the economy going as I have medical bills to pay thanks to my employers lousy health "benefits" (haha benefits). And how about college for my kid??? Who can afford the tuition? This country is a mess. And the sooner our so called representatives have to divulge whose butts their kissing, the better off this country will be!

Comments provided by :
Jackson, Patricia

This should not even be a question! All interests supporting a particular political party of action should be fully disclosed publicly, regardless of the amount donated or the occasion for donation! That's how a democracy should work.

Comments provided by :
Jadotte, Yuri

I believe the Supreme Court decision on Citizens United needs to be overturned. Big money in politics means big problems for the representation of the citizens. The State of Wisconsin is a fine example of how "Pay to Play Politics" benefits the special interest and not the people.

As a first course, all donations to any candidate should be disclosed and open record. The people need to know who's buying their elected official. Second, allow and increase public funding for candidates not wanting to accept PAC funding. Limit, or suspend, lobbying during election years. Limit the amount of money that can be raised for a candidate, or the amount that can be spent on a campaign. This included the money being spent by special interests.

Comments provided by :
Janisch, Tony

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE HAVE AN ABSOLUTE RIGHT TO KNOW WHO'S FUNDING CAMPAIGNS, CAMPAIGN MATERIALS, AND POLITICAL ACTIVITIES.

Because the first amendment to the US Constitution gave us the right to "petition our government for a redress of grievances" and we can't do that if we don't know who the people in our government are really serving. Money rules. Everybody with a boss knows that the guy writing your paycheck writes the rules. In a democracy, that's supposed to be the American taxpayer, but that's not the case today because of all the money flowing into politics in secret.

MONEY GIVEN IN SECRET IS NOT SPEECH; IT'S BRIBERY AND CORRUPTION. In order for a donation to be speech, it has to be identifiably public.

Also, the American system of politics is for Americans to control, and if the money controlling our politics is secret, then there's no way to know who's controlling it. Where's the money coming from that's so offensive that you can't let the American people know about it? China? Islamic State? Who's writing these checks?

The American people have a greater right, a greater interest, in knowing where the money is coming from because of our first amendment right to petition the government for a redress of grievances than anybody has to keep it secret.

Comments provided by :
Jenkins, Glen

I would like to see elections law be improved by the strengthening of disclosure law. What I would like to see is that disclosure follows the money back to the original donator, in other words the person who reported that money as income earned by them. I want to see the sunlight of disclosure start at the point the money is expended to support a political position and travel all the way back along the currently shadowy roads of "independent" organizations and political groups back to the source. This could be done by tracking individual donations all the way through the layers of obfuscation to the source. This could be done by tracking my \$20 donation to organization A, through organizations B, C, and D to where it was expended to support a specific candidate or position. This would be cumbersome, and it should be. It would encourage direct donations rather than hiding behind multiple layers of organizations designed to hide where donations come from. Alternatively each organization could simply say here is the entire list of who donated how much to us, and here is the list of how much of the money went where.

Again, the key here is the money has to go all the way back to the source, the person (or corporation) that reported that money as income.

Thank you for your time.

Comments provided by :
Jensen, Scott

Get money out of politics. Create representative government that is beholden to the people, and not the one percent who pays for their campaign; end the oligarchy once and for all, and restore American's faith in the democratic process.

Comments provided by :
Jeremy, Grey Robert

All financial contributions to political campaigns must be made public to maintain a representative democracy. Without transparency, the system collapses.

Comments provided by :
jessen, justus

Please consider instituting new rules requiring public disclosure of campaign money. The current system allows for special interests to spend large amounts of money to influence people's votes and then to influence the politicians to make laws that benefit themselves disproportionately. At least public disclosure of campaign money would add more transparency to a system which currently what amounts to dark money buying the political process.

Comments provided by :

John, Lauri

Voters should absolutely know the source of every dollar a candidate or the party receives.

Comments provided by :
Johnson, David

I believe Citizens United has undermined the entire election process. We need additional transparency of campaign finance funds to allow the voter to have an informed decision of the candidate they vote on who is supporting their campaign. This allows the voter to possibly have an understanding of the candidates support financially and determine if they also want to support the candidate if most of the contribution money is allied with the values and platform attributes of the voters and candidates talking points during a campaign or if they don't match then the voter has more discretion to decide if the candidate is providing false pretense and is possibly beholden to the contributors of big amounts of campaign funds from a single or small group of people that are contrary to the campaign platforms public record. Example the candidate is strongly supporting climate science and believes in climate change and should do something once they are in office will create legislation to help develop ways to reduce the short and long term effects of climate change. But during the campaign the donors of the candidates biggest campaign money are a few very large sums from anti climate change interests it may allow the voter to say maybe this candidate didn't have the attributes they have been using on there campaign and gives the voter more information to decide if the candidate is being truthful and gives the press enough info to vet the candidates biggest supporting people or groups there reason for supporting this candidate if they don't believe in the candidates platform but are giving massive amounts of contributions to support this candidate and campaign when they seem unlikely to be a contributor. So a corporate pool that is not in favor of any climate change legislation and has vehemently denied and support efforts to not have efforts by government to work on "climate change in any capacity. So the voter could say these two don't add up and I may want to look at another candidate that isn't taking money from these donor's.

In any case I believe it is important to have all the information to make informed decisions about their candidate based on all the information available and that info should also consist of who all the donors of very large amounts of money are coming from. So if a candidate supporting what was given in my example had large donors from people and groups that support climate change legislation. You would think the candidate was straight with the voters then not causing themselves to be not straightforward with the voters and possibly lying. So please make any candidate and donor register all funds received with the actual names and names of groups but the group must be transparent so we know who is in the group not hidden behind more groups that don't say what there purpose is regarding the candidates platform or just make it so a voter or the press can go to a public online record during the campaign and after that shows all the donors to allow real transparency and give voters and the press the tools to verify the candidates are being truthful to the electorate.

Thank you.

Comments provided by :
Johnson, Jerime

All donations to political parties or individual politicians or the groups that support them need to be made public

Comments provided by :
Johnston, Charles

I'm all for increased transparency and disclosure regarding election contributions. The public has the right to understand not only candidates positions on issues, but their background, business and commercial interests, and which companies, individuals, and organizations align with their campaigns including contributions. I also just learned of the Real Time Transparency Act S.2207 and H.R.4442, and support this easy change to the process.

Comments provided by :

Jones, Brian

I am saddened that a nation which was founded on the rights of FREE SPEECH would suddenly want to REGULATE speech on the internet! I call it a violation of the First amendment because this is not even coming from CONGRESS but instead from the Executive Branch, which, as I was taught in History and Civics classes, has the responsibility of ENFORCING the laws and NOT creating them!

If you REALLY want to do something about 'political speech' then instead of cracking down on Mr. and Mrs. John Q. Public AND what they post on Facebook or in a Blog in cyberspace why don't you crack down on "The New York Times" and the "Washington Post" and other so-called 'newspapers' but which are little more than Democrat Party talking points? Add to that the broadcast networks and their so-called 'News Departments' (and the cable news channels), most of which never saw a Conservative they liked and never saw a Liberal they didn't just absolutely LOVE! Let's crack down on them and call their products what they are--FREE ADVERTISING FOR THE DEMOCRAT PARTY!!!

For every article they put out that favors Liberals they should have to pay \$100,000.00 to the GOP! To make it fair of course they would also have to pay the Democrat Party if they posted something that favored conservatives. Extend this to the so-called "Entertainment Divisions" of the broadcast networks and the cable networks as well. This would truly stamp out 'political speech' and would also force so-called 'journalists' to actually do their jobs without bias!

we all know why such a plan would never be considered or enacted--because those companies have lots of LOBBYISTS who are busy working the halls of power to KEEP such regulations from hurting them. So instead you decide that WE THE PEOPLE are the problem and you have decided to go after US because WE cannot afford the lobbyists who can BUY the regulations that regulate the least like the big corporations can!

Think about this before you decide to further trash our country and the principles it was founded on! I don't expect this to change your minds because they are already made up--this little exercise is little more than a charade to make us believe that we the people still have some control over things. The current administration has made it CRYSTAL clear about how it feels about our country and the people who built it and who currently live in it and especially about the rule of law and the Constitution. It has also made it clear how it feels about anyone who opposes it! I am proudly standing in opposition today just like our forefathers did!

Comments provided by :
Jones, David

Bill Maher, comedian, donated \$1,000,000 in the 2012 election. His opinion is not more valid than mine. We both get a single vote. And there were others who spent considerably more than Maher. I am against any system that allows those with the means to spend amounts that most citizens would refer to as "a lot of money." I know my loose terms are open to interpretation but feel that the previous \$2000 cap (I believe) was at least a close multiple of what I could donate -- maybe \$100. That cap is twenty times what I could see myself donating. I could speak to, and possibly influence twenty people with my views of an issue in any election. But \$1,000,000 is 10,000 times what I could spend. And I don't think that I have any chance of meeting and possibly influencing that many people on a personal level. Add to that the idea that my views are often at odds with those I consider rich, and the system seems rigged. Making all donations public and traceable and limited is fair. The rich still will be able to give the max but will not be able to squash the little guy's voice by outspending by very large multiples of the common citizen's donations.

Gordon Jones

Teacher

Comments provided by :

Jones, Gordon

I agree, "dark money" contributions should be made public to give the voter the information he needs to make a well informed decision about his voting choice.

Comments provided by :
Jones, Jimmy

Please require disclosures of all campaign donations. We need to know who is supporting our politicians. I am tired of a Congress that is effectively bought and sold by those who make campaign donations. We need more transparency so we can hold our representatives accountable for their actions (or lack thereof).

Comments provided by :
Jones, Sam

Transparency is critical in evaluating the context of any message. The public needs to know the context, and any bias, of a speaker. This is particularly true for speakers who can dominate forums, like electronic media.

Bias is always at issue.

Providing transparency with respect to funding prevents deception. Deception, like theft, is always against the law. Defrauding a vote is actually worse than defrauding money.

The FEC should establish, promote, and maintain 1) transparency in our system and 2) a level playing field for all participants. Such elements are critical to our elections and our democracy.

Thank you.

Comments provided by :
Jordan, Andrew

Please make a rule or rules requiring public disclosure of campaign money, both the amount and the person or organization that donated the money. The public should be able to know which interest groups are supporting candidate's campaigns.

Thank you.

Comments provided by :
Jordan, Anthony

Disclosure must be required of all those who wish to use their money to influence the outcome of an election. To allow anonymous donation opens the possibility of foreign entities being afforded the opportunity to quietly exert influence.

Comments provided by :
Joseph, Jeff

We believe that all voting citizens should know who is running for office and that whoever is educating them as to the qualities of the candidates should identify themselves. In other words, whoever funds political ads must be identified. This may mean doing away with the 401(c4) tax category, allowing hiding your identity.

Comments provided by :
Judy Occhetti-Klohr, Leo Klohr and

The citizens of this country deserve to know who is funding political campaigns for or against an issue or candidate in a prompt and complete manner prior to an election. Not just some group name, but the names of the members of that group and how much each contributed as well as how much the group contributed to what political effort. In the age of the computer and internet, this should not be a major problem.

Postings by individual or by the group they contributed to for those contributing more than \$2,000 in aggregate should be made daily during each election cycle. Those who refuse to comply should be fined for each occurrence and item an amount triple the amount, or \$100,000, whichever ever is more. Individuals in the group should be held individually responsible based on their amounts for any default by the group.

Money does influence votes through the use of mass commercials and advertisements. A measure in determining the veracity of these is who is funding them. The voter deserves to know before they vote.

Comments provided by :
Jurkovich, William

As a citizen of the United States, I feel I have a right to know, what special interest groups and who, are backing our people running for office.

This will help me make an informed decision as to who I would support for office.

Thank you,
Christine Katz

Comments provided by :
Katz, Christine

The first amendment in the Bill of Rights was first for a reason. What FREEDOM as an American citizen is more precious than FREEDOM of SPEECH? Even "stupid voters" have the right to question, voice opinions and Share in public discourse. FEC you work for us.

Comments provided by :
Kearse, Karen

Please, hands off our First Amendment rights. America is the land of the free and the home of the brave. Much precious blood was shed to purchase and secure these very rights. Let us not be so quick to surrender such a dear gift.

Comments provided by :
Keenan, Marilyn

The Supreme Court ruling in favor of Citizens United opened the door for contributors to sway votes using excessive fund raising, insipid television ads, mailers, robocalls and other propaganda. This has violated my rights as a citizen and voter. The identities of these contributors should be made public. This commission needs to rule in favor of the average citizen and not big money.

Comments provided by :
Kelly, Kathleen

I feel that government should ALWAYS be required to give full disclosure of all its operations. Including, but not limited to earmarking, fundraising, campaigning, special interests, ect.

Comments provided by :
Kemple, Austin

I strongly believe that all contributors who fund efforts to influence votes on candidates or issues should be disclosed in a prominent way. I believe that effective steps should be taken to prevent contributors from hiding their identities through shell organizations or other schemes. I believe that the publication of this information should be extremely timely, and that delays in publication by using obsolete technology should be avoided.

Comments provided by :
Kennington, Ned

Between the disastrous rulings on McCutcheon and Citizens United and the striking of vital provisions of the Civil Rights Act, this SCOTUS has turned our representative democracy into an Oligarchy. The vast majority of Americans and their Middle-Class life problems are never considered, simply the wishes of the super-rich and corporations. We the People need government to work for US, and are desperately seeking legal methods for reversing both of these decisions, but more importantly, getting money completely OUT of politics. We need to reverse these SCOTUS decisions, have publically funded elections with equal funding provided to each candidate. No corporate money should ever be allowed to touch our elections or campaigns. End corporate influence, outlaw lobbying, publically fund elections with equal funding for each candidate and allow NO outside purchase of ads or support of political office. Outlaw all "social welfare" PACS and SuperPACS, set a significant Wall St transaction tax and restore the whole of the Civil Rights act to protect minorities. That must include ending all Voter Suppression Laws, supposedly preventing Voter Fraud which is virtually non-existent, but the implementation of these red state voter laws has disenfranchised millions of American citizens, primarily those of color, students, and minorities. We must restore our Democracy, and that begins with legislating that Corporations are NOT people, Money is NOT speech (it is property) and Racism is rampant rather than no longer a factor in American politics and life.

Comments provided by :

Kerr, Janet

Dear FCC:

It is very important to me personally that we, the US public (whether voters or not), should know about how money is being solicited, donated and spent as well as exactly how much is spent, to control Communications in the US.

I am concerned with the ethics of mega-corporations having undue influence over what materials are shared and the way material is shared with the public -- over radio, t.v. and the Internet in particular.

This is an important matter of ethics and I demand transparency at all levels of governance.

Sincerely,

Kristan Kincade
1618 W. 8th St.
Port Angeles, WA 98363-5208
(360-457-2063)

Comments provided by :
KINCADE, KRISTAN

I believe the American people have a right to know who is buying their votes, their politicians and their laws. When I know this information I can make a much better sense of what is happening behind the scenes. I can read the situation making my vote more carefully defined. I am now and always will be for full disclosure in all political funding at every level. I believe the Citizens United decision is not only unconstitutional but simply anti American.

Comments provided by :
king, walter

It is my right as a citizen if this country to know how politicians are supported and how money is spent in the political realm.

Comments provided by :
Kingsbury, Jennifer

I am not an attorney, but it appears to me that the SC, in its decision in *Boyle v US*, provided the FEC with enough latitude to strengthen its affiliation language. Specifically, Justice Alito, in his majority decision quoted the following: "an ongoing organization with some sort of framework, formal or informal, for carrying out its objectives" and that "the various members and associates of the association function[ed] as a continuing unit to achieve a common purpose."

The aforementioned language should be sufficient for the FEC to issue new "affiliation" regulations to determine if campaign contributions are, predicated on the furtherance of a "common purpose," where the goal is to enhance the financial viability of specific persons or interests. Therefore, disclosure of the "individual" identities of all contributors is in the public interest.

The "common purpose" instruction can also include determining who is actually controlling the purse strings of any particular organized political committee.

While citing a case involving RICO may seem a stretch, the FEC is responsible for protecting the American electoral process. Therefore, the regulations warrant full disclosure to ascertain the initial funding source of political contributions, and to determine if any foreign entities are attempting to "influence" American elections.

Comments provided by :
Kirk, James

Dark money is hurting our country. Voters should be aware of the sources of money that our "elected" officials are using to get into office.

Comments provided by :
Kiser, Mike

There should be no such thing as anonymous political campaign donations. All donations should be traceable back to the individual who made it regardless of whether it came from an individual, a PAC, or some other "bundling" group.

Comments provided by :
Klassen, David

There should be a ceiling on political donations. I would suggest a maximum of \$50 per candidate. The average US Citizen is hard pressed to make any donation because of the low compensation that companies pay their employees. The Rich (upper 1%) can afford to pay millions of dollars because they control the wealth of the USA. That is why the Rich have so much influence over the political system. The Rich influence elected officials to pass laws that reduce their taxes and get subsidies for their businesses that refund much more than their campaign donations.

The average citizen does not have enough to donate to get any influence. As a result the millions or billions of average citizens end up paying the majority of taxes and do not get subsidies.

Comments provided by :
Klein, Bill

Beyond limiting individual contributions to an amount that any concerned citizen might make, it is imperative to identify the source of contributions to the public discourse. If money is speech, then public speech requires public attribution.

Comments provided by :
Knight, David

In America, our democracy is predicated upon a well-educated and informed electorate.

We need to know where and from whom the money in politics is coming. Free speech is crucial for all opinions to be brought to the "public square" and so all citizens have a right to be heard. It is of vital interest to our democracy that we know who is speaking. Anonymous speech undermines the public trust and fosters an atmosphere of deceit and secrecy. We need to restore trust and accountability to our political process. I strongly support full disclosure of all political spending and contributions.

Comments provided by :
Knowland, Dan

All political dollars should be required to be disclosed completely and within 72 hours.

Comments provided by :
Koger, V

There should be no outside private funds allowed. Only public monies. No more lobbyists or campaign donors buying off politicians before they are even in office, to make laws against the will and/best interests of the American people. I don't have the money to "buy" a political to ensure he will govern they way I want him to, so others shouldn't either. Keep the voting process fair and equal to ALL.

Comments provided by :
Kopala, Wendy

It's critical for all Americans to know the source of political funding. Full disclosure of special interests allows citizens to weigh information in the appropriate context. Moreover, citizens should have the opportunity to support those entities that share a particular set of values. Politicians should be transparent about funding sources that may influence or confuse their decision-making abilities. We need to know. Please increase transparency.

Comments provided by :
Kornack, Julie

We need transparency in our election system.

Comments provided by :
Kunhardt, Tom

To whom it may concern,

I am very apathetic about voting because I feel that it's very difficult to get a true understanding of a candidate's interests. Disclosing the source(s) of campaign funds would give voters a better picture of where a candidate's interests are and increase the likelihood of getting them to the polls. Voter turn out is abysmal. This is one of many things that will need to happen to get the voice of the people heard.

Sincerely,

Todd Kunkelman

Comments provided by :

Kunkelman, Todd

I think informed voters are essential for a functional Democracy. We live in a time where popular confidence in the federal government is extremely low. I believe this is, in large part, due to the almost-obligatory dishonesty required of politicians under the current system of campaign finance. There's a disturbing paradox in a system where a successful campaign requires funds from corporate groups that expect a politician to act in accordance with their business interests when elected, but also requires the politician to appeal to a voter base whose interests are, in many cases, directly opposed to those of large corporate donors (the current argument pro/against net neutrality is a great example of this dynamic). There is an inherent dishonesty built into this system; and knowing exactly who has "invested" in a specific politician's campaign (and who will be expecting a return on that investment) is essential for voters to bridge the vast gulf between campaign promises made and the actions taken after a politician is elected. The current system helps politicians get elected based on their rhetoric and prevents any real accountability when their words do not match their actions. Please help us voters keep our elective representatives accountable by encouraging more transparency in campaign finance. The future of democracy depends on it. Moving away from transparency will only alienate more voters and create further dissatisfaction with the government as an entity.

I thank you for reading and considering this opinion.

Comments provided by :
Larrea, Juan Pablo

All contributions not made by individuals should be banned by the FEC. Campaigns should be funded only through public money made available equally to all qualified candidates and by donations from actually persons, not corporations, and limited at a reasonable amount. However, given the unlikeliness of those finance rules being implemented, all monies and contributions given to a campaign, PAC, or other political groups advocating for specific candidates or laws should be clearly identified and published. Transparency in campaign finance is one of the most important issues in our democracy/oligarchy.

Comments provided by :
Lauter , Andrew

There should be a limit on how much anyone can use on an election campaign, as there is in the United Kingdom. The fact that there were BILLIONS spent on the last Presidential campaign is ridiculous, and just plain wrong. The reason it is wrong is simply because those BILLIONS were donated by very large corporations and special interest groups hoping to sway their candidate. So effectively, the whole of Washington, both sides of the aisle, are legislating and governing for their large donors, not for the people. The fact that the Supreme Court decided these large donors do not need to be disclosed is also extremely worrying. The people, who politicians SHOULD be working for, have a right to know what entities have bought the politicians lobbying for their vote.

Comments provided by :
Lawrence, Tim

Hands off the internet and our freedom of speech according to our Constitution!

Comments provided by :
Lawson, Allen and Jennifer

Stop this bullshit. Let's be fair about the money . Full disclosure to stop corruption within my government

Comments provided by :
leahy, Christopher

I think that it is very important that there it should be clearly identified as to who has paid for a political ad. If it is an organization that has paid for a political then the financial sources/donors of that organization should be publicly identified.

Comments provided by :
Leber, M C

I am very much in favor of transparency in terms of affiliation, donations, funding, gifts from any and all sources of any kind. I am favor of full disclosure of this information whenever there is any kind of financial fund or incentive paid toward any politician, political fund, fund raising event- anything. It should all be on the record and made easily available for all to see.

There is no money involved in government of the people that should not be disclosed to the people.

Comments provided by :
Legato, Steve

I support full disclosure of the sources of campaign funds. I further endorse public financing on one of the models used in other countries. There is too much influence of money obscuring public issues.

Comments provided by :
LeRay`, Lancer

I want to be able to trace all money that was given to a candidate.

I want to know who (person, corporation or other organization)gave the money to the candidate. I want to know when the money was given and I want to know how much money was given.

I want this money to appear on a public website so that I can easily see it and then question the candidate about his ties to this person or organization.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Elizabeth Levine

Comments provided by :
Levine, Elizabeth

As a citizen of this country, and an avid activist, I have watched our political process become less "by the people" and more "by the money." The only way I believe our democracy will survive will be through transparency. Please, please do not further limit public access to the information about who is funding whom.

Comments provided by :
Lewis, Barbra

The American people deserve the opportunity to know who is attempting to influence not only their perceptions of candidates, but the candidates themselves. Full disclosure of all monies donated to any candidate should be made available from the root source of the donation through any (P.A.C.) channels until ultimately reaching a candidate's campaign coffers. Expenditures by P.A.C.s, not directly to a candidate, but to promote a candidate or issue, should also be disclosed, so that the public can be aware of what third parties are promoting what political issues and agendas.

Comments provided by :
Lihani, Pavel

Voters absolutely have the right to know what is funding politicians and ballot initiatives. If more money is coming from a private company or from a religious organization than from public contributions, we should know. This isn't rocket science. This is people wanting to ultimately keep business and religion out of politics. Politics belong to voters, not companies, not churches.

Comments provided by :
Lillian, Christopher

In this last election i believe lack of identification of donors made it easy to lie and obfuscate. When people are identified it means they will be sure to support reasonable positions. Our democracy needs the transparency.

Comments provided by :
Lindblom, Andrew

The new rules requiring public disclosure of campaign money being considered are essential so that voters will know which interests are spending how much to win over their votes.

Comments provided by :
Lisberger, Linda

We the People need to know every detail of election funding.

Comments provided by :
liversedge, William

Spending too much on election is bad for democracy. Not knowing who is paying for the elections should be illegal. Let's make that happen with a new law requiring every single dollar be revealed in an election, including money from 501c4's and any other corporation type you can think of. Reveal it all.

Comments provided by :
Lloyd, Anthony

Everything should be transparent. Politicians shouldn't be for sale. Politicians should be protecting the public from corporate greed, not work for them.

Comments provided by :
Loe, Valerie

I believe that there should be public disclosure of campaign money contributions.

Comments provided by :

Lord , Margaret

I believe that in this day and age it is above and beyond common sense that every penny related to an election or re-election campaign must be fully disclosed. Who gave it, when they gave it, etc. Our government is supposed to be THE collective representation of our citizens, "of the people, by the people, for the people". It is common sense, then, that the people have a right to know EVERYTHING that does not directly risk national security. If someone doesn't think it's ok for others to know they gave money to a candidate, it's safe to say that they probably shouldn't be giving any money to that candidate.

2+2=4.

Comments provided by :
Love, Daniel

The U.S. Supreme Court has declared that money to our legislators is free speech. As a constituent whose tax dollars contribute to pay my representative's salary, I think it is incumbent on the representative to inform their constituents who/what person, business entity, or interest group is expending funds to influence their decisions, which directly and/or indirectly may affect our personal and professional lives. Anything less than full disclosure creates the appearance of corruption, which undermines the trust vital to the relationship between governors and governed in a representative democracy.

Comments provided by :
Love, Marian

The electorate has a right to know where politicians are getting their money.

Comments provided by :
Loyd, Nancy

Massive out-of-state funds were spent on tv, signs, mailers during our last election in Arkansas. Issues were ignored, personal attacks abounded. PACS have far too much influence on the political conversation and on who is a candidate. The Supreme Court's Citizens United decision cut the legs out from under existing campaign finance laws passed by Congress. Since corporations do not vote, they should not have political power as evidenced in undisclosed campaign funding. In Oregon's recent GMO labeling vote, Monsanto was allowed to pour money into the election process. Our democracy should not be the good of the people vs. corporate greed. As corporate welfare continues to rise, the needs of the people are cut out of the budget. Votes, not dollars should be the true currency of democracy, and we need to be informed at all levels. Until such time as big money is eliminated from political discourse and campaigns, transparency for education is imperative. If the high cost of tv ads is the most important feature of campaigns, maybe tv needs to provide time for FREE!

Comments provided by :
Lukens, Sue

I do not have confidence that the vast majority of American citizens are being represented. Big money has corrupted our form of government. Give the power back to the average American. If it requires repealing McCutcheon and/or Citizens United, then do it.

Comments provided by :
Lusher, Steven

I would advocate that all campaign donation sources and amounts should be publicly disclosed. I sincerely cannot think of one legitimate reason why any campaign donation source or amount should be allowed to remain undisclosed.

But even preferable to disclosure of campaign finance sources and amounts, I would advocate for publicly financed elections. An honest examination of a more level field for candidacy should be pursued.

Thank you for the opportunity to express my views on campaign finance reform.

Comments provided by :
Lyon, David

The American people have a right to know who is contributing to campaigns and how the money is being collected and distributed. The vast amount of money in the political process has a direct effect on who is elected and why. This corruption of One Person One Vote is undermining our democracy. It's the height of hypocrisy for politicians to complain about transparency and then hide the benefactors to whom they are beholden. Our nation's system of governance cannot stand under this assault of legalized bribery. The voice of the people is being silenced by special interests. For the good of America, I urge that the FEC put in place practices that will keep the electorate informed of those who seek to control our votes.

Comments provided by :
Lyon, Rochelle

I call on the Federal Elections Commission to establish and maintain regulations that will support the principle "one person, one vote". As an ordinary citizen I am not able to scan the particular proposals in this regulation and interpret their likely effect nor legal viability; I depend on you to do that.

I am strongly against any regulation that favors one segment of society over another. It greatly offends me that corporations should be treated as people in any law or regulation - even Adam Smith warned that corporations had to be regulated for the common good.

It is your duty to work for the general, unprivileged public; effective implementation of the principles embodied in the Constitution depends on you.

May God bless your endeavors for the United States of America.

Comments provided by :
Mackinney, John

Not even sure why we are being asked for comments on this. Transparency on the funds that are given to our elected officials running or otherwise should be known to the general public since they work for the people not for the special interest, well at least that's how it's supposed to work. I am in favor of this and more so I would like to see restrictions on dollar amounts and on who can contribute mainly not special interests or groups like that.

Comments provided by :
madison, James

All voters deserve to know who is contributing to each and every candidate and how much they are contributing.

If the donor is an organization then all of the names have to be made public or the donation is unacceptable and should be considered illegal.

Any secret donations given to candidates should be considered illegal and both the donor and the receiver should be punished by law or at least considered committing a felony.

All donations should be required to be posted in the newspaper on the first Sunday in the month following the donation. This posting should include the who made the donation and their title, who that person represents, the amount of the donation and who the person is who received the donation and their political alignment/party.

Comments provided by :

Marker, Richard

I think we need to only allow public funds for candidates. The last few elections, especially since the Citizen United ruling, have shown just what is wrong with allowing people or groups to buy politicians who are supposed to be working for all the people....not corporations or just the rich. There was a reason for not allowing it. The court because they didn't think ahead, just proved that it was a bad idea to allow anonymous groups to put excessive amounts of money into the races. The amount of money being spent now is obscene.

Comments provided by :
Markstrum, Merion

There is no democracy without an informed citizenry. When people do not know who is paying the money to push an agenda, they can't know the true agenda. Our society has fallen prey to unscrupulous corporate players who are out to destroy every last regulation that could possibly put a check on their insatiable lust for wealth and political power. A government's job is to protect its' citizens from enemies within as well as those from the outside. The only way that our democracy can be revived is through the cleansing power of transparency. We must know who is using their vast wealth to push legislation and policy to enrich themselves at such a huge cost to the rest of us.

Comments provided by :
Marshall, Betsy

Sadly, the time has come to monitor what is spent on candidate and issue campaigns. We as an electorate need to know how much is spent by candidates, pacs, and special interest groups. We deserve to know who is campaigning and trying to win my vote as well as trying to influence my decision on ballot initiatives.

Comments provided by :
Martens, Steven

Campaign contributions should be publicly disclosed, and voters should know how much money specific individuals and corporations are using to influence America's political direction.

Comments provided by :
Martin, Dave

The American people should have the right to know who is backing the candidates so they might then be able to discern where the candidates true interests lie. Really there should be no backing by private parties.. It is really a legal bribe to coax the candidate to vote a certain way by the contributor. Anyone with half a brain should know that.

Comments provided by :
Martone, Nona

Public disclosure is a must. The average person has little influence compared to big donors.

Comments provided by :
Mason, James

the donors name should be published for any donations over \$100.00. THE VOTING PUBLIC IS ENTITLED TO KNOW WHO IS SUPPORTING EACH CANIDATE AND THE AMOUNT OF THE CONTRIBUTION BEING RECEIVED BY ANY CANIDATE. WE CANNOT KNOW WHAT AN ELECTED OFFICIAL MAY DO IF THE VOTING PUBLIC IS NOT INFORMED ABOUT WHO IS SUPPORTING A GIVEN CANIDATE AND THE AMOUNT OF THAT SUPPORT.

Comments provided by :
MAYES, J HASCAL

It is my understanding that you are taking input from the public concerning improving public disclosure of campaign donations. While I have not read any proposed change, my immediate reaction would be, "Are you F'ing crazy?? Of course there should be complete and total disclosure of ALL monies being used to influence voter/public opinion during elections. Further, the idea of unlimited monetary donations is so outrageously bastardly, I would say only a pack of conservative DILDOS would make such a decision. Someone needs to investigate the (not so)Supreme Court justices to determine if they were not bribed or otherwise coerced in making that decision. Surely someone has at least looked at their bank accounts.

Any other questions on your mind??? :)

Comments provided by :
Maynard, John W

To whom it may concern,

I strongly support any measure that would add transparency to the money that is spent on campaigns. It has been argued that money is speech and cannot be restricted under the constitution. If money is considered speech, then it should be pointed out that nowhere does the constitution guarantee that you have the right to anonymous speech. If corporations and wealthy individuals feel so convicted that they must speak with their money, let them declare themselves and their convictions openly.

Thank You, Kemp Mc

Comments provided by :

McCasland, Kemp

The only way one can be sure where the money came from, which tells a voter the bias, is to know ALL the information. Names and all. The so-called names of the group are useless for shedding light where it is needed. As a voter, I need to know who is supporting, or trashing, the candidate being shown. It is only fair!

Comments provided by :
McConnell, Eleanor

No more soft money, or political action committees should be allowed to contribute to political campaigns. We must, if we are truly a government of the people, then public financing of campaigns must be the standard for every candidate.

Comments provided by :
McCracken, Paul

All contributions should be made public on the individual who made the contribution.

No hiding behind a PAC or an entity.

Actual people, individual names only.

Any money given that can not be identified to a individual, person, should be given to each political party equally.

Comments provided by :

McElherne Jr, Paul

Reform campain fundraising !

Comments provided by :
McGaughy, Beverly

Let the voters see who our elected officials are beholden to.

Comments provided by :
McGowan, John

I wholeheartedly support all efforts to return control of American voters' rights to the voting Americans. I would want to be able to see where all campaign monies originate, ANYA strings attached, connections, subsets or other disguises of donors be made wholly illegal...

Secondly, evil aspects of the Post-Census gerrymandering processes used in the several states to undo the wishes of majority voters by a weslthy or powerful special interest group MUST be corrected.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment, my first time!

Marty McGrath

Comments provided by :
McGrath, Martha B

My husband and I feel VERY strongly that public disclosure of campaign contributions is critically important. Free exchange of ideas is the key to a vibrant democracy. When contributions to campaigns are made in secret, that undermines this exchange.

Diane and Ken McGuire

Comments provided by :
McGuire, Diane

I support full disclosure of all campaign monies and their source.

Comments provided by :
McIntosh, David

Transparency is how we can protect our democracy. As long as small organizations with deep pockets can use their money to influence voters through non-fact based and often derogatory mass media our democracy is being held captive by political terrorists.

Comments provided by :
Mckinley, Jeremiah

There is no question that campaign financing has enormous impact in electing officials on all levels. Transparency of financial backing is a key element in my research of a candidate. I believe transparency is critical.

Comments provided by :
McKinley, Mary

Keep it free! This is America! By the People, for the People, supported by the People!

Comments provided by :
McLaughlin-Owens, Katie

Campaign donations of any amount to any individual candidate(s) should be registered by the individual(s), group, corporation or entity making the donation and that this information should be public record. The originating source of the donation should be made public as well. The candidate receiving a donation should also be legally required to record the individual making the donation, the amount of the donation, and this should also be made public record.

Comments provided by :
McLenighan, Nicholas

Enough is Enough

Comments provided by :
medlock, casse

There needs to be severe limits to the spending during an election campaign.

It seems only the VERY well connected receive the financial backing to make it through the primary elections, then those elected become beholding to their major contributors.

Comments provided by :

Melewski, D

In light of Citizens United ruling 2012 and the exponential rate of money raised for political candidates, all donations/money raised should be identifiable and reported no more than a week of it having been received by a candidate or campaign. Regardless of whether the money comes directly from one person, corporation or political action committee. Candidates should not be able to hide behind political action committees that support them indirectly with negative/misleading TV ads, print ads or mailers. Politicians are no longer serving "we the people", they are beholden to wealthy individuals and corporations because of the contributions they receive.

Comments provided by :
mendoza, Alfonso

In order that the voting public be completely aware of where a particular candidate's loyalties and commitments lie, full disclosure of all campaign funds and the donors behind them is necessary. In order to form the most accurate and complete opinion and determine the best possible candidate for a particular post or seat, it is a necessity that any private or corporate interests who invest in a politician's campaign be disclosed. Transparency is of the utmost importance. I would also add that all PACs be required to list their majority donors. This would pull the cover off large scale monetary donations where the original source is shrouded in speculation. Let the voting public be educated in all aspects and better choices will be made.

Comments provided by :
Merle, Phillip

Of course we want to know where the money is coming from! All these surreptitious names for organizations spending money disguising they're true intent and the politicians salivating to get that money just so they can stay in congress...this is crisis time for the political system in America! The rich and corporations have a strangle hold on this country! I'm so disgusted!

Comments provided by :
Merwin, Julie

As an independent member of the electorate, I am disturbed by the fact that I do not know the financial sponsors of the candidates. This is important information for me to anticipate how my elected officials will behave once elected. That is to say, I fully expect my elected officials to put the interests of their large sponsors ahead of my interests as an individual. Therefore I want to know those interests the candidates will actually focus upon once they arrive in office. So, I want full transparency to all political donations: the amount, the organization, the political affiliation, the organizational affiliation(s), etc. It is only through absolute transparency that our electoral system can correctly function and this transparency is my expectation and desire for the next round of elections.

Thank you for taking the time to hear my opinion on this matter.

Comments provided by :
Mickle, Brian

We have every right to know where money comes from who is trying to influence our electoral process.

Comments provided by :

Miller, Andrew

Any communication for political purposes, including those termed "educational or informational" should be required to identify who is funding the effort. If it is an organization, the donors or founder list should be easily acceptable. Money from anonymous sources should not be permitted

Donations or investments should be limited.

Corporate sponsorships should be identified.

Comments provided by :
Mills, Nancy

All rules should be presented to the citizens of the USA and a committee should be set up to ensure all citizens understand all the rules, and have an opportunity to vote, yes, or no, on each proposal. We can no longer trust that our government has our best interests at hand. There is absolutely no excuse for continued disenfranchising of our citizens. I urge you all, save our nation from the coming uprising. Please do your job, make these regulations fair, and place oversight in place preventing future criminal activity forever. Support your children, and the United States of America, give American citizens their voice.

Comments provided by :
minschwaner, Ronald

The Citizens United decision should be overturned. There should be modest limitations on the amounts that can be contributed to campaigns or PACs or any other mechanism that might be used to funding political speech imposed on individuals, corporations, groups and any other entity that might make such a contribution. The identity of the contributor of every dollar should be clearly disclosed. If contributions are made by a corporation or group, the identities of the persons providing the funds and the persons deciding to whom funds are contributed should be clearly disclosed.

Comments provided by :
Mize, Timothy

Donations of campaign money from special interest groups are nothing other than bribes. At best they should be illegal, at minimum the public has the right to know who is purchasing their representative's votes and what that purchase is earmarked for.

Comments provided by :
Mohr, Maritza

The public has the right to know where the money that funds politicians?campaigns is coming from. There also should be some type of spending cap on campaigns.

Comments provided by :
Mooney, Stephen

I believe strongly that voters should know which interests are spending how much to win over their votes.

Comments provided by :
Moore, James

Democracy cannot work if we don't know who is contributing to candidates, parties, and interest groups. Given that so many nonprofits are created for political purposes while purporting to be charitable or "social interest," all nonprofits as well as individuals and lobbying groups should be required to disclose their donors.

Comments provided by :
Moore, Judith

Every citizen should know who is trying to influence their vote. They should also know what those interests expect in return for their funding.

Comments provided by :
Moore, Laura

The Internet needs to be kept open and free as it is. Blocking our content would be like taking our freedom of speech away. We as Americans have fought and died for our freedoms don't take them away.

Comments provided by :
Moore, Ryan

Campaign funding needs to be made more visible!!

Comments provided by :
Morales, Ben

Transparency in the financing of our political process is absolutely indispensable in order to maintain adequate accountability to the public, which the government is supposed to serve. The lack of such disclosure allows both public and private interests to disguise truth from fiction and fact from opinion. Rather than making informed decisions based on facts, public opinion is manipulated by veiled language, outright lies and sophisticated marketing. This undermines the electoral process and the very foundations of our democracy

This is supposed to be a government by the people, of the people and for the people, but it is repeatedly undermined by an small minority of mega-wealthy individuals and corporations, whose interests are rarely for the public good.

As a concerned citizen, voter and tax payer, I strongly urge the FEC to require full disclosure of all campaign contributions, whether from individuals, corporations, nonprofits, PACs, or others.

Comments provided by :
Morales, Rafael

All contributions should be made public and available to any citizen upon request. Secrecy of public campaign contributions or contributions to any political cause is damaging to our democracy. We, the people, have a right to know who is trying to influence elections and legislation with money. It is a basic right and being denied it we are being denied our right to be a democracy, a free nation, that is developed and evolved with freedom of information and a public vote that has precedence over those who try to buy elections and legislation for their own greedy purpose that are at the expense of our freedom to be a democracy.

Comments provided by :
Morgan, Jon

Especially since the removal of the limits on campaign contributions, disclosure of who is influencing our legislators is more important than ever.

If we only allowed unlimited fund contributions to be applied to issues that are on the contributors home address ballot, a lot of this inappropriate funding, the appearance of "bought and paid for politicians", and undue influence would disappear. Being able to influence matters that are under the control of your personal ballot should be the extent of your ability to influence governmental matters. It only makes sense to be limited to and to contribute to issues and politicians on your own personal ballot. That being said, it also implies that only a person who can cast a ballot should be able to influence the political process also. This would necessarily remove corporate money and influence from politics because corporations ARE NOT PEOPLE SINCE THEY CAN NOT CAST A BALLOT, the ultimate definition of citizenship in our representative form of government.

Money pouring in from out of state people and corporations is a foreign assault on the freedom each state and district within each state and should be considered such. Interstate transfers of political money should be monitored just as money moving across international borders is monitored. Interstate and international transfers should be considered the same and recording and disclosure of such should be commonplace, public records, and ordinary.

Immediate public transparency of political contributions should be required at the very least but the actual influence from foreign entities (not a registered voter who can physically vote on a given issue or candidate) should be banned. Local people voting on their local ballots should be able to do so without undue influence, and typically misinformation, from these foreign entities. Monitoring these activities would be immensely easier if the sources of political funds only came from the local voting population and illegal foreign contributions would stand out like a red flag.

Comments provided by :
Morris, Greg

We as citizens should be able to tell who is spending what on a given add campaign. We should have campaign rules that groups who raise or coordinate the raising of more that a set limit whether on behalf of a cause, or candidate or group of candidates, party ,or similar; for political purposes should name donors and rate by percentage or by bracket. The law prohibits political spending by not-for-profits should be enforced. And providing grants/or equivalent to other groups that perform campaign spending should be counted as campaign spending by the originating group/corp for purposes of political spending limits.

Comments provided by :
Morris, Zachary

It seems to me that some sort of check on the power of money in or "democratic" society should be maintained. Transparency is only a partial step forward.

Comments provided by :
Morton, David

Private moneys from corporations and wealthy business persons, to include lobby organizations not directly funded by membership, should be restricted outright from all participation in active electoral campaigns. That is to say, if electoral campaigns should be funded other than by taxes, then the moneys should come from the candidates themselves or from citizen constituents in the related district. Citizen lobbies, such as AARP, the NRA, Sierra Club, and the World Wildlife Fund, should be the only organizations allowed to make contributions. All contributions from such authorized organizations should be disclosed by the candidates. Additionally, all organizations making contributions to electoral campaigns should also disclose the source of the funds to ensure that the money did in fact come from their general membership and not a few wealthy benefactors.

Political campaigns are for politicians. Politicians make up the government. The government serves the citizenry--the living, breathing population. Therefore, only living, breathing human beings should be contributing to political campaigns--either individually or collectively via citizen lobbies as mentioned previously. For-profit businesses and corporations cannot consider the revenues of their business, either before or after taxes, as donations from individual citizens even if the company's political leanings, beliefs, or intentions are publicly stated.

Furthermore, large donations from corporate officers, board members, or private investors shall not constitute private contributions to meet the individual citizen contributions. As a means to structure and enforce this concept, no individual contribution, either made directly or via a citizen lobby, shall be allowed to exceed \$5000. All organizational contributions shall be accompanied by documentation of individual member contributions, not exceeding the \$5000 limit, to cumulatively produce the sum total of the organization's contribution.

Additionally, in the name of public service and public benefit, all media outlets should provide equal complimentary air time and print space for running candidates in their relative district/service area. Compliance with this provision shall be the basis for maintaining appropriate license with the FCC. This will effectively reduce the necessity for campaign fundraising and further level the playing field between establishment and working class candidates. Some means other than FCC license should be devised to ensure that print media comply with this provision also.

Comments provided by :
Moser, Ted

I believe that all fundraising contributions, contributors names, should be made public. The whole election process is being taken over by private undisclosed amounts of money. The current electoral system is letting down the citizens of the United States of America. Thank you Richard Moss Weser, Idaho.

Comments provided by :
Moss, Richard

Any group who spends money to influence an election, whether for an individual candidate or an issue, should be required to provide full disclosure to the public of the amount spent and on which candidates/issues. Each ad should include at least the name of the sponsoring group and other information should be readily available to the general public. It is the public's right to know exactly where ads are coming from in order to make an intelligent voting decision. Full and accurate information is the backbone of our democracy. The public should not have to do extensive research to find the original source of the money as it is shifted from group to group. Full disclosure means back to the original source.

Comments provided by :
Mueller, Nanc

I think outlets like YouTube and the broader Internet should be free from federal government control. It is our First Amendment right to do so, Freedom of Speech.

I want to tell FEC Chair Ann Ravel and her Obama administration friends HANDS OFF the internet and HANDS OFF our precious, constitutionally-protected freedom of speech. Do your job to protect the US Constitution and our US Constitutional rights, instead of seeking to take these rights away from the American public. We are a democracy, not a dictatorship!

Comments provided by :
Mullins, Joanne

It does not surprise me that an Obama filled bureaucracy is trying to limit free speech. When socialists don't have an argument to make their case in a public forum, well, they just shut that forum down. That's how it works in Venezuela and Cuba, that's where socialists look for ideas to silence loyal opposition. Freedom of speech is in the FIRST amendment. Our founder's knew that a Constitutional Republic could not work if speech was regulated and not a free and open expression of ideas. Socialists know this too. That is why they want to monitor the internet. This forum gives the lowliest among us a voice. The internet may be the only thing that eventually saves this country. The Ideas expressed here could lead to the real hope and the real change for which our nation is crying out. That is what really scares the liberals. Their answer to any dissent is to shut it down.

Comments provided by :
Mulry II, George

The two biggest issues killing American Democracy are:

- 1) Big hidden money made possible by the Wisconsin Right to Life and Citizen's United Supreme Court decisions.
AND
- 2) Gerrymandering of Congressional districts which promotes polarization

GET THE HIDDEN \$ OUT OF MY POLITICAL PROCESS!

Sincerely,
Michael Mulvey

Comments provided by :
mulvey, michael

I think it is essential that there be a quorum established for the FEC immediately.

As a voter, I want to know which companies and individuals are donating to all parties and how much. Dark money/anonymous donors should not be tolerated.

Both McCutcheon and Citizens United need to be overturned as they have unleashed unprecedented campaign donations from a handful of conservative and progressive donors. While large donors on the Democratic side disclose their donations, hundreds of millions of donations to Republican candidates are not disclosed and in many cases, neither the FEC nor the IRS are able to gather real time information regarding the legitimacy of these organizations and how millions of dollars are moved about seamlessly to GOP PACs and campaign coffers around the country.

Greater transparency and more staffing is needed to apprehend individuals who are blatantly breaking campaign finance laws.

Comments provided by :
Mundy, Gregory

I very much want to know who is funding the insipid and defamatory campaign ads that flood our airways

Comments provided by :
Munkacsi, Joyce

I disagree with the Supreme Courts decision but until Congress enacts legislation to correct this error, the FEC should do everything under the authority authorized to make all contributions transparent and available for public review.

In essence, these changes only mean that the more money available to an individual, the louder they can shout with their voice to drown out the voices of those that aren't as fortunate.

Comments provided by :
Murphy, David

It's sad to me how our democracy has become a punchline and special interest vote buying has become so commonplace that the majority of people just accept it as the way things work... especially since it isn't working. At least not for the American people. Transparency might not solve our problems but it is an important first step in taking some of the political advantage away from those who have the most money.

Comments provided by :
Murphy, Jonathan

See the previously cited Princeton study by Gilens and Page, which finds conclusively that we are now in an oligarchy, not a democracy. We must correct that. I echo the comments of Bill Zager:

"Every single dollar of every donation to all elected officials and candidates for public office should scrupulously be accounted for and made public, entirely without exception, no matter the identity of the donor, no matter the office the official holds or is a candidate for. This must hold true for every level of office, Federal, State, or local. We must require absolute complete disclosure; nothing short of that is honest."

Comments provided by :
Nadeau, Donald

I think that this is an EXCELLENT idea! Without this transparency, our democracy is in peril.

Comments provided by :
Naraghi-Arani, Pejman

There must be 100% transparency in election spending and advertising with no loopholes.
Anything less is a threat to our fragile democracy and undermines the rule of law.

Comments provided by :
Nass, Gregory

I think it is an essential part of a democracy to know who is contributing to political campaigns. We as voters should have the right to know what organizations or individuals are behind the television commercials, the flyers, the robocalls and any other tools used to sway our votes. No one or no organization should be able to hide, it is about full disclosure. Please do not hand our elections over to the highest bidder. It has already gone way too far.

Comments provided by :

Nass, Susan

It imperative that the the election process get cleaned up. Congress can enact laws to overturn Citizens United; however, they will not. They are criminally negligent in their sworn duties as Senators and Congressmen. They put their financial well being above the needs of the country and their districts.

Corporations are not Citizens. Lets be very clear about that. They do not suffer under Civil and Criminal law as a citizen who breaks them would. They willfully cause harm to consumers, then environment and communities for the express intent to profit. They do not get convicted of crimes and when they are fined the fines are off set by tax incentives and subsidies.

The Citizens United Ruling by the Roberts court shifts control of the Congress from the Citizenry of the United States to the moneyed Corporate class. There were three very distinct ruling by the supreme court (late 1800's, 1920's and 1930's) that put to rest the role of public companies in this country. Each ruling supported that a public company has no ethical, moral or fiduciary responsibility to the community or the state. Its sole responsibility is to its shareholders. That is not the definition of a citizen and if a citizen conducted themselves in the same manner as a corporation, then murder could be justified in the name of profit.

The Roberts Court and Congress have essentially allowed the governing of this country to be put up for sale to the highest bidder. The top 200 most politically active companies in this country pay on average -2% in Taxes and have received over \$6 Trillion in subsidies, contracts and tax breaks. They are not job creators, consumers are. Congress has been bought and distributes tax dollars to corporations an the ultra wealthy, a complete money grab from the middle class. Congress cuts taxes for corporations and the wealthy while cutting benefits for Veterans, Children, education and Senior Citizens.

The Citizens United Ruling has been the single greatest threat to our National Security since the horrific budget policies of the Bush Administration.

There also needs to be individual campaign adjustments made. The amount an individual can donate to campaigns needs to be lifted and should grow with the rates of inflation.

Comments provided by :
Nelson, eric

The recent McCutcheon/Citizens United decision mean that freedom of speech equals money, so more money apparently means more freedom. This is clearly NOT what the Framers had in mind, since it completely contradicts the idea of one man/one vote. Corporations are NOT people, people have morals. Corporations are a legal fiction created to serve our collective interests, but these decisions have created a situation where they don't serve us any longer, we serve them.

Comments provided by :
Nelson, William

The Koch bros have been doing too much coke, this system is broken. For the people by the people!

Comments provided by :

Nevin, Jack

I want to know where campaign contributions are coming from. I also want to see Citizens Uniter overturned. Enough!

Comments provided by :
Nilsson, Randel

Maintaining transparency regarding sources of campaign finance strengthens our citizen governance, secrecy promotes abuse of power. In order to preserve a government responsive to our citizenry, Americans need to understand how our democracy is functioning; this includes knowing where money donated to candidates running for and serving in public office originates. All sources of campaign monies need to be disclosed.

Comments provided by :
ohara, colleen

I believe it is vital for the public to know who funds all campaign efforts whether directed at a candidate or an issue. I think all contributions, individual or corporate, over \$100.00 should be a matter of public records. I would also like to see limits on the total amount of spending during election campaigns.

Comments provided by :
Okland, Linda

Please insist of public disclosure of all campaign funds. It would be even better if campaigns were financed by individual voter support and the quantity of support received by a candidate determined the amount of public received.

Comments provided by :
Olson, Judith

Individual citizens should be able to see from whom candidates receive campaign donations. A democracy functions best in a transparent environment.

Comments provided by :
Osborn, Mary Lynn

I think the sneaky way persons of great wealth use and abuse the system to stifle our voice is positively reprehensible. The least that could be done is to expose this information instead of allowing it to be done in secrecy.

Comments provided by :
Oslund, Eric

Election campaigns must be transparent. Voters should know who is paying for the messages they receive. The ability to contribute large sums to political campaigns anonymously is inconsistent with free and fair elections. I should never have to wonder or guess who paid for a political advertisement, ever.

Comments provided by :
Osteen, Sam

It goes without saying that big money interests will corrupt the democratic process. All money donated to elections should be severely scrutinized and transparently disclosed and regulated to accomplish a fair balance afforded to the electorate and the countries laws .

Comments provided by :
Overlin, Donald

By all means, please rule that all political contributions by any one, any PAC, or any organizations must be fully identified. The Voters not only need to know who is contributing so we, the Voters, may ascertain who is beholden to who.

Is there any person alive today that thinks that large political contributions do not come with strings attached.

If all donations are fully disclosed, then we, the Voters, will at least have an idea who is being bought and by whom.

Comments provided by :

Ovist, Ron

Dear Federal Election Commission

Please make all funds raised by all parties public. For all Americans to be well informed when we choose to exercise our right to vote this must be disclosed. Please require disclosure of all campaign funds from all parties. This is long overdue. I am tired of this can being kicked down the road. It is not easy to do the right thing. It is not popular either. But this is the right time and the right thing to do. If done it will be remembered forever as the day voters were given the truth.

It is time to update this system and share this info. It is a decision that is long over due. We have public records, we should have public disclosure of campaign funds as well.

Thank you

Sirena Painter

Comments provided by :
Painter, Sirena

If we continue to allow outside financing, then all financing should be disclosed. That includes PACs and Super PACs running pro and con campaigns, such as negative attack ads (even without being endorsed by a specific candidate).

It would be significantly better to deny outside funding, but having public funding - in equal shares. Also, there should be multiple views heard - not just the two major parties. This includes allowing more candidates access to a national platform by increasing the number of participants in national debates.

Comments provided by :
Pangburn, Jonathan

I believe it is of the utmost importance that I and the rest of the public at large know who is trying to "buy" my vote and how much they are spending to try and buy it.

Comments provided by :
Parry, Michael

The electorate deserves to know the names and details of all contributors to a political campaign, whether those contributors are individuals or corporations.

Comments provided by :
Passarelli, Michele

We need to know where and by who is throwing millions of dollars at causes and elections for their own personal gains.

Comments provided by :
Paterson, William

Every cent of every contribution for any political purpose (campaigning, lobbying, advertising, etc) should be identified in its exact amount and from what person or persons, including if made through an organization, group, or other non-human entity. No more hiding of where the money is coming from.

Comments provided by :
Pavan, Michael

As it sits now, only those entities who can mass-market their chosen candidate or issue can decide who runs or what gets legislated and how. The use of rhetorical appeal and logical fallacies are rampant. Exposing, at least, the sources of power behind the propaganda is a step towards representative government. There is no "us" or "them". There is only us. People cannot make good choices with bad information. The oligarchy must end.

Comments provided by :
Pearman, Gary

We need to limit the influence of big money on politics. Too often those with moneyed interests are allowed to contribute as much as they want, to the detriment of our democracy. Too often the candidate with the most money wins as opposed to the most qualified one.

Comments provided by :
Pelak, Ryan

I think every dollar that all candidates get should be logged and made public where it came from. Just like the voting records were before the midterm election. As long as lobbyists are allowed to offer unlimited and anonymous monetary gifts of any kind, our nation will remain corrupt.

Also the ruling that "corporations" are "individuals" is insane and needs to be reversed. The voters of America realize these corporations are really the puppet masters of the politicians we THOUGHT would represent US! It's just ridiculous! The Supreme Court is either going senile, or they're friends with some VERY good "individuals"

As an American voter, I expect more justice than we are getting. And more cooperation on things like an infrastructure LONG TERM improvement plan. And hold Congress accountable for wasting so much money in frivolous law suits against the President of The United States!

Shame on them all! Especially here in Kansas though, where all budget cuts made come from the pockets of the most needy and the education system. Mr Sam Brownback, like the other State Governors that did not comply with the ACA, want to try and keep as many voters as possible uneducated, poor, and unable to vote at all if possible.

Please help us!!!

Sincerely,

Roger Perdue

Comments provided by :
Perdue, Roger

I feel as a legal voter I have a right to know where the money is coming from. I also believe that there should not be no lobbyist or corporations allowed to control our politicians. Monies should only be allowed from the people.

Comments provided by :
Petty, Marion

It is absolutely CRITICAL in our world today, that we know what special interests are trying to influence not only our votes, but also those of the people we elect to speak for us!

Comments provided by :
Pirl-Roth, Leslie

I want to know what special interests are supporting campaigns and the contributions granted. As a citizen, this is important information to know about the representative I select. To not disclose this is an utter lack of transparency and the downfall of an indirect democratic system.

Comments provided by :
Polyak, Diana

Dear Sirs,

Please fix the pay to play loophole. Big money must limited as much as possible. Public financing is what we need. In the meantime transparency, and some good anti trust is in order.

Thankyou, Debra Pombo 4th dis, Ca.

Comments provided by :

pombo, debra

I am in favor of full disclosure of the source of all political contributions. I think Congress by legislation or the IRS by regulation should close the 501(c)(4) loophole. Ideally, no entities of any sort could legally contribute money to campaigns or parties, or in any other way to influence elections. Ideally, the Citizens United decision will be reversed or done away with by Constitutional amendment. I know that much of what I wish for is outside the jurisdiction of the FEC, but I address those points anyway, in the hope that future FEC regulations will push in these directions as far as is legally possible.

Comments provided by :
Pomerene, Robert J

I am concerned about the vast sums of money spent in the elections. It is well known that the side with the most money to spend will win the election. The electorate's votes are not bought outright. However the electorate falls victim to the influence brought to bear on them through advertising. They will vote for the candidate who spends the most on advertising. If candidates could spend the same amount of money on advertising the playing field would be level.

Comments provided by :
Posey, William

I am tired of the wealthy buying elections and that is EXACTLY what they are doing! Get rid of these packs (however the heck you spell it) that allow unlimited funds being thrown at elections. Equal air time, equal \$ equal everything...I am SO tired of them buying elections like the Rockefellers and friends did with McKinley-This has gotten SO out of control....SO much \$ is wasted on elections that could be put to better use. How about limiting each side spend the EXACT same amount-so it no longer is he who has the most money wins? How about also NOT allowing Congress OR Presidents a free pass to take almost a year away from work to Campaign? We are paying their salaries so they should be at work-not running around the country trying to get votes for theri co-conspirators. Let them do what WE do when we want to take a day off....put in for a day off...Give them a few weeks paid leave like most people get, and when they use it up, put them on UNPAID leave....We'd see them taking a lot less time off if they are doing it without pay LOL I don't know why Congress gets treated like Royalty...they are not. They are PAID public servants who should be at their jobs working!!! Not off playing golf, off being paid for by lobbyists, or off campaigning for their buddies.

Comments provided by :
Presnall, Joyce

It's time to have full disclosure and overturn this law.

Comments provided by :
Proteau, Jeanne

We need to know what interests are behind money being funneled into campaigns or ancillary entities that act in their interests.

Comments provided by :
Pulver, Clifford

YES the public deserves to how campaign funding is allocated!!! The less information we are privy to, the more this institution seems like a farce, when a man receiving millions from fossil fuel companies is speaking against the existence of climate change, and many other instances of conflicts of interest in our representatives. please let us be informed

Comments provided by :
rajan, ruth

We must have full disclosure of the source of all monies used in financing the election of any representative of the people. A representative of the people must be unbiased in their decisions that affect those they represent. We must have disclosure of those that might unduly influence our representation, and if possible we must put greater limits on the contributions to our elected officials campaigns. Our public servants should exist to serve the public, not just the few that finance their election. If we must have private finance of elections, it must be limited, and it must be fully disclosed, until such time that we can completely remove private financing and use only public financing to fund elections.

Joshua E. Ramirez, PMP, MSM-PM

Comments provided by :
Ramirez, Joshua

I believe that all money spent to influence an election in any way, whether through direct support of a candidate, support of a political party, or (nominally) independent advertising, should be publicly accountable. The person(s) or organization(s) providing the money should be clearly identified. I support all provisions of REG 2014-01 that advance this principle, and oppose all provisions that run counter to it.

Comments provided by :

Rappolt, George

Our democracy needs more transparency in election financing. The public needs to know who is spending money and how much they are spending to influence votes. The sources of all campaign spending, campaign or issue advertising spending and campaign contributions should be publicly identified, well in advance of the election date.

Comments provided by :
Rauth, Michael

I think it is only right and fair to know who or what entity is "footing the bill" for most of the "so-called" advocacy advertisements in the political campaigns. An informed voter should want to know who is paying for the ads. I am quite frankly disgusted with the Supreme Court's ruling in "Citizen's United". A corporation is not a person and free speech should not mean buying an election just because you can afford to fill the airways with your viewpoint.

Comments provided by :
Raycraft, John

Of course we should know which interest group gives what amount of money, who they give it to, what organization they represent, and the organization's political leanings.

How can there be an informed democracy otherwise?

Comments provided by :

Reed, Evan

I strongly support open government and that all candidates for public office provide detailed info regarding all campaign contributions including pacs and 501c3.

Comments provided by :
reed, patrick

Our political system can function with adequate accountability only if the forces influencing critical political decision making are known to the public, subject only to matters of national security. Campaign contributions, from whatever source, have the obvious potential to be one of the most significant influencing forces at play in the political arena. The FEC must take the steps necessary to make campaign contributions fully transparent so that the actual parties in interest are clearly identified to the public. The need for full disclosure has been heightened by the SCOTUS decision in the Citizens United case. Please implement the rules necessary to shine a light on the point of origin and subsequent contribution path for every dollar used to finance a federal campaign. Please do not implement exceptions to these rules that undermine the ultimate objective. The public has a right to know who is financing political operations, and to what extent, including the right to know the individuals who are behind contributions from or through corporations or political action committees.

Comments provided by :
Reid, Jonathan

A distinct line needs to be drawn that distinguishes corporate donations from blatant and corrupt bribery. All details regarding money given to candidates by corporations or unions (or from any other source for that matter) should be disclosed to the public- this includes amount given, where the money will be spent, and who is giving the money in the first place. Campaign spending is reaching ludicrous levels and none of it does any good to curb corporate bribery or corruption within our political system.

Comments provided by :
Rhoads, Donald

i agree that money spent on elections should be disclosed

Comments provided by :
Rhoney , Richard

I WANT TO KNOW WHO POURS MONEY INTO CAMPAIGNS. AND I WANT TO KNOW THE PRIMARY OF THE ADDS ON TV. NOT SOME INNOCUOUS NAME WHICH TELL YOU NOTHING. I THINK THE DECISION THAT A CORPORATION HAS THE SAME AS A HUMAN BEING IS RIDICULOUS AND I WANT IT STOPPED.

Comments provided by :
RICE, CAROLYN

The public has the right to know who or what companies back politicians and political issues, and the amount spent. This information will give voters a more comprehensive picture of the political landscape.

Comments provided by :
Richards, Flora

Our government has moved from the republic it was created, to that of an oligarchy. Our elections are now becoming more and more determined by special interests and money from relatively few, extremely wealthy individuals. We need to return our country back to whence it came. Finance contributions and the perceived helplessness of individual votes having influence on our elections, has led to significant voter apathy.

Accountability is essential to bring integrity back to the voting process of our country and ensure elected officials are in fact, representing "the people", not certain individuals, corporations, or lobbied interests.

Comments provided by :
Richards, Thierry

Require maximum visibility to all the original sources of the financial support of all candidates.

Comments provided by :
Richardson, Donald

HANDS OFF the internet and HANDS OFF our precious, constitutionally-protected freedom of speech!

Comments provided by :
Richman, Mark

As a voter, I want to know who is spending how much for every candidate. As long as there is secret campaign money, we will have politicians we don't want, winning because of well paid propaganda, to act against the interests of our communities. Please do all you can to pass a transparency rule. The public has a right to know where campaign contributions come from, and how much is being spent.

Comments provided by :
Riker, Mary

All funds donated to elections should be made public. Voters have a right to know which politicians are being bought by major corporations.

Comments provided by :
Roberts, Dave

Please do SOMETHING to control the influence of big money on our electoral system. The big-money corporate interests have turned our republic into an oligarchy. Please at least give us some way to know which "representatives" of the people are paid for by which interests.

Comments provided by :
Roberts, Ruth

I believe all contributions to political campaigns or political ads relating to political campaigns should be made public to all United States citizens. The ruling of citizens United and the Mccutcheon ruling has ruined the basic principles of democracy. Therefore to make our democracy fair we should know where the money is going in all political campaigns.

Comments provided by :
Roessler , Curtis

We the people should know who is donating, how much they are donating and to whom they are donating to.

Comments provided by :

Rogal, Robert

Of course the source of all funds involved in the electoral process should be a matter of public record. Transparency is fundamental to the electoral process. If someone is trying to influence the outcome of an election, we all need to know about it so that we can evaluate their motives for doing so.

Comments provided by :
Rogers, Andy

It is absolutely imperative for the political health of the United States that the election process have complete fairness and total transparency. This is especially true in the area of campaign financing, whether it be financing through a political party or organization, or whether it be by anyone outside the party structure operating as a person, organization, PAC, super-PAC, or whatever the entity happens to be.

Essentially, all money spent on any election, federal or otherwise, should be subject to this rule of ABSOLUTE transparency. It could easily be applied to lower-level elections with the interstate commerce clauses in the Constitution and US Code.

There should also be quite stringent regulations on how much any person or entity can contribute to any candidate, party or issue. If possible under this regulation, the total amounts spent on any campaign or issue for federal office should have an absolute ceiling, with the highest being for the Presidential campaign, then lowering on a percentage basis depending on the office.

If possible under this regulation, there should also be a very strict time limit on any federal election (assuming that state and local elections would probably follow) to limit the ENTIRE campaign and election process to NO MORE than 30 days prior to any primary election, and NO MORE than 60 days prior to the general election.

There should also be an absolute moratorium on any type of political advertising by any person or entity other than within these time limits. This would include any type of media, including social networks (paid ads). If possible, this should also include any so-call 'educational' advertising by any person or entity that may be construed as an explicit or implicit attempt to influence an election for any candidate, party or issue.

Finally, there should be put in place a stringent oversight and enforcement process, with appropriate penalties, to assure the American citizens that we as a society and a democratic republic are guaranteed free and fair elections.

As the Federal Election Commission, it is incumbent on you to be sure that this is accomplished. Thanks for your kind consideration.

Comments provided by :
Rogers, Jon

The elections in this country are like politicians are for sale to the highest bidder. However we will never get anywhere with the current supreme court or the current congress especially the one coming in January 2015. I do not hold that much hope for democrats but at least they are not attempting to suppress the vote.

It is OK to have access to make your point of view to the legislators but not to the detriment of the rest of the country. This country is moving towards the political model we have in Latin America. This is not the reason I did decide to come to this country at one time in my younger life. We need to maintain the tradition of the middle class and of paying a decent wage always, otherwise we will be become just like a third world country we are there in some places already. Business people in their majority are so gritty that they can not see that a system of paying people a living wage is good for business and they could do so much better under such a system.

It is time to design a system of elections that in their majority are publically funded with some restrictions.

We need visionary leaders that solve problems for the country not a congress that only is th8nking about the next election and not the business of the country on the long run, we have lost that kind of politician.

Comments provided by :
Ropbles, Arturo

Full disclosure must be made of large or multiple contributions to political organizations or any so-called "charitable" organization or PAC that devotes more than 10% of it's collections to political advertizing. All contributions from foreign sources or corporations must be disclosed.

If we are to be a government of, by, and for the people, then the people need to be informed, not ignored an buried by propaganda.

Comments provided by :
Rousu, Dwight

To ensure full transparency, all donors, donations and/funding to candidates should be fully disclosed. Any and all campaign financing should have a paper trail leading to a person or organization who is contributing. Organizations who also collect donations in foreign nations should have all records of funding publicly disclosed to ensure no illegal donations are being funneled into campaigns. Under no circumstances should political funding be hidden from the view of the public. By allowing hidden funding, we can not assure that illegal political donations aren't being laundered I with legal donations. Limits to political donations should be in place to ensure that each citizen has an equal voice in the outcomes of elections. Dollars should not equal votes or increase voting power of any person or organization. Political donations by individuals who are also members of organizations, 501c4 exempt organizations, or other entities should have their names attached to all political donations from all organizations with which they are affiliated. One person, one vote. Allowing one person to hide their political donations via "dark money" organizations defies open and transparent elections.

Comments provided by :
Routh, Michael

The endless flow of dark/big money into our political system is corrupting the people that are supposed to represent us. Corporations are not people and money is not speech. The constitution guarantees equality under the law and the idea of money being speech acts contrary to that and implies that somebody with more money has more speech which is a very un-american idea. I am aware that the currently corrupt supreme court makes it almost impossible to reverse any of this but I would like to say as a citizen of this country that there needs to be:

- limits on campaign donations
- all donations must be disclosed in public record
- corporations, super-PACS, and other non human entities should be banned from contributing
- eventually there should be public financing of elections

These rules are crucial to all Americans having an equal voice in our government. What I have to say should hold no more or less weight than what somebody like Sheldon Adelson or Bill Gates has to say and the endless flow of money into elections simply makes that impossible.

Comments provided by :
Rowe, Joshua

The United States government is a PUBLIC entity that decides matters of PUBLIC importance and administers laws that apply to the PUBLIC. Thusly, all sources of spending on campaigns and elections should be completely transparent and accessible to any interested member of the public. The administration of this country should not be shrouded in secrecy from those who put the public officials in office in the first place. Also, being a member of the National Guard, I am duly and directly involved in how my state and congressional leaders are biased in their special interests. Full disclosure is the only acceptable solution.

Comments provided by :
Rybicki , Nick

Voters should have the right to know which interest(corporations or individuals) are contributing to to campaigns to win over our votes. Even if the majority of voters don't care, this information should be easily available to any voter who wants to know.

Comments provided by :
Sanborn, Sherburn

All must be disclosed to operate a true democracy.

Comments provided by :
sandwina, anita

We need absolute transparency in campaign finances. The ability for corporations to act as individuals has placed a "FOR SALE" sign on our government. This has to stop.

Comments provided by :
Sanford, Karen

Please remove special interests and their money from American democracy.

Comments provided by :
Santana, Frank

campaign financing should be totally transparent. we should know who is trying to buy and influence which politician. If money is speech then it's only fair that we all know who is talking.

Comments provided by :
Sartain, Harold

Donors are themselves participants in a political candidacy, an activity which is supposed to take place in an open society; the donors to a candidacy are taking what should be recognized as a public action, and therefore their donations should be open to public scrutiny. Please advance the process of public disclosure.

In contrast, voters are protected by the secrecy of the ballot box, so that all may participate in an election, regardless of pressures they may have experienced.

Comments provided by :
Savage, Joan

Voters should know who is spending how much to win their votes.

Comments provided by :
Scaggs, Melinda

The public has a right to know the sources of political contributions, particularly from large corporations and the wealthy.

Comments provided by :
scalisi, Eugene

It's time the American public regains some control on how our elections are being influenced by big money interests. It's key to our Civil rights that we have full disclosure on who is contributing and who is receiving those "donations" We have to separate money from politics for the public interest.

Comments provided by :
Schaefer, Carole

Since Congress has refused to consider legislation on disclosure requirements, partly due to the vehement opposition by the soon to be Senate Majority Leader, the FEC must now take up this task. A majority of the American public feel that there is too much money in politics and strongly prefer transparency for campaign spending from corporations. The Federal Election Commission shouldn't be bullied by corporations or by politicians, who twist the words of the First Amendment in order to justify their vehement opposition to fixing our campaign finance system and to continue benefiting from this state of legalized bribery. This is unacceptable. The FEC must take steps to rectify the errors made by the judiciary branch. These steps may be small and limited, but would go a long way. In devising these rules, however, the commission members should not allow themselves to be influenced or intimidated by outside interests opposed to these rules. The rights of the ordinary American citizen are more important than the rights of an artificial entity or the self-centered motivations of a few individuals who seek and obtain power for themselves alone. In conclusion, I urge the commissioners to craft a strong rule that will ensure the ordinary voter knows the amount of money being spent by a particular interest group to influence the vote.

Comments provided by :
Schaeffer, Michael

I want to know everything that I possibly can, please.

Comments provided by :
Schepper, Faith

I want to know how much people or entities are spending on elections and who they're donating to.

Comments provided by :

Schill, Paul

We need more transparency in campaign financing. No more dark money!! Let the light shine on who is contributing and in what amount to each campaign.

Comments provided by :
Schmidt, Helen

Big, anonymous, contributions in politics is turning our democracy into an oligarchy. We need to do everything we can to limit large contributions and create as much transparency in regard to these donations as possible.

Comments provided by :
schmidt, Robert

I believe that money should not buy elections. Buy elections, and soon you own the elected official. Preferential treatment follows. The U.S. should treat everyone, regardless of financial status the same, and allowing the rich to control elections negates the fairness principle I believe is the basis for the founding of this country.

Comments provided by :
Schoenefeld, Karl

Voters would benefit from knowing who is funding political campaigns, advertisements, and candidates. An honestly informed electorate will make the best choices. I support rules and regulations that require full disclosure of all funding sources over a reasonable minimum.

Comments provided by :
Schwartz, Paul

It is my opinion that all campaign contribution information should be made public, including the names of all donors and the amounts of their contributions. This information should also be publicized prior to the election for which it is raised so that the voting public can use it to inform their decisions. Making public means posting it online in a well-known and accessible location in a format such that interested parties can easily perform analysis of the data.

I would also like to know who is the end recipient of that money. In other words, if money is being spent for television advertising, I'd like to know who produced the ad, how much they were paid to produce it, which networks and/or television stations aired it, and how much each network and/or television station received for airing the ad. Huge amounts of money are flowing through our election system today, so it would be nice to see who's getting rich because of it. It sure doesn't seem to be the voters.

Comments provided by :
Schweitzer, William

WE DON'T NEED YOU. YOU'RE FIRED.

Comments provided by :
Scott, Barbara

It is absolutely imperative for the political health of the United States that the election process have complete fairness and total transparency. This is especially true in the area of campaign financing, whether it be financing through a political party or organization, or whether it be by anyone outside the party structure operating as a person, organization, PAC, super-PAC, or whatever the entity happens to be.

Essentially, all money spent on any election, federal or otherwise, should be subject to this rule of ABSOLUTE transparency. It could easily be applied to lower-level elections with the interstate commerce clauses in the Constitution and US Code.

There should also be quite stringent regulations on how much any person or entity can contribute to any candidate, party or issue. If possible under this regulation, the total amounts spent on any campaign or issue for federal office should have an absolute ceiling, with the highest being for the Presidential campaign, then lowering on a percentage basis depending on the office.

If possible under this regulation, there should also be a very strict time limit on any federal election (assuming that state and local elections would probably follow) to limit the ENTIRE campaign and election process to NO MORE than 30 days prior to any primary election, and NO MORE than 60 days prior to the general election.

There should also be an absolute moratorium on any type of political advertising by any person or entity other than within these time limits. This would include any type of media, including social networks (paid ads). If possible, this should also include any so-call 'educational' advertising by any person or entity that may be construed as an explicit or implicit attempt to influence an election for any candidate, party or issue.

Finally, there should be put in place a stringent oversight and enforcement process, with appropriate penalties, to assure the American citizens that we as a society and a democratic republic are guaranteed free and fair elections.

As the Federal Election Commission, it is incumbent on you to be sure that this is accomplished. Thanks for your kind consideration.

Comments provided by :
Scott, Daniel

I am favor of legislation that would add transparency to the money that is spent on campaigns, particularly when out-of-state interests come and try to influence what happens within our state. As a friend of mine says, "it has been argued that money is speech and cannot be restricted under the constitution. If money is considered speech, then it should be pointed out that nowhere does the constitution guarantee that you have the right to anonymous speech." There is great cynicism about politics these days and democracy faces grave danger. If our politicians are going to be corporately bought and paid for, and least we have the right to know in whose pocket they reside. Corporations should not be allowed a greater voice simply because they have greater wealth.

Comments provided by :
Sebrell, Cheryl

We desperately need transparency to ensure a fair election process. Please vote to require that contributions are fully disclosed. Thank you.

Comments provided by :
Seriff, Mariann

Since our Supreme Court has seen fit to allow any amount of money to influence politics, I am suggesting that these contributions be regulated. To keep outside corruption at a somewhat lower level, anyone contributing to a candidate, measure, proposition, etc. must also be able to vote on that candidate, etc. NO VOTE, NO CONTRIBUTION. Also, all contributions should be made public. Secrecy is never beneficial to a democracy. That being said, most Americans feel that money truly corrupts our voting system and a much better proposition would be to eliminate contributions altogether. Reagan and Carter ran publicly funded campaigns!

Comments provided by :
Sheehy, Robbie

To whom it may concern, I strongly support any measure that would add transparency to the money that is spent on political campaigns. It has been decided that money is speech and cannot be restricted under the constitution. However, the constitution doesn't guarantee that you have the right to anonymous speech.

Comments provided by :
Sheil, Kevin

Please enact improved FEC online rule making procedures

Comments provided by :
Shepler, Kathy

Simply put, Citizen United has taken control of the representative form of government from the citizens and put it in the hands of corporations. This should not be a secret process. It should be public.

Comments provided by :
Shoemaker, Ralph

We should have the right to know who is backing a campaign advertisement so we can identify what, if any, benefit they have for supporting that campaign.

Comments provided by :
shull, Dawn

All money going to elect someone to public office should be known to the public. This includes direct money to candidates and any outside money. Before I vote for someone I want to know who owns that candidate.

Comments provided by :
Simmons, Larry D

How can any election be fair if it is not open and honest to all the participants? If those running for office do not disclose the sources of their campaign contributions, then how can a voter make an informed decision? As a voter and citizen of this great country, I demand to know who and what money is behind every candidate running for office. How else can I trust a candidate?

Comments provided by :
SIMOES, MARCELO

How can any election be fair if it is not open and honest to all the participants? If those running for office do not disclose the sources of their campaign contributions, then how can a voter make an informed decision? As a voter and citizen of this great country, I demand to know who and what money is behind every candidate running for office. How else can I trust a candidate?

A free democracy only exists where the process is transparent. Please require that all campaign contributions be released - even those in PACs.

Comments provided by :
Simonds, Jacqueline

There should absolutely be public disclosure of the sources of campaign contributions. The public should know who is spending what in order to influence their vote.

Comments provided by :
Sipes, Ryan

It is important for us as citizens to know who and what organizations are promoting and/or attacking people running for office. This is especially important if the money is coming from out of state organizations. It is equally important to know if these organizations will be writing bills for elected officials to be promoting at our state level. We need to know who is writing our state agendas. It is our responsibility as citizens to know our candidates and we cannot know this unless we know who is backing them. Will they be supporting issues important to our state or important to some organization. Please open the dark curtains hiding this information from us. AO 2011-11 (Colbert)

Comments provided by :
Smit, Violet

I definitely think the American people deserve to see whether their elected representatives have corporate sponsors, who those corporate sponsors are, how much campaign or other money the corporate sponsors gave to each elected official, and how these representatives voted on legislation affecting their corporate sponsors.

Comments provided by :
Smith, MaryAnn

I think is extremely important for voters to know who is donating to all politicalwhobis supporting candidates

Comments provided by :
Sommerlad Rogers, Deirdre

The sheer volume of corporate dollars in our political system is atrocious. Corporations don't have moral values or human interests at heart, because a corporation doesn't have a heart, and whatever justifications one might use to mask this fact are hollow. If we can't get the money out of politics, can we please for the love of reason make the money transparent?

Comments provided by :
Southwell, Tara

I could not believe that corporations were classified as "people" outside of a narrow legal view. And then to decide that money is free speech was a total blow. There is absolutely no logic to this. We can see what it has created. It is time for full disclosure and a CAP on what individuals may contribute. Contributions from "groups" of any kind should be excluded. This is destroying the very fabric of our society.

Comments provided by :
Sovil, Terry

I feel I have the right to know whose political "speech" I am being subjected to when bombarded with constant, sometimes patently false, electioneering propaganda via the US Mail, television, radio, print publications, or the internet. Allowing donors to remain anonymous, hiding behind "educational non-profit" organizations, obviates any possibility of considering the source of any claims made in these communications when evaluating the plausibility of their message.

I feel that any person or organization participating in something as important as the election process should do so openly, revealing ALL their funding sources. Organizations which hide the identity of any of their donors should not be allowed to participate, nor to donate to any of the participants.

Comments provided by :
Sparks, Lisa

While a great many people are aware of how Citizens United and McCutcheon rulings opened the floodgates to a torrent of special interest money in elections, far fewer understand the damage the court's rulings have done to transparency and accountability in campaign financing. The rulings have rendered our disclosure laws obsolete, leaving the public increasingly in the dark about where all the political money comes from.

Citizens United legalized a form of election spending that had been banned in my home state since 1905 and outlawed in federal elections since 1907. Of course there were no laws requiring disclosure of donations used to fuel that spending because there was no such spending for over 100 years. It was prohibited. When the Supreme Court overturned these laws, we not only lost protection against the corrupting effects of unlimited election spending but we also didn't get disclosure. Transparency in these transactions would require new laws requiring the disclosure of the origins of the funds fueling special interest electioneering. New disclosure laws that Congress has not enacted for federal elections, and neither the current Republican-controlled legislature nor the Democratic majority that preceded it has created for our state elections.

If money equals speech as the Supreme Court insists, then each Super PAC donor speaks volumes above each of the millions of Americans who give much smaller amounts to candidates. The public needs and has the right to see how special interests are funneling money into political advertising campaigns. An informed citizenry is paramount to a healthy American democracy.

Comments provided by :
Speer, Beverly

If we are going to spread democracy around the world, we need to set the standard for how democracy works. And then practice what we preach. As it stands, we are as corrupt as any nation on earth. There are no shades of gray when it comes to honesty.

Comments provided by :
Stabler, Anthomy

In the one man, one vote concept, I only have one vote. Yet people with lots of money to give to campaigns have a greater influence, and smother my vote. Elected officials need money to run campaigns to get re-elected. If the elections aren't publicly funded, then we at least have a right to know who is speaking in the political arena with their money.

Comments provided by :
Stewart, Michael

The FEC should:

- revisit the manner in which it enforces its earmarking regulation to encompass the "implicit agreements" addressed by the Supreme Court in *McCutcheon*
- establish a maximum percentage of a PAC's funds that can go to one candidate in order to ensure that a substantial portion of an individual's PAC contribution does not go to a single candidate
- create limits for contributions to independent expenditure-only committees, aka Super PACs

Comments provided by :
Stockstill, Mason

I strongly support transparency in campaign funding in elections at all levels. The inability to know who is funding what has essentially allowed our government to be sold to the highest bidder. This must end. It has resulted in the greatest transfer of wealth to the elite, via tax and other laws that favor the elite. It has resulted in the greatest number of people living in poverty in our history, and the erosion of the middle class, our infrastructure, and the stability of our society. We will not be able to change this until our elections are no longer for sale, and all campaign spending is disclosed publicly.

Comments provided by :
Stone, Mary

In a democracy, transparency must be paramount for a properly functioning government. The people must be able to trust the elected officials who govern in their name. Without such trust, the whole structure fails. Therefore, it is a serious public concern as to who gives money to political campaigns in an attempt to influence candidates and lawmakers. Make public every dollar spent in such a manner. Let the people trust their government. Let democracy reign supreme.

Comments provided by :
Strother, James

Yes, I absolutely want as much transparency as possible. Therefore, I would like to be able to see who is donating to whom in every election campaign. Period.

Thank you!

Comments provided by :
Sullivan, Mary-Helen

In the recent election of November 7, 2014 there were several different groups, individuals, and entities sponsoring campaign ads for various candidates and proposed laws and regulations in my State, California, and my Voting District, that were endeavoring to influence a positive outcome for their position on the given issues and candidates. None of these groups, etc were residents of California, nor were they remotely eligible to vote in this election in this State let alone my Voting District. This maraud interest was buried in documents and various nefarious methods of transfer of funds for the support of these issues and candidates. There was no avenue to who these individuals, groups, or entities were for an eligible voters to seek and find the identify nor the interest of this plundering herd.

Transparency of all supporters of issues and candidates is paramount to giving the voter an informed platform to make a voting decision. It was explicitly outlined, or implied depending on who is interpreting it, in the Constitution of the United States and should be definitively transmitted in law by Congress and the legislative bodies on all states.

Thank you for the opportunity to present my opinion on this matter. It is my hope that the Federal Election Commission will take these comments under its advisement and ensure the voters of the United States of America will have all the necessary information at hand to make an informed vote in all elections.

Thank you.

Comments provided by :
Summerlot, Barbara

The American People should KNOW who (specifically, in name) funds campaigns, by how much and who the recipients (in name) are and in actual dollar amounts. The Public Disclosure of Funding should be available to all indicating the money trail from donation in monetary instrument, service or benefit, through Super PAC or Non-Profit, or For Profit Organization, to Other Organizations, subsequently to other organizations or Dollars spent outside the "Funding System" yet used to Promote Candidates or Issues. Examples include Advertising in ALL Medias, Infomercials, Documentary Film, Promotion by Public Entertainment or Informational Figures and Commentators "Promoting" their choice of Issue or Candidate.

Furthermore Fund Raising should NOT begin until 6 months prior to any election. Campaigning should not begin until 60 Days prior to election and IDEALLY ALL candidates and Issues should receive EQUAL TIME and SPACE in all Media and ALL campaign funds should be collected and divided equally to ALL competitors.

Our Country is supposed to be a Democratic Republic not an Oligarchy.

Thank You for allowing public comment.

Jay Summers

Comments provided by :
Summers, Jay

keep government out of our personal freedoms!!!

Comments provided by :
Sumpter, Jon

Public financing of all political campaigns is the only solution. We can start with overturning the recent court decisions, but ultimately we should get all private money out of the process

Comments provided by :
sweeny, robert

It is my right as a voting, law abiding citizen of the United States to know exactly who is contributing to candidates and the dollar amount of those contributions. As it is currently, I feel as if my vote means literally nothing because the only people the candidates are paying attention to are the corporations (who, contrary to the Supreme Court's decision, are NOT persons)and moneyed interests who seek to influence policy. Knowing who contributes (and how much) will tell me a lot about any candidate and their probable behavior once in office.

Comments provided by :
Szulczewski, Linda

I believe that all campaign finance information should be subject to full and open disclosure. All citizens should have the right to know who and to what degree individuals, corporations or other interests are contributing to all political campaign efforts.

Comments provided by :
Tabbert, Gary

Dear FEC Board Members,

I consider public disclosure of political campaign spending to be of paramount importance to help voters evaluate the relative merits of the information presented to them by any of the media forms. Knowledge of individuals and organizations (corporations, unions, and interested groups) allow the voter to consider the self interest of donors when they back politicians or political and social causes. Additionally, donors should be identified by their interest as well as their name because the names are often meant to disguise self-interest.

It is imperative for a functional Democracy that sufficient and readily understandable information be available to the often busy voter who doesn't have the time and resources to keep abreast of the professional lobbyists and politicians who try to run our Democracy.

Furthermore, in the Citizens United case, the Supreme Court unanimously supported and encouraged financial disclosure.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter.

Sincerely yours,
John Tampanello

Comments provided by :
Tampanello, John

I fully support requiring the fullest possible disclosure to the public of all sources of campaign contributions at the earliest possible time. All information should be made available to the public in electronic format without cost on the internet as well as print.

Comments provided by :
Tarbox, John

*DITTO(USA)...I, Do-Not, Approve Of Your Wanting To Regulate 'Our' Freedom Of Speach With Respect To The 'Internet'...Hence, Violating 'Our' First-Amendment Rights With Respect To 'Our' U.S. Constitution...Thanks-Much/In-Liberty, Dennis Tavares...Sooner And/Not, Later!!! *PS:
"GoBabyBoomers/GoTheBroadMiddleClass/GoNewEnglandPatriots"!!!

>
>
>

Comments provided by :
Tavares, Dennis

Please publish all information pertaining to political campaign contributions by every individual and every corporation. The citizens need to know if there is a relationship between who contributes to office holders' campaigns and how office holders vote on government laws.

Comments provided by :
Taylor, Brian

The current regulations insure that those who spend the most money win the elections at every level. Citizens United has totally corrupted the election process.

No one wants to vote in a "fixed" election. By that I mean that the candidates and winner were picked long before the voting even started because of the lack of limitations on funding elections by you guys. Spending money on elections is not a violation of free speech, but a shouting down of others' free speech rights by overwhelmingly outspending the opposing candidates.

Voter turnout is dismal. Nobody wants to vote when it is a mere formality to a foregone conclusion. You should be very alarmed by a small populace electing the candidates, because so many feel and are disenfranchised by the voting process.

Many states add ridiculous conditions as a way of suppressing voters. Long lines and reduced numbers of precinct workers at election sites discourage the process. Vote by mail ballots are seldom counted unless the election is close. **EVERY VOTE SHOULD COUNT and BE COUNTED**, before announcing winners. Vote by mail should be started counting as soon as it arrives, not on election day. The appearance of an unbiased election system is not happening, and many changes are due, to get people back to the polls and know their vote counts.

Comments provided by :
Taylor, John

All campaign contributions for a federal office holder or candidate from any individual or entity exceeding \$1000 in total should be reported publicly. It is the public's right to know where funds used by any federal office holder or candidate originate from.

Comments provided by :
Taylor, Marilyn

The democratic process is not transparent unless all sources of contributions are reported.

Comments provided by :

Teige, Pamela

The public should be able to find out where money for campaigning comes from. The public cannot make informed decisions about the information presented about candidates without being able to put it in the context of who is paying to have the information made public, essentially who is saying it. People have to vote for a candidate without truly knowing who the candidate is indebted to. This leaves us in the dark guessing which candidates actually support the same things we support. The rules about campaign finance disclosure must have full disclosure or elections are guessing games and not true elections.

Comments provided by :
Tennis, Ellen

All political donations should be transparent! All PACs should have to name their donors!!

Comments provided by :
Thacker, Alice

As voters we should know what's going on with contributions to campaigns. It would give us a better sense of a candidate's real values. Also if a corporation backs a candidate we don't support we have two votes, one for a candidate and one with our wallets.

Comments provided by :
Thayer, Christine

The situation as it stands is untenable. We have politicians blatantly taking bribes and it is deforming our government.

One party created and perpetrates this problem which has been greatly exacerbated by the "Citizens United" travesty to say nothing of the judicial coup of 2000 committed by the Supreme Court. The justices appear to be a corrosive unelected partisan political entity.

The Super PAC's are another part of this criminal setup. They serve to ensure that those with money get to set the rules while 99% of the citizens are impoverished at the hands of the plutocrats.

If adults were in charge, which they obviously are not, there would public financing with no commercials allowed, a required schedule of prime time televised speeches and debates on the public airwaves and a total prohibition on the receipt of outside funds.

The gerrymandering and voter suppression efforts of the GOP are way over the line and are clearly a form of vote fraud where they disenfranchise the majority to retain power. This is despite the fact that their policies are pretty much universally unpopular.

The problem is that this system is not the only one they have broken. Someone needs to get a mop and get to work.

Sincerely,

Ralph Cooksey Talbott Thomas

Comments provided by :
Thomas, Ralph

The Supreme Court's actions on contribution limits make it imperative that disclosure be full and timely. As close to "next day" as possible. The public needs to know not only the amount and identity of the group, but also what contributions are being funneled through it. Otherwise you have a "money laundering" situation.

Comments provided by :
Thompson, William

"I care not who does the electing, so long as I do the nominating." - William "Boss" Tweed.

To allow anonymous, unlimited campaign funding is to place the nomination process of our great democracy exclusively in the hands of the upper class, effectively granting this smallest of sections of our society not only the privilege of deciding which candidates we the electorate can choose between, but an enduring influence over those that are elected.

This cannot be allowed. If the donation amounts must remain limitless as a protection of freedom of speech, so be it. Allow the corporations, super PACs and extremely wealthy this expression of their political opinions, but let the American people know to which of these our elected representatives are indebted.

This country has been made strong through a historically well functioning democracy. In order to continue this legacy, however, we must have the ability to choose leaders and policymakers that will govern effectively, honestly, and in our interest. Public disclosure of campaign funding would give American voters the information they need to make such choices not just in the coming election or the next, but for generations to come.

Please consider this in your coming decision.

Thank you, and God bless the United States of America.

Comments provided by :
Thomsen, Mason

I would prefer to see less money spent on campaigns, especially by wealthy corporate interests, but will settle for more disclosure if that's all we can get (for now).

Comments provided by :
Tollefson, Tammy

We don't need the government controlling our life's Obama is acting like a dictator Dictator. Like Saddam Husayn, Stalin, Hitler and like all dictators they start by taking the Freedom of the people one by one.zThe UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. IS A FREE CAPITALISTIC NATION. WE ARE THE ONES THAT SHOULD BE MR UK ING THEORY COUNTRY NOT THE GOVERNMENT. All YOU DEMOCRATS THAT HAVE A PROBLEM WITH THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA SHOULD LEAVE THE COUNTRY AND GO LIVE IN RUSSIA, CHINA. OR ANY OTHER COUNTRY THAT CONTROLS IT' PEOPLE BY TAKING THEIR FREEDOMS ONE BY ONE AND THAT'S HOW ALL DICTATORS AND TERANICAL GOVERMENTS BEGIN. WAKE UP AMERICA. ...!!!!

Comments provided by :
Torres, Victor H

We should know who is contributing. Rules should require all donations to be identified. Dark money is a real threat to democracy.

Comments provided by :
Townsend, Brack

This is very important. If corporations, billionaires and labor unions want to broadcast messages to influence my vote, they should be required to say who they are. Please require full disclosure of corporate, union and wealthy funding sources behind express advocacy ads and electioneering communications.

Full disclosure should be required to insure an informed public.

Comments provided by :
Townsend, Kelly

Please require full disclosure of all broadcast ads intended to influence my vote. What are the corporate, union and wealthy funding sources behind express advocacy ads and electioneering communications.

Comments provided by :
Travis, Chip

Disclose everything about campaign donations. No hidden dark third party money. Just the truth!

Comments provided by :
Trottmann, Jerry

If money is speech, then the electorate needs to know fully and clearly who is speaking. Full disclosure of the identity of the contributor, and the dollar amount, are critical pieces of information to be used to determine exactly who is supporting a particular candidate. Ideally, eliminating all private contributions and replacing those with a common public election fund would be best, but as an interim step, strongly restricting the amount a candidate can accept from a single contributor would help prevent those with the deepest pockets from buying elections.

Thanks for creating this opportunity for us mere citizens to be heard.

Comments provided by :
Truch, Ron

I think that in the interest of fairness and balance it is crucial that the sources of political fundraising be as transparent as possible, particularly in regards to so called "dark money" and superpacs. Perhaps if we were to do away with all forms of outside money and restrict all candidates to a pre-determined amount paid for through taxes, so that all candidates were on equal footing so that money was not the deciding factor in a race. This would also confer the positive externality of reducing the amount of time that elected officials spent fundraising so that they actually spend the brunt of their work day focusing on the needs of their constituency. The Citizens United ruling simply opened the door for rampant abuse by corporations and other large, monied interests to unfairly tip the scales as money = influence. All voices should have equal weight and in fact what what we should be working towards is that those with the least amount of money and influence should be heard the loudest.

Comments provided by :
Tu, Chris

It is very important, in a democracy, to have transparency in the financing of political campaigns. If we do not, it no longer is a democracy. Without full disclosure, it is difficult to see who is behind the policy makers. We are losing so much in this current political landscape. Our future as a democracy is at stake.

Comments provided by :

Vail, Janet

A policy of absolute and crystal-clear disclosure of campaign donors is vital to the health of our democracy. Nothing less is acceptable, until public funding is the law of the land. Money is not speech.

Comments provided by :
van Eyck, Devan

There is a reason that huge corporations and billionaires hide behind hundreds of mysterious organizations created specifically to conceal the source of the money being spent on political advertising. They do so because they think people will be more receptive to what they're saying if they don't know it's being said by the rich and the powerful. The rich and the powerful don't need any help influencing the decisions our democracy makes. It's the ordinary middle-class working person who needs help maintaining their voice and their power. Please make the rich and the powerful at least participate openly in our political process. Require all political advertising to include the names of the people or corporations who are paying for it. This must be the names of the original funders, not the name of some pass-through corporation whose only purpose is to obscure that information.

Comments provided by :
Van Pelt, Jasmine

Just as is the case with moneys being given to political candidates' campaigns, moneys given for the purpose of influencing elections should not be anonymous. Full disclosure is the only way for voters to know what interests are speaking.

Comments provided by :
VanDuren, Mau

As a voter of limited means I would like to think my vote means as much as the next person's. However with the Citizen's United decision our Supreme Court has made the ludicrous real by saying money is speech. This means that those with a great deal of money have more speech than others with lesser means. The idea of one man one vote is undermined when the wealth of individuals is allowed to dominate the discourse in an election. All available airtime may be purchased by one party or person restricting others access to the public airwaves. Whole networks can be created to present propaganda 24/7. Inaccuracies and falsehoods go unchallenged, deceiving the public is depriving the electorate of the ability to make informed decisions. It is as much a fraud as any vote tampering. If a candidate or party is libeled or slandered there is no recourse if they do not have the means to answer back. I ask that the FEC act to insure elections remain fair and that all candidates have equal opportunity to access the public airwaves/internet. I would also ask that the validity of campaign advertising be established before being aired. I do not want to promote censorship but a neutral examination of facts presented. Opinions should be clearly identified and disclaimers issued. Often pronouncements or statements are made as opinion but appear to be factual. All I want to see is fair elections where one man one vote is the law of the land and that unlimited speech be factual or identified as opinion.

I would also like that there is transparency in campaign donations made to PACs Parties and Candidates. Issue advertising also needs to have its source identified. Anyone who contributes money to the political process must be identified along with the amount of their contribution. This allows the voters to determine the source of opinion and influence. For good or ill political speech cannot be anonymous the courage of conviction must accompany public words and consequences felt. The source of unpopular speech over the public airwaves/Internet needs to be identified so that voters know who is influencing their opinion and vote.

Democracy is not served by unlimited speech. Democracy is not served by untruthful speech. Democracy needs to operate with as much transparency as can be accomplished by law and custom.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Philip Vassar
Oregon 2nd Congressional District

Comments provided by :
Vassar, Philip

The current opacity of campaign funding definitely affects how the campaigns run. It's imperative that voters know who is funding the advertisements used in all elections so they know whether the candidate will be beholden to interests that are contrary to the interest of the voter. The current system makes it virtually impossible to determine who is impacting government.

Comments provided by :
Vazquez, Julio

We have a right to know who is really controlling the puppets in Washington.

Comments provided by :
villegas, Demetrio

Yes, voters should be told where politicians are getting funds for political campaigns. I would also like to see strict limits on how much money can be donated both by individuals and corporations. The current system is too much like legalized bribery.

Comments provided by :
Vincenti, William

I believe the public should be made aware of, have access to any and all fundraising activities. There should be public disclosure of campaign money. We as voters should know which interests are spending how much to win over their votes.

Comments provided by :
Vold, Cheryl

Yes, I would like for all fundraising, spending, and related information to be required to be made public.

Comments provided by :
Walker, Michael

I read this post on facebook, supposedly by Robert Reich: The Federal Election Commission, considering new rules requiring public disclosure of campaign money, is asking the public whether voters should know which interests are spending how much to win over their votes.

It led me to this page. My two cents follow.

All monies given to campaigns of all varieties should be viewable by the public. While doing so would clearly become a political football for anyone to kick around (what isn't these days?) it would also let us know exactly who is, for lack of a better term, trying to use funds to influence the government to move in the direction of their choice.

America is being pulled in many directions by those trying to buy the America they want to live in, and by those who don't have the means to do so. These two forces are at odds. The monied interests (billionaires, large corporations and organizations) run free in the darkness, with no ability on our part to know exactly who is buying whom when. And we are powerless in that darkness.

We wouldn't be powerless, or would be less so, if we knew who was trying to buy this country and alter it's direction. It would lead us to a knowledge of why it is being moved, and give us a means to move it, and our, future in a direction we, rather than monied interests, prefer.

It seems to me that the public wants to know exactly is trying to control those who control and govern this state. They are right to want to know, and we should do all we can.

Thank you very much for reading this. Have a nice day.

Comments provided by :
Walsh, Michael

I feel it is in the best interested of a transparent democracy to ensure that anyone donating to a campaign make full disclosure of individual names and what groups or companies they are affiliated with. Also any special ear markings of where they want the funds to go and if they expect anything specific favors with how the candidate will vote on specific issues. Transparency is essential to a free and untainted election.

Comments provided by :
Watkins, Renee

Big money, especially "dark money" causes some people's votes to be far more influential than others'. Finance reform is needed desperately. Please act!

Comments provided by :
Watson, Richard

Public taxes should entirely fund ALL campaigns. No more lobbyists or campaign donors buying off politicians before they are even in office. This goes against the very nature of the Constitution of the United States of America. We are currently leaning toward an oligarchy because the wealthy are the ones buying the way of the politicians into office. These so-called elected officials are then creating laws against the will and best interests of the American people.

Comments provided by :
Weaver, Robyn

I want it to be made very clear and obvious how much money are being spent in campaigns. Maybe each add could specify how much was spent. And not in tiny Print. There should be a designated font. I also want to know who is affiliated with whom, and who sponsors whom. Maybe if we can see right in front of us how much certain parties are at a disadvantage, we can see the injustice and maybe more people will be inspired to participate politically.

Comments provided by :

West, Elise

Under no circumstance should ANY political campaign contributions from for profit or not for profit corporations, organizations, or any one individual based or residing anywhere in the world be allowed to exceed \$10.00 USD. Each violation should be punished with a \$100 fine to be divided equally among all candidates running for office.

Comments provided by :
Wexler, Veronica

I believe that voters should know which interests are spending how much to win over their votes. I encourage strong campaign finance disclosure rules that would make this information readily available to the public.

Regards
Brian Wheeler

Comments provided by :
Wheeler, Brian

The difference between bribery and political contributions is essentially public disclosure. If individuals and corporations are no longer restricted in the size of their donations to some reasonable sum, then all that is left to protect the public from outright purchase of our legislators by special interests is the embarrassment of disclosure that they are beholden to those interests. Full disclosure of political contributions is essential in light of this country's absence of campaign finance limitations wrought by the Supreme Court.

Comments provided by :

Whisler, Terry

I want it to be known that myself and practically everyone I know has a major issue with the FCC attempting to regulate the internet and speech as we are currently able to make statements, post, and comments be it likeable or unlikeable to anyone or any mass of people. I think that it is a human right to be able to share ones thoughts to the public without retribution, threat, or recourse by the government or any other entity ! Keep out of the business of censorship and the business of regulating free speech efforts!

Comments provided by :
WHITTINGTON, KEITH

Full disclosure of all funds and affiliations should be required for all persons running to be a representative to the people of the United States.

Comments provided by :
Wilde, Ryan

Voters should know which interests are spending how much to win over their votes. Corporations are not people and money is not free speech.

Comments provided by :
Williams, Donald

May I advocate for a voluntary on-line citizen's registry that a person (but not a corporation) could set up while filing their taxes. If a person is current on their tax bill, they have the opportunity each month to update their own political profile and directly address the Federal Government on topics important to them. To qualify to have an opinion, a citizen must correctly answer a short quiz of factual information on the topic they wish to take a position.

Such a system could be similar to Facebook and the data compiled for each profile would be available in graphic form. Hence, the congress would know where the Citizens of the United States stood on each issue.

As I realize the above is all but a dream, I must state my opposition to any money in the U.S. political system being untraceable. The donor and source of all political donations must be traceable to its origin.

Comments provided by :
Williams, Gilbert

It is crucial for voters to make informed decisions that they should know the sources of funds spent in advertising on behalf of candidates -- regardless of whether the advertising was solicited or approved by the candidates. And I don't mean just an organization name appearing in fine print on the screen. They should know the names and affiliations of all contributors to any political advertising. I don't mean each ad should display a complete list but that list should be available online through FEC. Furthermore, I do wish the Supreme Court would realize that corporations are NOT people -- but I realize that goes beyond the power of FEC. Just had to say it.

Comments provided by :
Williams, Marsha

The idea that money spent is equal to free speech is not valid. If a person wishes to say something, let them say it in public- as an individual, not under the table or in a closet with their cash. The use of massive amounts of money to foster the success of a particular candidate, without the acknowledging of who is doing the funding, is the same as bullying an individual (or the public) by overwhelming force. We the public have the right to know who is trying to influence our elected representatives- and with what agenda.

Comments provided by :
Williams, Russell K.

I am opposed to any government control of political speech written or viewed over the internet. This clearly is an attempt to dramatically curb political speech freedoms that our constitution guarantees all citizens of USA.

Comments provided by :
Wilson, Getchel

Campaign contributions should be public domain.

Comments provided by :
Wilson, Heather

I believe that all Americans should be able to look up and determine where campaign finances come from. Hiding this, or choosing not to share is unjust. With the rising and record breaking spending occurring every election, where this money is coming from should be known. I encourage the FEC to enact new laws that will allow us to see campaign spending and funds openly and honestly.

Comments provided by :
Wilson, Madison

Of course we should know where big money comes from that is used to garden or suppress voters or voting,

Comments provided by :

Winer, Paul

The public should definitely be informed regarding how much campaign funding is given by whom and to whom. Secrecy in this regard undermines the democratic process; public disclosure of the sources of campaign funds is necessary to free and transparent elections. Thank you.

Comments provided by :
Wiseman, Wendy

Full Disclosure is the only Fair and Just System. The People of the United States deserve a Fair and Open System.
Money and Politics do not mix.

Comments provided by :
Wollenburg, Douglas

In this latest election, it was obvious that a lot of the money being spent on behalf of a large number of candidates and issues was virtually untraceable, making it hard for voters like me to determine an appropriate response. In my view, voters should know which interests are spending how much to win over their votes. I feel very strongly that we must eliminate the possibility for "dark money" to drive and manipulate the electoral process. It makes for a perversion and corruption of the entire electoral process. It's a dark day for democracy when people like me, with meager resources, feel like elections have been "rigged" by invisible entities with deep pockets whose agendas are unclear at best and likely at odds with the principles put into place back in 1776 when this country was founded.

Comments provided by :
Woods, Catherine

One of the greatest things about this country is free speech. Its awesome being able to say whatever I want whether it's in person, in a comment section, or in a YouTube video. The government has no right to limit free speech! Not even political speech. The Constitution says we Americans have free speech and the government shall not infringe on that! Thank you.

Comments provided by :
Wright, Benjamin

The fact that corporations can make unlimited contributions in the first place is contrary to open democracy, but the fact that we as citizens have no idea which corps are donating to whom is even more unconscionable. We the People deserve to know who is sponsoring our legislators.

Comments provided by :
Wright, Jason

Every single dollar of every donation to all elected officials and candidates for public office should scrupulously be accounted for and made public, entirely without exception, no matter the identity of the donor, no matter the office the official holds or is a candidate for. This must hold true for every level of office, Federal, State, or local.

We must require absolute complete disclosure; nothing short of that is honest.

Thank you.

Comments provided by :
Zager, Bill

Internet should bee a free

Comments provided by :
Zec, Dragan

I think it is vitally important that every dollar be accounted for and announced when those dollars are spent to "sway" the politicians we vote into office. Especially now since there seems to be no ethics left in any of the people who campaign for our votes. Without this information, it's too easy for the candidates and office holders to say they believe in one thing and then do the exact opposite when voted in or re-elected. It's a devastating perversion of Democracy.

Comments provided by :
Zeman, Kathie

Free America From Millionaires

Comments provided by :
Zukow, Edward