

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Blackler_Edd_01_14_2015_18_30_18_CommentText.txt

=====

Every effort possible must be made to eliminate the influence of "dark money" on our election process. I urge you to take the necessary actions to see that this happens. Thank you.

Comments provided by :
Blackler, Edd

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Byron_Patrick_01_14_2015_18_30_26_CommentText.txt

=====

As a citizen of this country I believe that any matters dealing elections, in any form, NEED to be as TRANSPARENT as possible.

This includes where candidate financial support originates.

She the light on the election process..

NO

MORE

"DARK MONEY"

ALLOWED!!

Comments provided by :

Byron, Patrick

=====

=====

I oppose this proposed rule and am writing to demand that the FEC keep the Internet free. As Americans we enjoy the right of freedom of speech and the freedom to petition our government. In today's modern age that includes the right to make political satire videos on You Tube, the right to assemble and form 501(c) groups, the right to criticize the Administration on Twitter and the right to make political commentary on FaceBook. The First Amendment applies to the digital arena and the FEC needs to understand that fundamental point.

Comments provided by :
Fredericks, David

=====

=====

The Rising Price of Politicians

Politicians have always been for sale, but not for nearly so much as in the last few years. This prices out common people like us. At these prices, paid in "legal" contributions, there is almost nothing that can't be asked by the big dollar contributors. This is more and more likely as the majority of funds are supplied by fewer and fewer contributors. After all, you wouldn't want too many conspirators because "secret" information is too likely to leak out. And even all together we can't cough up anywhere near enough \$ to even begin to match the BIG \$\$\$ contributors. So the only fair way is to make election expenses "crowd sourced", freezing out the BIG \$\$\$\$. We each kick in only a very little bit, or legally limited, whether we have mega \$\$\$, or just a few \$. Limit the number of ads that can be bought, make them equal by law. Make lobbyists illegal. That is the ONLY way to have fair elections at every level from your town, state, or nationally. How to get this done? Start by signing this petition, but don't stop there. Carry the "bought and paid for politician" problem everywhere you go, tell everyone you can.

Comments provided by :
Davis, Roger

=====

=====

Please enact rules to let the "people" know who is buying political favors.
Our country is being bought by the millionaires' and billionaires. This not
only hurts our country but the people without a voice. Middle Class..
Hundreds of millions of dollars from secret sources are leading to corruption
in our government. This money puts ads on television that are lies and
misleads the general public... Please do the right thing for America.
Purpose and Enact new rules...

Comments provided by :
Wilson, Alice

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Kudrna_Den_01_14_2015_18_30_50_CommentText.txt

=====

I oppose the FEC proposal to limit free speech on U-tube and other forms of communication on the Internet. The proposal violates the First Amendment guaranteeing free speech and is therefore UNCONSTITUTIONAL! Please retract your proposal immediately and do not try any other measures restrict the freedoms our founding fathers fought so hard to obtain for U.S. citizens.

Comments provided by :
Kudrna, Den

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Hughes_Gerald_01_14_2015_18_31_01_CommentText.txt

=====

leave the internet alone, leftys

Comments provided by :
Hughes, Gerald

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Wier_Allan_01_14_2015_18_30_54_CommentText.txt

=====

Please update the FEC disclosure rules to allow transparency with donations

Comments provided by :
Wier, Allan

=====

=====

My father fought in WWII including the Battle of the Bulge and later was an interpreter at Neremberg, earning the purple heart and other medals. My son is a disabled vet from OIF 3 serving as a combat medic with the 2nd ID in Ramadi in 2004 and 2005. They both fought for free speech and access to information. Neither my son nor I can grasp how his sacrifice (and my fathers) has been squandered by this admnistration and the federal government as a whole. This regulation is another attempt by the Federal Government to further control we the people, and limit access to information, opinions, and communication via the internet concerning politicians and the political process. I vehemently oppose this attempt to further limit freedom of speech for we the people. I have eight grandchildren, and it is very disheartning for me to picture them in the liberal, socialist world with coninued usurption of freedom that this regulation embodies as a continued assult on free speech. Keep the internet FREE. Keep the federal government OUT of the people's business and right to communicate freely. Tary Schumacher

Comments provided by :
Schumacher, Tary

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Stahl_Burnie_01_14_2015_18_31_01_CommentText.txt

=====

I oppose the FEC trying to over ride our 1st Amendment rights. We've had way more than enough over reach of the U.S. government the way it is. Let us have America the way it was intended by our founding fathers, not the way this administration thinks it ought to be. We are not your puppets and we damn sure don't want a socialist- communist types of government.

Comments provided by :
Stahl, Burnie

=====

=====

We have a right to know which elected officials are being bought, but our current system allows many political spenders to hide their true identities. That?s simply unacceptable in a democracy. Please enact rules NOW to expose political spenders and disclose the true identities of those who bankroll political ads. In Citizens United, the Supreme Court assumed we would know who is trying to influence our decisions on Election Day ? and who is buying attention from our elected officials. But since that decision five years ago, hundreds of millions of dollars from secret sources have been spent in ways that have corrupted our elections,, our Congress, and have demolished our democracy.. Please update and strengthen the FEC?s disclosure rules to protect our democracy.

Comments provided by :
valdez, ruth

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Narayan_Seeta_01_14_2015_18_32_00_CommentText.txt

=====

For Americans to truly be free-we need to be able to post, blog, upload, download, email, text our feelings without worrying about repercussions. This part of the American life is one of the main reasons America remains unique.

Comments provided by :
Narayan, Seeta

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Harris_N._E._01_14_2015_18_32_04_CommentText.txt

=====

Protect our democratic process with transparent campaign finance regulations. The commission has the power and responsibility to give universal understanding of who supports which ideals and goals of elected government. Be our "American Eagle" watching and protecting the electoral democratic process vital to any democracy.

Comments provided by :
Harris, N. E.

=====

=====

Here are my views. The Incorporation Laws were made to protect the owners of a company from personal bankruptcy. Not to allow the owners to take millions of dollars to influence the people who receive this money. We need this decision repealed. The least you can do is tell us who the "dark money political spenders" are and who has received their money! The following also are my views stated by someone else. May God save the Republic!! You guys sure aren't!!

We have a right to know to whom elected officials are beholden, but our current system allows many political spenders to hide their true identities. That's simply unacceptable in a democracy. Please enact new rules to bring dark money political spenders out into the open and disclose the true identities of those who bankroll political ads.

In Citizens United, the Supreme Court assumed we would know who is trying to influence our decisions on Election Day ? and who is buying attention from our elected officials. But since that decision five years ago, hundreds of millions of dollars from secret sources have been spent in ways that will lead to corruption.

Please update and strengthen the FEC's disclosure rules to protect our democracy.

Comments provided by :
Akins, Clifford

=====

=====

Dark Money has no place in our political system. It promotes and allows the rich to sway our elections without taking responsibility nor acknowledging their involvement. They can lie, cheat, deceive, pander, pay off, promote stupidity while hiding behind a veil of secrecy. Cowardly and despicable.

We have a right to know to whom elected officials are beholden, but our current system allows many political spenders to hide their true identities. That's simply unacceptable in a democracy. Please enact new rules to bring dark money political spenders out into the open and disclose the true identities of those who bankroll political ads.

In Citizens United, the Supreme Court assumed we would know who is trying to influence our decisions on Election Day ? and who is buying attention from our elected officials. But since that decision five years ago, hundreds of millions of dollars from secret sources have been spent in ways that will lead to corruption.

Please update and strengthen the FEC's disclosure rules to protect our democracy.

Comments provided by :
Howard, Dan

=====

=====

I oppose the FEC's proposed rule, and am writing to demand that the FEC keep the Internet free.

This Administration may not always like the content of what Americans say or write on the Internet.

But the Administration and the FEC must uphold the First Amendment and respect our right to voice our opinions on the Internet, even when our message is inconvenient to the Administration.

Comments provided by :
Bailey, Steve

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Howard_Susan_01_14_2015_18_32_56_CommentText.txt

=====

?I oppose the FEC's proposed rule, and am writing to demand that the FEC keep the Internet free. This Administration may not always like the content of what Americans say or write on the Internet. But the Administration and the FEC must uphold the First Amendment and respect our right to voice our opinions on the Internet, even when our message is inconvenient to the Administration.

Comments provided by :
Howard, Susan

=====

=====

I oppose this proposed rule and am writing to demand that the FEC keep the Internet free. As Americans, we enjoy the right to freedom of speech and the freedom to petition our government. In today's modern age, that includes the right to make political satire videos on YouTube, the right to assemble and form 501C groups, the right to criticize the Administration or Congress on twitter, and the right to make political commentary on Facebook. The first amendment applies to the digital arena, and the FCC needs to understand that basic point. Please contact me if you have any further questions.

Comments provided by :
Reinert, Robert

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_furst_joseph_01_14_2015_18_33_50_CommentText.txt

=====

Everyone knows that the larger the contribution the larger the favor in return. Not called a bribe anymore, but what ever one wishes to call it we lowly voters have the right to know who is bri..er..contributing what to whom.

Comments provided by :
furst, joseph

=====

=====

I am seriously concerned that "dark" political giving will have the eventual effect (and not that far into the future) of making the national-level U.S. election experience almost entirely under control of funders using hugely expensive, limited mass-communication outlets. If I and 1,000 friends agree on a candidate, we do not have the realistic option of collecting enough money to run timely, effective ads to get our point across to the x number of people who have seen the sophisticated, not-necessarily-true ads run by campaigns funded by dark money. And we shouldn't have to! Our role is to be thoughtful voters, explaining our votes mostly in our own communities, to people we know.

Even online, where some of us (that's the "citizen we") may have a wide reach of readers--how many are receiving adequate funds (from ANY source) to support us while we campaign (for what we believe in) full-time?

In addition, probably from the beginning of democracy, it's been understood that sources of voting support can and often do affect an elected person's votes. Only since Citizens United has it been possible to keep that information almost invisible.

PLEASE do whatever is necessary to recreate a transparent election-finance system. Our democracy is literally on the verge of being an oligarchy because of the power of a few peoples' money becoming greater than the power of millions of peoples' opinions.

Comments provided by :
Wells, Holly

=====

=====

The FEC should not limit nor rule on methods of public speech like social media. Speech available to all should not be limited or monitored - no matter the groups or organizations who use them. The solution to influential speech or speech with a bias is always more speech, not less. Our government is not wise enough, honest enough nor empowered to judge which speech in a public forum presents an undue influence on elections or political discourse. In short, the FEC needs to let we the people speak and discuss matters and stay out of attempts to inform, persuade and influence the voter. As this activity is at the core of democracy and a self governing populace. I reiterate, the solution to speech we disagree with is always more speech.

Comments provided by :
Cressall, William

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Sprague_Richard_01_14_2015_18_35_42_CommentText.txt

=====

freedom of speech cannot be curtailed.

Comments provided by :
Sprague, Richard

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Cuono_Ermelinda_01_14_2015_18_36_32_CommentText.txt

=====

In a democracy, it is unconscionable that secret donors support political parties and thus influence election outcomes. The US is becoming a nation where only the very wealthy can run for public office. This means that when elected, their decisions most often than not, are based on serving their own interests and those of their cronies.

As a tax paying citizen, I strongly urge and demand that the law be updated so that full disclosure is required of all donors who contribute to political parties.

Comments provided by :
Cuono, Ermelinda

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Gignac_David_01_14_2015_18_37_00_CommentText.txt

=====

Please don't ruin the internet

Comments provided by :
Gignac, David

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Blain_Susan_01_14_2015_18_36_12_CommentText.txt

=====

Please listen to the public and protect us, and democracy itself, from secret money sources in politics.

Comments provided by :
Blain, Susan

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Callahan_Cate_01_14_2015_18_36_56_CommentText.txt

=====

PLEASE, please help the citizens of the US keep Big Money out of our political process. We, the people, need government by the people and for the people....and Big Corporations are NOT people. Thank you.

Comments provided by :
Callahan, Cate

=====

=====

I oppose the proposed rule. This administration has a history of attempting to silence any voices which speak in opposition to its policies.

The First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States states:

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

This rule is attempt by the current regime, extra-congressionally, to abridge the freedom of speech and the freedom of the press. Bloggers, commentators and satirists and citizens who want to review their commentary assemble and communicate on the internet. This regime wants to limit and contral that assembly.

I demand that the internet remain free, and that any rule to limit or control in any way on-line conversations, comment, assembly or satire be struck down.

Comments provided by :
Beyer, Gregory

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

The Supreme Court's 2010 decision in Citizens United unleashed a flood of corrupting special interest money into our elections-- drowning out the voices of average voters. I recognize that the Commission cannot overturn this decision, even if it wanted to. What the Commission can do, though, is bring the Commission's disclosure requirements into closer alignment with the Supreme Court's own expectation of full disclosure expressed in Citizens United.

I respectfully urge the Commission to revise its disclosure rules to ensure the public receives full and complete information about the true donors funding political ads. This means that groups paying for these "independent expenditures" must disclose the real sources of the money they use to fund these campaign ads. As a federal court ruled recently, the Commission's electioneering communication disclosure rule is illegal because it creates an "easily exploited loophole that allows the true sponsors of advertisements to hide behind dubious and misleading names." The Commission must close the dark money loophole that it created-- and make good on the Citizens United Court's promise that the flood of special interest money it unleashed on our elections would be fully disclosed.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in this proceeding.

Comments provided by :
Gilbert, Camille

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Lum_Michael_01_14_2015_18_38_11_CommentText.txt

=====

Please let there be free speech on the internet.

Comments provided by :
Lum, Michael

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Gramcko_Sara_01_14_2015_18_38_23_CommentText.txt

=====

Disclosure of exactly who is funding political advertising is crucial to Americans being able to judge the veracity of such advertising and make informed political choices. It is imperative that every political ad has full disclosure attached to it.

Comments provided by :
Gramcko, Sara

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Novkov_Russell_01_14_2015_18_39_08_CommentText.txt

=====

Please let our voices be heard and keep the Internet open!

Comments provided by :
Novkov, Russell

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Willis_Elaine_01_14_2015_18_38_54_CommentText.txt

=====

I very strongly oppose this proposed rule, this is a clear cut violation of the first admendment and the people's right to free speech. The Internet is the one medium that is truly free, and government intervention would damage that. This would be a major government over-reach and a clear violation of the sacred trust of the people.

Comments provided by :
Willis, Elaine

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Dunn_Julie_01_14_2015_18_39_32_CommentText.txt

=====

I BELIEVE IN FULL DISCLOSURE OF ANY AND ALL MONIES ASSOCIATED WITH POLITICS!!!
THAT MEANS ALL MONIES!!! IF IT'S FOR POLITICAL ADS, FOR POLITICIANS, TO SUPPORT
LEGISLATION, ETC. I WANT ANY AND ALL MONEY SPENT IN CONNECTION WITH POLITICS, THE
GOVERNMENT, ELECTIONS, ALL OF IT, TO BE FULLY DISCLOSED AS TO WHERE IT CAME FROM
AND WHO FUNDED IT!!!

Comments provided by :
Dunn, Julie

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Loeffler_Arlene_01_14_2015_18_39_29_CommentText.txt

=====

In my many years of voting I always felt that voting was a free choice in our country!!! I can not even begin to tell you how many polititons have requested \$\$\$ from me! I believe this is an abomination. Is this not a free country.? the Supreme Court should be impeached!!!
(The ones who voted to say this LEGAL.)It is NOT!!!
Arlene S.Loeffler CRNA, PhD

Comments provided by :
Loeffler, Arlene

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Barys_Sarah__01_14_2015_18_39_30_CommentText.txt

=====

With Citizens United there is too much secrecy in who contributes monetary donations for this organization's political agendas. I believe the FEC needs to make the rules stricter so that Citizen United's donors are listed along with their contributions so there is transparency for public viewing.

Comments provided by :
Barys, Sarah

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Tirado_Christina_01_14_2015_18_40_47_CommentText.txt

=====

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 :
Tirado, Christina

=====

=====

Greetings,

I want to express my feeling regarding the limited access to who and what are donating large sums of funds to influence what is broadcasted and printed about elections. I strongly believe transparency is needed to allow those who see and or hear material for and against a thing or person coming up for vote, to be able to base their vote upon the clear understanding of who is pushing one opinion or another.

I want to see this no matter what political party or faction feels a need to sway the public to vote the way they want them to. Please let everyone know where the funds originate so they can make a more educated decision on the many things that come up for the vote.

Thank you,

George Jackson

Comments provided by :
Jackson, George

=====

=====

We have had so many attacks on our freedoms that are destroying our country. Government and individuals who desire to control and override the freedoms of the people and those who have an alternative view point should never be allowed to be silenced. Freedom of speech and Christian and Constitutional Support, must prevail or this country, like Germany, under Hitlers control will fall. When America destroys the laws that protect its citizens, and I would have more benefits, rights of freedom and no accountability for following the laws of this country, which grow as a noose around the necks of its people under the guise of Obamacare, let's vote....how many Americas still want to be citizens in a nation where our backs carry the world, and our government feels they have the right to tell us what we have to buy and tax us if we do not. This bill did not come from or pass in the House..which makes it illegal. What do we tell our children...we have a dictator ship and not constitutional laws...that the Senate an President can tell us what we can say, what we can do, what we have to buy an pay for. When did our country become communist...with PCPolice, KGB in Germany. Please, if you love this country, stop the insanity of mind control by government agencies and special interest groups. Get back to the beliefs of the American Citizens of this nation and protect there God given rights in the Constitution and Bill of Rights.

Comments provided by :
Rivera, Marsha

=====

=====

Since the Citizens United decision, our democracy has been placed at risk by an unprecedented flood of secret money into campaigns.

The Federal Election Commission now has a golden opportunity to begin turning the tide by enacting strong disclosure requirements.

All contributions, both those made directly to electoral campaigns and those made in order to influence the outcome of elections, must be disclosed.

Full disclosure must apply to all donors, rich and poor, corporations and unions, individuals and organizations.

Disclosure must include, at a minimum, the name, mailing address and occupation of the donor.

It must apply to campaigns at all levels of government: federal, state and local. It must apply to all elected offices, whether executive, legislative or judicial.

In the case of a donation from a corporation, the name, mailing address and occupation of the Chief Executive Officer and of members of the Board of Directors of the corporation must be disclosed.

This is a minimal first step in restoring our damaged democracy, and also in reasserting the authority of the FEC.

Comments provided by :
Ferrell, Jack

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Boyer_Loneta__01_14_2015_18_41_40_CommentText.txt

=====

Please keep our internet free. Let us retain our freedom of speech, and the right to express ourselves fairly without censorship.

Thank you, Loneta Boyer

Comments provided by :
Boyer, Loneta

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Hutchings_Lee_01_14_2015_18_42_58_CommentText.txt

=====

People, not corporations are real, and no amount of money can hold a conversion, so how can money be speech? The people know this, only politicians and their pay masters refuse to recognize reality. Time to end this insanity - NOW.

Comments provided by :
Hutchings, Lee

=====

=====

Please vote against any funding for amnesty.

Also we are being smothered by muslims..I want the borders closed. I want the muslims gone. China won't let in one muslim, and I have been told that they are not even swearing fealty to America,taxpayers paying for everything, we have put the foxes in the hen house..I don't want them here, or anyone that swears to kill us for our beliefs..America is now too open. As long as everyone could come and believe their own beliefs it was fine, but not with the muslims, or any more illegals. The rules should change, tougher standards. In Mexico you cannot own land, unless you are native born..America is owned more by other countries than Americans..Things need to change before we are overtaken and make to move to their will.

Please vote again funding and work to stop the muslims from being here. I would prefer that they were told to leave. Go home, or swear to mix, mingle and forget allah, who calls for my death..

Comments provided by :
WINTTERS, ANNETTE

=====

=====

We have a right to know to whom elected officials are beholden, but our current system allows many political spenders to hide their true identities. That's simply unacceptable in a democracy. Please enact new rules to bring dark money political spenders out into the open and disclose the true identities of those who bankroll political ads.

In Citizens United, the Supreme Court assumed we would know who is trying to influence our decisions on Election Day ? and who is buying attention from our elected officials. But since that decision five years ago, hundreds of millions of dollars from secret sources have been spent in ways that will lead to corruption.

Please update and strengthen the FEC's disclosure rules to protect our democracy.

Comments provided by :
Pagenkopf, Kris

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Palermo_Mark_01_14_2015_18_43_59_CommentText.txt

=====

There is a federal interest in cultivating, not preempting, individual human minds, and the countless hundreds of millions around the world that share our interests and values in a broader sense.

The danger to national interest is one side or group buying up the airwaves, and public perception. For many shared problems, distributed collective 'swarm' intelligence is more effective than secrecy, command and control, which can disaffect and depress the people they're there to serve. The People don't care for, or benefit from, the 'mushroom treatment'.

As a citizen, I would be grateful to speak on this at the Commission's February 11, 2015 hearing.

Mark Palermo

<http://www.linkedin.com/in/markpalermo>

Comments provided by :
Palermo, Mark

=====

Attachment:

REG_2014_01_Graham,_Esq_(retired)_Katherine_01_14_2015_18_43_50_CommentText.txt

=====

Although corporation(s) constitute "a person" under current applicable laws, the latter does not, in my opinion, absolve such entities from "abuse" for which individual Americans could be held accountable under civil and/or criminal law.

Yours most respectfully,
Katherine Graham, Esq (retired)

Comments provided by :
Graham, Esq (retired), Katherine

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

The Supreme Court's 2010 decision in Citizens United unleashed a flood of corrupting special interest money into our elections-- drowning out the voices of average voters. I recognize that the Commission cannot overturn this decision, even if it wanted to. What the Commission can do, though, is bring the Commission's disclosure requirements into closer alignment with the Supreme Court's own expectation of full disclosure expressed in Citizens United.

I respectfully urge the Commission to revise its disclosure rules to ensure the public receives full and complete information about the true donors funding political ads. This means that groups paying for these "independent expenditures" must disclose the real sources of the money they use to fund these campaign ads. As a federal court ruled recently, the Commission's electioneering communication disclosure rule is illegal because it creates an "easily exploited loophole that allows the true sponsors of advertisements to hide behind dubious and misleading names." The Commission must close the dark money loophole that it created-- and make good on the Citizens United Court's promise that the flood of special interest money it unleashed on our elections would be fully disclosed.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in this proceeding.

Comments provided by :
Meissner, Steven

=====

=====

Giving the Supreme Court the benefit of the doubt, I believe they thought that Citizen's United should be paired with full disclosure of the source of the new massive influx of money into the political system. We are a democracy, and hiding the political identities of so many big players is unethical. Please enact new legislation to open up this funding process, and bring some hope back to so many of us that think we have lost the power of our vote.

Thank you,
Candace O'Brien

Comments provided by :
O'Brien, Candace

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_tumbleson_jared_01_14_2015_18_46_19_CommentText.txt

=====

we need less govt intrusion in our lives , we were once the home of the free but no longer is that the truth
! we are far down the list of countries that offer the most freedom and liberty , please do people not
remember "give me liberty or give me death" what has happened to our once great god fearing freedom
loving nation ? god help america

Comments provided by :
tumbleson, jared

=====

=====

We have a right to know to whom elected officials are beholden, but our current system allows many political spenders to hide their true identities. That's simply unacceptable in a democracy. Please enact new rules to bring dark money political spenders out into the open and disclose the true identities of those who bankroll political ads.

In Citizens United, the Supreme Court assumed we would know who is trying to influence our decisions on Election Day ? and who is buying attention from our elected officials. But since that decision five years ago, hundreds of millions of dollars from secret sources have been spent in ways that will lead to corruption.

Please update and strengthen the FEC's disclosure rules to protect our democracy.

Comments provided by :
Goode, Dalton

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Drawbaugh_Diane_01_14_2015_18_46_39_CommentText.txt

=====

The hearing about Americans use of Freedom of Speach is our God Given and will always be the Americans voice. There will always be a two party political systems which makes this uniquely our out spoken citizens. I would not want a country without this and it will always be that way. Thank you

Comments provided by :
Drawbaugh, Diane

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Cupp_Joseph_01_14_2015_18_46_42_CommentText.txt

=====

The internet is simply another venue for US citizens to voice their opinions and as such is protected under the 1st Amendment to the Constitution. Under no circumstances should there be any restriction on what may be said on any website or blog. As a military veteran, and as a citizen, I have to wonder what my government is up to when they wish to silence my voice when it disagrees with the agenda of a political party. Thank you.

Joseph W Cupp

Comments provided by :
Cupp, Joseph

=====

=====

The democracy our forefathers fought and died for is not a system in which money from secret donors floods our airwaves with anonymous political ads.

Citizens / taxpayers have the right to know to whom elected officials are indebted, but our current system allows many political spenders to hide their true identities. That's simply unacceptable. Please enact new rules to bring dark money political spenders out into the open and disclose the true identities of those who bankroll political ads.

In Citizens United, the Supreme Court assumed we would know who is trying to influence our decisions on Election Day ? and who is buying attention from our elected officials. But since that decision five years ago, hundreds of millions of dollars from secret sources have been spent in ways that will lead to corruption.

Please update and strengthen the FEC's disclosure rules to protect our democracy.

Comments provided by :
Mendelsohn, Paul

=====

=====

We have a right to know to whom elected officials are beholden, but our current system allows many political spenders to hide their true identities. That's simply unacceptable in a democracy. Please enact new rules to bring dark money political spenders out into the open and disclose the true identities of those who bankroll political ads.

In Citizens United, the Supreme Court assumed we would know who is trying to influence our decisions on Election Day ? and who is buying attention from our elected officials. But since that decision five years ago, hundreds of millions of dollars from secret sources have been spent in ways that will lead to corruption.

Please update and strengthen the FEC's disclosure rules to protect our democracy.

Comments provided by :
Henke, Jill

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Schoelier_Fred_01_14_2015_18_48_37_CommentText.txt

=====

Our lives are currently regulated to the extreme. No need to take the internet there too!

Comments provided by :
Schoelier, Fred

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Kyler_Scott_01_14_2015_18_48_33_CommentText.txt

=====

I strongly oppose this proposed rule and stand for freedom of speech on the Internet. Do not continue to chip away at our First Amendment protected rights. The FEC needs to show that they are a truly AMERICAN body, NOT a traitorous one, by rejecting this proposed rule.

Comments provided by :

Kyler, Scott

=====

=====

Corporations and wealthy special interests hide behind front groups to keep us from knowing who's trying to influence our votes, and to make sure we won't know whom our elected officials will owe favors to after they take office. It's dishonest, and it's bad for our democracy.

In the five years since Citizens United, Senate Republicans have repeatedly filibustered the DISCLOSE Act which would shine a light on secret spending. The FEC has the right and the responsibility to do what it can ? and if we all speak out, it'll know that the pressure is on.

If dark money groups try to challenge new disclosure rules in court, the FEC will have my comments to show the court why transparency in political spending is important to you and how critical it is to a democracy of, by, and for the people.

Davida Rabbino

Comments provided by :
Rabbino, davida

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Pullara_Christine_01_14_2015_18_48_52_CommentText.txt

=====

As a US citizen I am very concerned about the current rules allowing wealthy companies and special interest groups to spend unlimited amounts of money to support their candidates without disclosure. We need more transparency and limits on political contributions.

I do think Louis Brandeis said it best:

?We can either have democracy in this country or we can have great wealth concentrated in the hands of a few, but we can?t have both.? ?Louis Brandeis U.S. Supreme Court Justice (1856-1941)

Thanks,
Chris P.

Comments provided by :
Pullara, Christine

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Cunningham_David_01_14_2015_18_49_04_CommentText.txt

=====

I oppose this proposed rule, and am writing to demand that the FEC keep the Internet free.

This latest attempt to stifle free speech and restrict our First Amendment rights fits into a

long and repeated pattern of abuse from this Administration

Comments provided by :

Cunningham, David

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Reese_Jeff_01_14_2015_18_48_53_CommentText.txt

=====

Please consider the citizens right to know who is influencing an election by contributions.

Comments provided by :
Reese, Jeff

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Barth_Andrea_01_14_2015_18_49_00_CommentText.txt

=====

I oppose the FEC's proposed rule, and am writing to demand that the FEC keep the Internet free.

This Administration may not always like the content of what Americans say or write on the Internet. However the Administration and the FEC must uphold the First Amendment and respect our right to voice our opinions on the Internet, even when our message is inconvenient for the Administration.

Outlets like YouTube and the broader Internet should REMAIN free from federal government control!
KEEP FREE SPEECH ON THE INTERNET FREE!

Comments provided by :
Barth, Andrea

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_friedrich_Linda_01_14_2015_18_49_30_CommentText.txt

=====

I oppose the proposed Rule changes to the internet! I am writing to demand to keep the internet free.
As americans we enjoy our rights to free speech and freedom to petition our government,

Comments provided by :
friedrich, Linda

=====

=====

For the health of our democracy, require that political spending and contributions be transparent and open. If people and groups are pouring large sums of money to support candidates or influence issues, their identity and amount contributed should be disclosed and available. Knowing that an ad is supported by an idyllic sounding name does not disclose the individuals, corporations or industry or other associations that are really supporting it. Require that the source of contributions be open and available.

Citizens United which allows large sums of money that are far beyond what most ordinary citizens can give is a threat to our democracy, including hiding where these funds are from.

Comments provided by :
McGlone, K

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Walker_Willie_01_14_2015_18_50_26_CommentText.txt

=====

Save free speech from goverment outreach, these people want to make sure we are under their thumbnail

Comments provided by :
Walker, Willie

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Green_Matthew_01_14_2015_18_50_19_CommentText.txt

=====

I think best would be to take money out of our elections completely. All of our elections. While finances and economic rewards and opportunities continue to influence our elections, I think it is very important to have full transparency. Citizens have a right to know what is influencing the outcomes of our elections. Thank you.

Comments provided by :
Green, Matthew

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Barr_Gordon_01_14_2015_18_51_03_CommentText.txt

=====

I vociferously oppose the FEC's intention of limiting free speech on the Internet.

Comments provided by :
Barr, Gordon

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Lampkin_Donna_01_14_2015_18_51_38_CommentText.txt

=====

I can't believe this is even being considered. Restricting rights? After you become our censors, which of our rights do you plan on taking next? There is always a "next" once the door is opened. The League Of Women Voters does not speak for all women! Our rights should not so easily be destroyed. Realize where this can lead.

Comments provided by :
Lampkin, Donna

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Dorr_Steve_01_14_2015_18_51_30_CommentText.txt

=====

No entity should be allowed to make such large contributions!

Comments provided by :
Dorr, Steve

=====

=====

Americans need to know where our politicians' allegiance might be, especially since so many Republicans in particular seem clearly aligned with big business, banks and the wealthy. The current system allows many campaigners to put up a smokescreen to hide their donors' true identities. This does not belong in a democracy, because who is supporting a candidate unfortunately can at times tell a potential voter more about the candidate even than what the candidate says!

Please offset the damage caused by recent Supreme Court rulings on Citizens' United and McCutcheon by making specific rules to bring dark money political donors out into the open and also reveal the true identities of those who bankroll political ads.

In Citizens United, the Supreme Court assumed we the voters would know who is trying to influence our decisions on Election Day versus who is buying attention from our elected officials. How they came to this conclusion I'll never know. But since that decision, hundreds of millions of dollars from secret sources have been spent in ways that will (notice I said "will", not "might" because, this is inevitable I fear) lead to corruption.

I implore you to please update and strengthen the FEC's disclosure rules to protect our democracy and give us the information to make an informed decision at the voting booth.

Thank you very much for your attention to this matter.

Comments provided by :
Tescher, Patricia

=====

=====

We have a right to know to whom elected officials are beholden, but our current system allows many political spenders to hide their true identities. That's simply unacceptable in a democracy. Please enact new rules to bring dark money political spenders out into the open and disclose the true identities of those who bankroll political ads.

In Citizens United, the Supreme Court assumed we would know who is trying to influence our decisions on Election Day ? and who is buying attention from our elected officials. But since that decision five years ago, hundreds of millions of dollars from secret sources have been spent in ways that will lead to corruption.

Please update and strengthen the FEC's disclosure rules to protect our democracy.

Comments provided by :
Whitehouse, Katy

=====

=====

Concerning the FEC's proposed rule changes for the Internet,I am opposed to same.

I am writing to demand that the FEC keep the Internet free.
In this country,we enjoy the right to freedom of speech and the freedom to petition our government. In today's modern age, that includes the right to make political satire videos on YouTube, the right to assemble and form 501c groups, the right to criticize the Administration on Twitter, and the right to makepolitical commentary on Facebook.
The First Amendment applies to the digital arena, and the FEC needs to understand that basic point

Comments provided by :
Wroblewski, Daniel

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

The Supreme Court's 2010 decision in Citizens United unleashed a flood of corrupting special interest money into our elections-- drowning out the voices of average voters. I recognize that the Commission cannot overturn this decision, even if it wanted to. What the Commission can do, though, is bring the Commission's disclosure requirements into closer alignment with the Supreme Court's own expectation of full disclosure expressed in Citizens United.

I respectfully urge the Commission to revise its disclosure rules to ensure the public receives full and complete information about the true donors funding political ads. This means that groups paying for these "independent expenditures" must disclose the real sources of the money they use to fund these campaign ads. As a federal court ruled recently, the Commission's electioneering communication disclosure rule is illegal because it creates an "easily exploited loophole that allows the true sponsors of advertisements to hide behind dubious and misleading names." The Commission must close the dark money loophole that it created-- and make good on the Citizens United Court's promise that the flood of special interest money it unleashed on our elections would be fully disclosed.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in this proceeding.

Comments provided by :
Smith, P.

=====

=====

"The freedom of the press is one of the greatest bulwarks of liberty, and can never be restrained but by despotic Governments." As true today as it was in 1776. Imposing any legislation upon the rights of Americans to express themselves is un-American.

Freedom of speech is a God-given right. The freedom to express thoughts, to report activities, to solicit support and convey opinions shall not be infringed upon. It seems clear enough. This Congress does not have permission to change this. There is no need to change, monitor or control this method of communication.

Recent events in Paris underscore the need for society to guard the freedom of expression. Those who would kill human beings because of the way they expressed themselves are monsters, of that there is no doubt. Take notice of the global support that was shown toward the right to express oneself freely. People of all nations walked hand-in-hand in support of this liberty. Communist nations and democratic nations banded together to support freedom of expression. Amazing resolve in the face of oppression. America, in the form of it's Constitution and the Bill of Rights, gave the world an example of what governments should do and what they should never do. Let us never consider the prospect that we should ever be the first to try to legislate freedom of expression or freedom of speech out of the world.

During recent uprisings in despotic governments, the government disrupted citizens' attempt to communicate to the world the conditions inside those countries. They cut off the Internet so that citizens could not communicate. Will we be equal to Iran, to China or North Korea?

Do not fall for the absurd suggestion that you can ever legislate more freedoms for America. That has already been accomplished long before you and I were ever born. Any attempt to subvert freedom of speech, under the guise of being good for America, is a farce. I might suggest it to be putting a pretty coat of paint on a pile of manure, it is still manure.

Strongly Opposed,
Pete Gordon

Comments provided by :
Gordon, Peter

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Lance_Ray_01_14_2015_18_51_52_CommentText.txt

=====

We have a right to know to whom elected officials are beholden, but our current system allows many political spenders to hide their true identities. That's simply unacceptable in a democracy. Please enact new rules to bring dark money political spenders out into the open and disclose the true identities of those who bankroll political ads.

In Citizens United, the Supreme Court assumed we would know who is trying to influence our decisions on Election Day ? and who is buying attention from our elected officials. But since that decision five years ago, hundreds of millions of dollars from secret sources have been spent in ways that will lead to corruption.

Please update and strengthen the FEC's disclosure rules to protect our democracy.

Comments provided by :
Lance, Ray

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_ryan_colin_01_14_2015_18_53_00_CommentText.txt

=====

The Citizens United decision goes completely against the spirit of our election process. The "great experiment" is failing and the annals of history will have your names in it as the reason for this. Every vote should have equal weight. It is obvious that this is not the case anymore. You can dress it up with all the legal jargon you want but America is no longer a democracy and Citizens United is why.

Comments provided by :
ryan, colin

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Haley_Karen_01_14_2015_18_54_19_CommentText.txt

=====

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 :
Haley, Karen

=====

=====

We have a right to know to whom elected officials are beholden, but our current system allows many political spenders to hide their true identities. That?s simply unacceptable in a democracy. Please enact new rules to bring dark money political spenders out into the open and disclose the true identities of those who bankroll political ads.

In Citizens United, the Supreme Court assumed we would know who is trying to influence our decisions on Election Day ? and who is buying attention from our elected officials. But since that decision five years ago, hundreds of millions of dollars from secret sources have been spent in ways that will lead to corruption.

Please update and strengthen the FEC?s disclosure rules to protect our democracy. The duplicity that Citizen's United and similar law changes permit are devastating our nation, creating unjust, unethical power imbalances. It is your responsibility to halt this devastation and reverse it.

Comments provided by :
Staton, Janiece

=====

=====

We have a right to know to whom elected officials are beholden, but our current system allows many political spenders to hide their true identities. That's simply unacceptable in a democracy. Please enact new rules to bring dark money political spenders out into the open and disclose the true identities of those who bankroll political ads.

In Citizens United, the Supreme Court assumed we would know who is trying to influence our decisions on Election Day ? and who is buying attention from our elected officials. But since that decision five years ago, hundreds of millions of dollars from secret sources have been spent in ways that will lead to corruption.

Please update and strengthen the FEC's disclosure rules to protect our democracy.

It is truly difficult to believe that we have a representative government any more. I don't feel represented coming from a state where the elected officials both in federal, state and local government speak words and express opinions that are not mine in any way. There is not attempt to represent all the people - or at least recognize that all of their constituents do not believe the same way. It would be gratifying for a federal agency to listen to the voices of people.

Thank you.

Comments provided by :
Osters, Sandra

=====

=====

there should be no one trying to stop any kind of speech at all wether it be political or otherwise. we are given this right by God and The Constitution Of The United States. that to me means no one in the government elected or some hired bureaucrat in government has no right to stop our right to freedom of speech. if they do this they should be tried for treason! i am really tired of these people that are being elected and not up holding the constitution like they swore they would when they took their oath of office. they needto be held responsible and they shouldn't be getting the pay and benifits that they are getting because they really do not desrve it!

Comments provided by :
bidgood, john

=====

=====

I
oppose
this
proposed
rule,
and
am
writing
to
demand
that
the
FEC
keep
the
Internet
free.
As
Americans,
we
enjoy
the
right
to
freedom
of
speech
and
the
freedom
to
petition
our
government.
In
today's
modern
age,
that
includes
the
right
to
make
political
satire
videos
on
YouTube,

the
right
to
assemble
and
form
501c
groups,
the
right
to
criticize
the
Administration
on
Twitter,
and
the
right
to
make
political
commentary
on
Facebook.
The
First
Amendment
applies
to
the
digital
arena,
and
the
FEC
needs
to
understand
that
basic
point.
? I
oppose
this
proposed
rule,
and
am
writing
to
demand
that
the

FEC
keep
the
Internet
free.
President
Truman
once
said
in
a
speech
to
Congress,
"Once
a
government
is
committed
to
the
principle
of
silencing
the
voice
of
opposition,
it
has
only
one
way
to
go,
and
that
is
down
the
path
of
increasingly
repressive
measures,
until
it
becomes
a
source
of
terror
to
all

its
citizens
and
creates
a
country
where
everyone
lives
in
fear."
I
hope
the
FEC
will
heed
this
advice
and
NOT
regulate
the
Internet.

Comments provided by :
Capozella, Tom

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Emrick_Roy_01_14_2015_18_55_46_CommentText.txt

=====

I am distressed by the hundreds of millions of dollars in "dark money" going into political campaign ads. We citizens need to know to whom politicians are indebted. I feel that the Citizens United decision is a warped interpretation of the free speech clause. In any event, transparency is imperative in good government. Please improve and strengthen the FEC's disclosure rules to protect our democracy.

Comments provided by :
Emrick, Roy

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Johnson_Joan_01_14_2015_18_57_13_CommentText.txt

=====

I am deeply concerned with the huge amounts of money that are now part of our election process. The fact that these donors -- large corporations, unions, the very wealthy... can and do influence elections without being identified is most destructive to the democratic process.

Please open up the process! Require that all donors be identified. Renew our commitment to a government of the people -- not a government controlled by powerful groups and the elite!

Sincerely,

Joan Johnson

Comments provided by :
Johnson, Joan

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Cotton_Brad_01_14_2015_18_57_14_CommentText.txt

=====

Unlimited cash, especially secret cash, in elections destorys deomocracy.

Comments provided by :
Cotton, Brad

=====

=====

First, I think it ironical that your policy mandates I provide extensive personal information about myself and no effort is made to protect my privacy on your website. That demonstrates the hypocrisy of our government and officials in so many ways. Case in point, the allowing of contributors to secretly finance political candidates, violating transparency in public elections, and destroying a major premise upon which true democracy is based. This destruction of transparency in democracy is compounded because large contributions by a few people again skews the American democratic purpose of one vote per person. Only extremely strong willed elected officials will be capable of not giving more attention and very probably favorable consideration to the issues of major contributors. This contributes to many additional inequities in our government and systems. Your agency can and should insure campaign and other politically funding is transparent and traceable. Otherwise you are contributing to the demise of American democracy.

Comments provided by :
Shah, Nancy

=====

=====

FEC's Proposed Rule Changes for the Internet

I oppose this proposed rule, and am writing to demand that the FEC keep the Internet free. This is an attempt to stifle free speech and restrict our First Amendment rights.

There is bipartisan opposition to the FEC's proposed regulations to clamp down on the Internet. Americans of all political points of view understand what's at stake here? our treasured First Amendment rights!

Most people will not like the content of what some Americans say or write on the Internet. However the Executive Branch and the FEC must uphold the First Amendment and respect our right to voice our opinions on the Internet, even when the message is inconvenient or unpopular.

As Americans, we enjoy the right to freedom of speech and the freedom to petition our government. In today's modern age, the First Amendment applies to the digital arena, and the FEC needs to understand that basic point.

President Truman once said in a speech to Congress, "Once a government is committed to the principle of silencing the voice of opposition, it has only one way to go, and that is down the path of increasingly repressive measures, until it becomes a source of terror to all its citizens and creates a country where everyone lives in fear."

I hope the FEC will heed this advice and NOT regulate the Internet.

Lowell Harrison
Chesterfield County, VA

Comments provided by :
Harrison, Lowell

=====

=====

Please enact rules so that we know who is paying for political ads. We have a right to know to whom elected officials are beholden, but our current system allows many political spenders to hide their true identities. That's simply unacceptable in a democracy. Please enact new rules to bring dark money political spenders out into the open and disclose the true identities of those who bankroll political ads.

In Citizens United, the Supreme Court assumed we would know who is trying to influence our decisions on Election Day ? and who is buying attention from our elected officials. But since that decision five years ago, hundreds of millions of dollars from secret sources have been spent in ways that will lead to corruption.

Please update and strengthen the FEC's disclosure rules to protect our democracy.

Comments provided by :
Good, Louise

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Welch_Roger_01_14_2015_18_58_49_CommentText.txt

=====

Please make sure that the FCC is not allowed to interfere with our Freedom of Speech. We do not need the government sensoring our right to freedom of speech. Thanks

Comments provided by :
Welch, Roger

=====

=====

Regarding proposed REG 2014-01

Our current system allows many political spenders: corporations, wealthy special interests, even people from other countries, to hide their true identities behind front groups to keep us from knowing who is trying to influence our votes, and to make sure that we do not know to whom our elected officials will owe favors after they take office. That is unacceptable in a democracy.

In Citizens United, the Supreme Court assumed we would know who is trying to influence our decisions on Election Day ? and who is buying attention from our elected officials. But since that decision five years ago, hundreds of millions of dollars from secret sources have been spent in ways that are leading our political system into corruption.

The FEC has the right and the responsibility to enact new rules to bring dark money political spenders out into the open and disclose the true identities of those who bankroll political ads. Transparency in political spending is important to the majority of us voters - and it is critical to a democracy of, by, and for the people.

Sincerely,
Ann L. Grewe

Comments provided by :
Grewe, Ann

=====

=====

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. Democrat FEC Vice Chair Ann Ravel apparently finds this unacceptable, and speaks unfavorably of ?this effort to protect individual bloggers and online commentators.[1]?

I think outlets like YouTube and the broader Internet should be free from federal government control, when government takes over everything goes to pot. The internet should be free for all to support any belief that they have including political. The democrats just want to shut up people who do not agree with them.

Comments provided by :
Kowlsen, Dean

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Jarman_Lowell_01_14_2015_19_01_25_CommentText.txt

=====

All donations to any campaign or election should be a matter of public record. There should be no opportunity to anonymously buy an election -- whether it be for a person; a proposition; federal; state; or local.

Comments provided by :
Jarman, Lowell

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Remington_Thom_01_14_2015_19_01_33_CommentText.txt

=====

At this time, our elections are being skewed by a number of factors. The FEC could eliminate some or all of them and,, by those actions, ensure that elections result in fair representation of the will of the people.

Specifically:

"Dark money," anonymous donations, must be eliminated.

Unlimited donations from individuals must be eliminated.

Donations from corporations and unions must be eliminated.

Gerrymandered districts need to be banned and undone.

You, the FEC, have both the power and the responsibility to help make elections more fair. Please do so.
The fate of the nation is at stake.

Comments provided by :
Remington, Thom

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_hays_lisa_01_14_2015_19_02_22_CommentText.txt

=====

Transparency should be a minimum requirement for political contributions. Secret contributions only exacerbate the "pay to play" and "money talks" political game. Secrecy, bribery and laundering have been inherent components of the political system for centuries and the time is right for a new beginning in which people have a voice.

Comments provided by :
hays, lisa

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Paskali_Tony_01_14_2015_19_02_37_CommentText.txt

=====

Free speech is one of the founding cornerstones of our country and the internet needs to remain unfettered by federal over regulation. If I find something offensive on tv, radio, a public place, internet, etc. I do not run looking for some government agency to over see the problem. I take action by ignoring the item and together with other like minded people let the free market place put the offensive material out of business.

Some where at some time some one is going to get offended by some thing and that is what can happen in a free society.

Comments provided by :
Paskali, Tony

=====

=====

I oppose this proposed rule, and am writing to demand that the FEC keep the Internet free. As Americans, we enjoy the right to freedom of speech and the freedom to petition our government. In today's modern age, that includes the right to make political satire videos on YouTube, the right to assemble and form 501c groups, the right to criticize the Administration on Twitter, and the right to make political commentary on Facebook. The First Amendment applies to the digital arena, and the FEC needs to understand that basic point. President Truman once said in a speech to Congress, "Once a government is committed to the principle of silencing the voice of opposition, it has only one way to go, and that is down the path of increasingly repressive measures, until it becomes a source of terror to all its citizens and creates a country where everyone lives in fear." I hope the FEC will heed this advice and NOT regulate the Internet. This is what makes America stand out from every other country on the planet, is freedom to speak our minds and not be persecuted for our speech

Comments provided by :
Cunningham, David

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Alwine_Douglas_01_14_2015_19_04_03_CommentText.txt

=====

I am writing to demand that the Internet remain free. This administration is always looking for ways to stifle free speech and to take away our constitutional rights. This must now be allowed to happen again!

Comments provided by :

Alwine, Douglas

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Flanegin_Gail_01_14_2015_19_04_22_CommentText.txt

=====

We need to restore democracy in America and each vote matters ... one person one vote.

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.

Thank you,

Comments provided by :
Flanegin, Gail

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Vicory_Roy_01_14_2015_19_03_59_CommentText.txt

=====

The internet provides many avenues for investigation, learning, communication, and everyones opinions on any number of topics in our homes and businesses. The internet must be protected from those who would impose their ways on others to prevent each and every one to have equal opportunity to use the unlimited resources provided by it to all.

Comments provided by :

Vicory, Roy

=====

=====

We have a right to know to whom elected officials are beholden, but our current system allows many political spenders to hide their true identities. That's simply unacceptable in a democracy. Please enact new rules to bring dark money political spenders out into the open and disclose the true identities of those who bankroll political ads.

In Citizens United, the Supreme Court assumed we would know who is trying to influence our decisions on Election Day ? and who is buying attention from our elected officials. But since that decision five years ago, hundreds of millions of dollars from secret sources have been spent in ways that will lead to corruption.

Please update and strengthen the FEC's disclosure rules to protect our democracy.

Comments provided by :
Hiltabrand, Linda

=====

=====

We have a right to know to whom elected officials are beholden, but our current system allows many political spenders to hide their true identities. That's simply unacceptable in a democracy. Please enact new rules to bring dark money political spenders out into the open and disclose the true identities of those who bankroll political ads.

In Citizens United, the Supreme Court assumed we would know who is trying to influence our decisions on Election Day ? and who is buying attention from our elected officials. But since that decision five years ago, hundreds of millions of dollars from secret sources have been spent in ways that will lead to corruption.

Please update and strengthen the FEC's disclosure rules to protect our democracy.

Comments provided by :
Baker-Brown, Jake

=====

=====

When citizens for united was passed by the supreme court it was assumed that the public would know which organizations were bankrolling a candidate, project or major investment. It did not turn out that way at all. Groups are able to hide who they are and what they stand for and the general public does not know who these people are and what groups are they really representing. This is not in practice democracy at all but a sneaky way to push ones agenda behind the scenes. If these groups have nothing to hide then why cloak who they really are? Americans have a right to know who is buying what influence.

Comments provided by :
elkins, sara

=====

=====

Speech on the internet should be free with no government entity deciding what can or can't be said. I personally disagree with a lot of things I see on the internet, but to impose my standards on them would be censorship. The internet is already policed by self censorship. I do it every day. I simply don't visit web sites or blogs with subject matter I don't like. This is the best system people can say whatever they want but no has to listen unless they want to. It's 100% constitutional because it allows free speech but does not force any one to listen. Censorship does just the opposite it prevents free speech and only leaves open to some people views with which they disagree. Most of the people proposing and supporting this censorship are liberals. They are simply trying to shut down those who hold a different political view. They advocate free speech in all areas unless it disagrees with their viewpoint. Political and religious censorship are always the first steps to dictatorship. I urge you not to enact any censorship rules on internet content.

Comments provided by :
Mann, Ian

=====

=====

this move is just another example of the socialist / communist democratic party trying to block any and all objections to their socialist / communist agenda . by keeping the citizens uninformed they can and will pass any junk bill they want in the future . this move violates our first amendment rights of free speech , which the democrats have been trying to ban . they need to be stopped either by ruling against this move or in the courts . I would hope you take the easy way out by standing against this move and avoid the courts .

Comments provided by :
Womack, Wayne

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

The Supreme Court's 2010 decision in Citizens United unleashed a flood of corrupting special interest money into our elections-- drowning out the voices of average voters. I recognize that the Commission cannot overturn this decision, even if it wanted to. What the Commission can do, though, is bring the Commission's disclosure requirements into closer alignment with the Supreme Court's own expectation of full disclosure expressed in Citizens United.

I respectfully urge the Commission to revise its disclosure rules to ensure the public receives full and complete information about the true donors funding political ads. This means that groups paying for these "independent expenditures" must disclose the real sources of the money they use to fund these campaign ads. As a federal court ruled recently, the Commission's electioneering communication disclosure rule is illegal because it creates an "easily exploited loophole that allows the true sponsors of advertisements to hide behind dubious and misleading names." The Commission must close the dark money loophole that it created-- and make good on the Citizens United Court's promise that the flood of special interest money it unleashed on our elections would be fully disclosed.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in this proceeding.

Comments provided by :
Glaston, Joe

=====

=====

I strongly oppose any regulatory action by the Commission with respect to the Internet. The original unanimous bipartisan vote not to impose such regulation is not only appropriate from a policy perspective by encouraging rather than chilling open and vigorous political speech by all sides, but I believe is required by the First Amendment. Today communication on the Internet is tantamount to ordinary speech whether by spoken or written word where all can participate. Regulating speech simply because it is in an electronic medium is no more antithetical to freedom of speech than regulating the content of books or oral speech which regrettably some are also trying to do but is simply unconstitutional. As has often been said, the remedy for any perceived ills in political dialogue is more speech not less. Inserting the government into the mix would be disastrous, simply too much potential for regulatory partisanship or bias (or at least the perception of same) in the discussion of political/governmental issues, the very area where citizens should feel the most comfortable and uninhibited in speaking and which is vital for a vibrant democratic republic.

Comments provided by :
Klegerman, Neal

=====

=====

This country has become the United States of Greed due to the Supreme Court political agenda, and the purchase of the political process and elected officials by corporations and the super wealthy. It is leading to a violent confrontation between corporations and the super rich which will be bloody. This country has the most heavily armed citizenry thanks to the NRA. Politicians do not believe that an Arab spring could take place in the U.S. but they are so divorced from the people that they are supposed to represent. They live in a bubble in D.C. protected from any interaction with the average person. They ought to start riding busses, pump their own gas, along with all the other things the average citizen does daily. Perhaps if they listened to people, they might be able to see what is ultimately going to happen.

Comments provided by :
Zurakowski, May

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Goodman_Margaret_01_14_2015_19_07_47_CommentText.txt

=====

We the public have a right to know who is supporting the campaigns of our politicians.

Comments provided by :
Goodman, Margaret

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

The Supreme Court's 2010 decision in Citizens United unleashed a flood of corrupting special interest money into our elections-- drowning out the voices of average voters. I recognize that the Commission cannot overturn this decision, even if it wanted to. What the Commission can do, though, is bring the Commission's disclosure requirements into closer alignment with the Supreme Court's own expectation of full disclosure expressed in Citizens United.

I respectfully urge the Commission to revise its disclosure rules to ensure the public receives full and complete information about the true donors funding political ads. This means that groups paying for these "independent expenditures" must disclose the real sources of the money they use to fund these campaign ads. As a federal court ruled recently, the Commission's electioneering communication disclosure rule is illegal because it creates an "easily exploited loophole that allows the true sponsors of advertisements to hide behind dubious and misleading names." The Commission must close the dark money loophole that it created-- and make good on the Citizens United Court's promise that the flood of special interest money it unleashed on our elections would be fully disclosed.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in this proceeding.

Comments provided by :
Sokolsky, Joel

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Walker_Martin_01_14_2015_19_08_28_CommentText.txt

=====

ANY restriction of communication for other than pornography and slander/libel is in opposition to both the letter AND spirit of the Constitution's first amendment. Freedom of speech and press, peaceable assembly and petition were for political rights.

Restricting the internet would be the equivalent of outlawing the correspondence committees during the American Revolution.

Comments provided by :
Walker, Martin

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Rice_Nancy_01_14_2015_19_08_34_CommentText.txt

=====

Free speech is a constitutional right.

Comments provided by :
Rice, Nancy

=====

=====

PRESCRIPT:

Money ≠ Free Speech! Corporations are NOT people, my friends!! DEMOCRACY NOW!!!

We have a right to know to whom elected officials are beholden, but our current system allows many political spenders to hide their true identities. That?s simply unacceptable in a democracy. Please enact new rules to bring dark money political spenders out into the open and disclose the true identities of those who bankroll political ads.

In Citizens United, the Supreme Court assumed we would know who is trying to influence our decisions on Election Day ? and who is buying attention from our elected officials. But since that decision five years ago, hundreds of millions of dollars from secret sources have been spent in ways that will lead to corruption.

Please update and strengthen the FEC?s disclosure rules to protect our democracy.

Comments provided by :

Copple, Nathan

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Hankins_Richard_01_14_2015_19_08_25_CommentText.txt

=====

The internet has been working just fine under current regulation/law and should be left alone. Net Neutrality is not needed. Leave our internet alone.

Comments provided by :
Hankins, Richard

=====

=====

The free election system and the fundamental nature of this nation's democracy are at risk. The funding of election campaigns by corporations and special interest groups and individuals has kidnapped our democracy. We are no longer a democracy but an oligarchy. We must demand full disclosure of campaign funding as a measure to restore a government by the PEOPLE, not special interests.

Comments provided by :
Hiser, Sandra

=====

=====

Our current system allows big spenders to control political outcomes. We have a right to know who they are when they often control our legislators. It's simply unacceptable in a democracy for government to be controlled by "dark money". Please enact new rules to bring these political spenders out into the open and disclose the true identities of those who bankroll political ads.

In Citizens United, the Supreme Court naively assumed we would know who is trying to influence our decisions on Election Day and who is buying attention from our elected officials. But since that decision five years ago, hundreds of millions of dollars from secret sources have been spent in ways that have led to corruption.

Please update and strengthen the FEC's disclosure rules to protect our democracy.

Comments provided by :
Edson-Plumb, Mary Ann

=====

=====

Dear FEC,

Please promote new rules that expose the secret source of money that is spent to influence elections.

We teach our youngsters that America owns the moral high ground, and that we are above corruption and influence from special interests. The FEC is in a tremendous position to help us practice what we preach.

Thank you.

Comments provided by :

Hibbs, William

=====

=====

I oppose the FEC's proposed rule, and am writing to demand
that the FEC keep the Internet
free. This Administration may not always like the content of what
Americans say or write on
the Internet. But the Administration and the FEC must uphold the
First Amendment and
respect our right to voice our opinions on the Internet, even
when our message is
inconvenient to the Administration.

Comments provided by :
Ferry, James

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Hatfield_Ted_01_14_2015_19_08_59_CommentText.txt

=====

I understand that consideration of a new round of regulation of the Internet is pending before the Commission and I am writing to express my opposition to ANY new regulation of Internet content or usage allowable under current laws.

The First Amendment to the US Constitution guarantees Americans the right to freely express their opinions in public (short of shouting "Fire" in a movie theater, etc.) Period.

This fundamental right supersedes any and all concerns about the relative intellectual merit, factual or potentially offensive content of such speech, there not being any right codified into law anywhere which can guarantee freedom from being offended.

Please do your utmost to preserve our freedom of expression, be it in person, in print or over the Internet.

Thank you for your consideration!

Comments provided by :
Hatfield, Ted

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Dreist_Richard_01_14_2015_19_10_39_CommentText.txt

=====

As an avid follower and commentator regarding political news, I object to the proposed regulations that are attempting to limit freedom of expression on the internet. Judging from previous government attempts to regulate health care, education standards, etc., any regulations that try to limit free speech on the internet will get misinterpreted by some bureaucratic group and wind up being used to promote a political agenda,

Comments provided by :
Dreist, Richard

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Posh_Dave_01_14_2015_19_10_26_CommentText.txt

=====

To the members of the FEC: I have heard that you are attempting to regulate political speech on and off the Internet, and to restrict our constitutionally-protected freedoms.

This is un-American and against the freedoms described in the Declaration of Independence and guaranteed in the Constitution of the United States of America.

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.

The United States is currently experiencing an attempt of over-regulation and I am asking the FEC, with full exposure, to cease and desist this attempt at unconstitutional preemptive regulation.

Backed by the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States of America, I humbly submit my opinion and name.

David Posh

Comments provided by :

Posh, Dave

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Kilgarriff_Jeffrey_01_14_2015_19_09_44_CommentText.txt

=====

Free speech is just that. Stay out of the internet. Your proposed regulation is unamerican.

Comments provided by :
Kilgarriff, Jeffrey

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Nichols_John_01_14_2015_19_10_14_CommentText.txt

=====

Please enact new rules requiring disclosure of the true identities of those who pay for political ads.

We have a right to know to whom elected officials are beholden, but our current system allows many political spenders to hide their identities.

In Citizens United, the Supreme Court assumed we would know who is trying to influence our decisions on Election Day, and who is buying attention from our elected officials. But since that decision five years ago, hundreds of millions of dollars from secret sources have been spent in ways that will lead to corruption. That's unacceptable in a democracy.

Please update and strengthen the FEC's disclosure rules to protect democracy.

Comments provided by :
Nichols, John

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Wells_Irene_01_14_2015_19_10_21_CommentText.txt

=====

Please update and strengthen the FEC's disclosure rules to protect our democracy

Comments provided by :

Wells, Irene

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

The Supreme Court's 2010 decision in Citizens United unleashed a flood of corrupting special interest money into our elections-- drowning out the voices of average voters. I recognize that the Commission cannot overturn this decision, even if it wanted to. What the Commission can do, though, is bring the Commission's disclosure requirements into closer alignment with the Supreme Court's own expectation of full disclosure expressed in Citizens United.

I respectfully urge the Commission to revise its disclosure rules to ensure the public receives full and complete information about the true donors funding political ads. This means that groups paying for these "independent expenditures" must disclose the real sources of the money they use to fund these campaign ads. As a federal court ruled recently, the Commission's electioneering communication disclosure rule is illegal because it creates an "easily exploited loophole that allows the true sponsors of advertisements to hide behind dubious and misleading names." The Commission must close the dark money loophole that it created-- and make good on the Citizens United Court's promise that the flood of special interest money it unleashed on our elections would be fully disclosed.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in this proceeding.

Comments provided by :
Hall, Robert

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Young_Deborah_01_14_2015_19_10_03_CommentText.txt

=====

I oppose this proposed rule and am demanding that you keep the Internet free. Americans of all political persuasions understand what's at stake here. Don't be the ones to trample on our First Amendment rights!

Comments provided by :
Young, Deborah

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Lowther_Donald_01_14_2015_19_10_52_CommentText.txt

=====

I oppose this proposed rule, and am writing to demand that the FEC keep the Internet free. This latest attempt to stifle free speech and restrict our First Amendment rights fits into a long and repeated pattern of abuse from this Administration.

Comments provided by :
Lowther, Donald

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

The Supreme Court's 2010 decision in Citizens United unleashed a flood of corrupting special interest money into our elections-- drowning out the voices of average voters. I recognize that the Commission cannot overturn this decision, even if it wanted to. What the Commission can do, though, is bring the Commission's disclosure requirements into closer alignment with the Supreme Court's own expectation of full disclosure expressed in Citizens United.

I respectfully urge the Commission to revise its disclosure rules to ensure the public receives full and complete information about the true donors funding political ads. This means that groups paying for these "independent expenditures" must disclose the real sources of the money they use to fund these campaign ads. As a federal court ruled recently, the Commission's electioneering communication disclosure rule is illegal because it creates an "easily exploited loophole that allows the true sponsors of advertisements to hide behind dubious and misleading names." The Commission must close the dark money loophole that it created-- and make good on the Citizens United Court's promise that the flood of special interest money it unleashed on our elections would be fully disclosed.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in this proceeding.

Laura Redwine

Comments provided by :
Redwine, Laura

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Bayardi_Bonnie_01_14_2015_19_12_21_CommentText.txt

=====

It's unconscionable to keep secret who has influenced my representative for their own interests. If it's all right for money to influence politics, then it has to all right for me to know where that money came from.

Comments provided by :
Bayardi, Bonnie

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Pender_Steven_01_14_2015_19_12_51_CommentText.txt

=====

..... The Internet doesn't need any Government Intervention....

..... It's doing just fine as it is...

Steve Pender

Comments provided by :

Pender, Steven

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_McBride_Shelton_01_14_2015_19_13_03_CommentText.txt

=====

Keeping the internet free from proposed government regulation and/or fees is imperative to first amendment rights of free speech. It is wrong to consider such. I am asking for proposals infringing upon internet use to be dropped immediately.

Comments provided by :
McBride, Shelton

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Haertlein_Frank_01_14_2015_19_12_58_CommentText.txt

=====

The internet needs to free of government regulation, period! Keep your greasy, government fingers out of the People's Internet!

Comments provided by :
Haertlein, Frank

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Amos_Jerry_01_14_2015_19_13_10_CommentText.txt

=====

Free Speech is exactly that, free and open speech. Secret \$ behind everyone's back is absolutely not free speech - it is absolutely corruption under the table payoffs.

All funds to the political process and to U.S. politicians must be public.

What we have now is dark secret money from outside this state directly affecting state elections. Is this what the Founding Fathers intended? NO!

Comments provided by :
Amos, Jerry

=====

=====

I oppose the proposed FEC rule and demand that the internet be kept free as free speech.
Keep commentary on YouTube exempt from political campaign reporting requirements.
Keep internet social comment outlets such as YouTube free of government agency interference and control.

In America we have free speech rights guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution and these rights are not to be interfered with by any government body seeking to bring social commentary under bureaucratic interference and control.

Please leave the way it is now.

Comments provided by :
Littlefield, Paul G.

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Lowther_Donald_01_14_2015_19_14_40_CommentText.txt

=====

I oppose this proposed rule, and am writing to demand that the FEC keep the Internet free. There is bipartisan opposition to the FEC's proposed regulations to clamp down on the Internet. American's of all political points of view understand what's at stake here--our treasured First Amendment liberties!

Comments provided by :
Lowther, Donald

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Elder_Allan_01_14_2015_19_14_23_CommentText.txt

=====

DO NOT allow king Obama to take over the Internet (or anything else). Neuter that man until his time is up and send him packing.

Comments provided by :
Elder, Allan

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Sackett_Gayle_01_14_2015_19_15_00_CommentText.txt

=====

I oppose the proposed rule that will let the FEC regulate the Internet! Knowing that there IS bipartisan opposition to this makes it all the more important to allow political points from all Americans to be free according to the First Amendment of the United States of America! KEEP THE INTERNET FREE!

Comments provided by :
Sackett, Gayle

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

The Supreme Court's 2010 decision in Citizens United unleashed a flood of corrupting special interest money into our elections-- drowning out the voices of average voters. I recognize that the Commission cannot overturn this decision, even if it wanted to. What the Commission can do, though, is bring the Commission's disclosure requirements into closer alignment with the Supreme Court's own expectation of full disclosure expressed in Citizens United.

I respectfully urge the Commission to revise its disclosure rules to ensure the public receives full and complete information about the true donors funding political ads. This means that groups paying for these "independent expenditures" must disclose the real sources of the money they use to fund these campaign ads. As a federal court ruled recently, the Commission's electioneering communication disclosure rule is illegal because it creates an "easily exploited loophole that allows the true sponsors of advertisements to hide behind dubious and misleading names." The Commission must close the dark money loophole that it created-- and make good on the Citizens United Court's promise that the flood of special interest money it unleashed on our elections would be fully disclosed.

This is so important to me. I do my utmost to be an informed voter, yet when moneyed people are able to not only put vast sums into campaigns, silencing the majority of citizens who cannot contribute the same large sums, They are able to actually pick and advance candidates without our knowing they have done so. This, of course gives the wealthiest a huge advantage over most of the populace. It subverts the one person, one vote of our democracy and creates a one dollar, one vote to a very few.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in this proceeding.

Comments provided by :
Breckenridge, Bonnie

=====

=====

Hello, I would like to take a moment and share a few comments on this topic. It is of the upmost importance that the FEC strongly considers our founding principals of freedom and equality when making a decision. All of our greatest leaders and champions of civil rights believe in these principals. Therefore, any limitation to freedom or equality, even electronically, will stifle the free exchange of ideas, beliefs and all other information. This directly opposes our country's founding principals and undermines the greatness of The United States by destroying the tools responsible for its success.

Comments provided by :
Kellman, Gerald

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Dunkerley_Craig_01_14_2015_19_15_54_CommentText.txt

=====

Small donors may(?) be entitled to some degree of "privacy," but when corporations, unions and wealthy individuals can and do buy hugely disproportionate influence over our electoral process by running political ads, they owe it to voters to disclose who they are. Our democracy is a sham without this transparency.

Comments provided by :
Dunkerley, Craig

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Clayton_Luanne_01_14_2015_19_16_01_CommentText.txt

=====

I believe as a voter that I have a right to know--in a critically timely manner--who is writing about campaign, election, voter, and candidate issues and, especially, who is paying for it. Full Disclosure!!!
Public Disclosure!!

Comments provided by :
Clayton, Luanne

=====

=====

We have a right to know to whom elected officials are beholden, but our current system allows many political spenders to hide their true identities. That's simply unacceptable in a democracy. Please enact new rules to bring dark money political spenders out into the open and disclose the true identities of those who bankroll political ads.

In Citizens United, the Supreme Court assumed we would know who is trying to influence our decisions on Election Day ? and who is buying attention from our elected officials. But since that decision five years ago, hundreds of millions of dollars from secret sources have been spent in ways that will lead to corruption.

Please update and strengthen the FEC's disclosure rules to protect our democracy.

Comments provided by :
mondello, ed

=====

=====

I oppose this proposed rule, and am writing to demand that the FEC keep the Internet free. As Americans, we enjoy the right to freedom of speech and the freedom to petition our government. In today's modern age, that includes the right to make political satire videos on YouTube, the right to assemble and form 501c groups, the right to criticize the Administration on Twitter, and the right to make political commentary on Facebook. The First Amendment applies to the digital arena, and the FEC needs to understand that basic point.

Comments provided by :
Pemberton, Altima

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Dizon_Wilfredo_01_14_2015_19_16_18_CommentText.txt

=====

Please do not infringe on our free speech!

With much respect,

Wilfredo P. Dizon

Comments provided by :

Dizon, Wilfredo

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Poston_Miriam_01_14_2015_19_16_40_CommentText.txt

=====

We, the people have the right to know the true identities of political spenders. We need real disclosure to protect our democratic way of life. Show us the money---so we can be informed voters.

Comments provided by :
Poston, Miriam

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Townley_Shelley_01_14_2015_19_17_38_CommentText.txt

=====

I oppose this proposed rule, and am writing to demand that the FEC keep the Internet free.

As Americans, we enjoy the right to freedom of speech and the freedom to petition our government.

In today's modern age, that includes the right to make political satire videos on You Tube, the right to assemble and form 501C groups, the right to criticize the Administration on Twitter, and the right to make political commentary on Facebook.

The First Amendment applies to the digital arena, and the FEC needs to understand that basic fact.

Comments provided by :
Townley, Shelley

=====

=====

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. Please level the playing field and cease to allow dark money into election campaigns. Let us make sure any and all money collected for a campaign or particular politician, or party should have a name of the non-profit from which it came, attached to it. In order to track which non profit originally collected the money from each contributor extensive records need to be kept and how much is transfer to which part of the company for what purpose and how much was actually used for the described purpose. In other words let us get rid of dark money completely. I want to know which countries are contributing money to our elections and for which politicians.

Comments provided by :
Horwath, Emmett

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Gates_Phyllis_01_14_2015_19_17_29_CommentText.txt

=====

Keep the Internet open and without restrictions for our right to free speech.

Comments provided by :

Gates, Phyllis

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Roebuck_Larry_01_14_2015_19_18_14_CommentText.txt

=====

I oppose this proposed rule, and am writing to demand that the FEC keep
the Internet free.
This latest attempt to stifle free speech and restrict our First Amendment
rights fits into a
long and repeated pattern of abuse from this Administration.

Comments provided by :
Roebuck, Larry

=====

=====

We have a right to know to who is paying off our elected officials. Our current system allows many political spenders to hide their true identities. That?s simply unacceptable. We no longer live in a democracy. We live in an oligarchy. It is time to do your job and enact new rules to bring dark money political spenders out into the open and disclose the true identities of those who bankroll political ads.

Citizens United, one of the most corrupt decisions the Supreme Court has ever made assumes corporations are people. This shows how our system has been co-opted by corporations and when corporations and government marry that's called fascism, which is what we now have in our corrupt system.

The system is broken and no longer serves the citizens of the United States.

The system is a sham and the American people know it. Do your job.

Comments provided by :
Dalton, Julia

=====

=====

Today's world finds few freedoms left for the individual. I refer to freedom from government regulations. The internet currently stands as one of those last bastions of such freedom for the most part. It is very disheartening that once again the government with her regulators can not stand to see such freedoms go untethered. Of course these regulators are experts at spinning the reason for such regulations in the name of fairness, or protecting the people, or some other "noble" justification. In the end it is freedom and individual liberty that always suffers.

Please do not allow these master minds of government regulations get their hands on the internet in any way, shape or form. History is replete with examples of enterprises that prospered prior to government regulations which stifled an otherwise viable system. Let me be perfectly clear, no government regulations involving the internet for whatever reason, please.

Comments provided by :
Valese, Joseph

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Irwin_William_01_14_2015_19_18_08_CommentText.txt

=====

Leave the government out of the internet. We need free speech available on it.
We spend enough of our taxed money on government. The less government the better. Every time
they stick their nose in it costs US money. We don't need another agency or board to spend our money.

Comments provided by :
Irwin, William

=====

=====

We have a right to know to whom elected officials are beholden, but our current system allows many political spenders to hide their true identities. That's simply unacceptable in a democracy. Please enact new rules to bring dark money political spenders out into the open and disclose the true identities of those who bankroll political ads.

In Citizens United, the Supreme Court assumed we would know who is trying to influence our decisions on Election Day ? and who is buying attention from our elected officials. But since that decision five years ago, hundreds of millions of dollars from secret sources have been spent in ways that will lead to corruption.

Please update and strengthen the FEC's disclosure rules to protect our democracy.

Comments provided by :
Dreier, Tamara

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Perry_Rev._Jisho_01_14_2015_19_19_27_CommentText.txt

=====

I would like to support full disclosure of the source of funds given to candidates for federal offices. I would specifically like money given through corporations, associations or political pacts to disclose the source of their funds.

Comments provided by :
Perry, Rev. Jisho

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Kegresse_Nancy_01_14_2015_19_19_14_CommentText.txt

=====

Please return our country to being the democracy it once was by overturning Citizens United. Our elections should NOT be allowed to be bought by those with the most money!!

Comments provided by :
Kegresse, Nancy

=====

=====

We have a right to know to whom elected officials are beholden, but our current system allows many political spenders to hide their true identities. That?s simply unacceptable in a democracy. Please enact new rules to bring dark money political spenders out into the open and disclose the true identities of those who bankroll political ads.

In Citizens United, the Supreme Court assumed we would know who is trying to influence our decisions on Election Day ? and who is buying attention from our elected officials. But since that decision five years ago, hundreds of millions of dollars from secret sources have been spent in ways that will lead to corruption.

Please update and strengthen the FEC?s disclosure rules to protect our democracy.

Comments provided by :
Owen, Jean

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Boggs_Marci_01_14_2015_19_20_20_CommentText.txt

=====

DISCLOSURE, DISCLOSURE, DISCLOSURE!!!

We as citizens deserve the right to full disclosure from those who fund ALL political campaigns. We are tired of the corruption of hidden funding by PACs, SuperPACs and corporate shell games. We have a right to know who is truly behind the advertising until we wise up as a nation and go to PUBLIC FUNDING OF ELECTIONS IN THE UNITED STATES. That is the only way to get money out of political campaigns.

Our system is corrupt. We need public funding of elections.

Comments provided by :
Boggs, Marci

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Holcomb_Cindy_01_14_2015_19_19_47_CommentText.txt

=====

Leave the internet ALONE

Comments provided by :
Holcomb, Cindy

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Stull_Ginger_01_14_2015_19_19_58_CommentText.txt

=====

We have a right to know to whom elected officials are beholden, but our current system allows many political spenders to hide their true identities. That?s simply unacceptable in a democracy. Please enact new rules to bring dark money political spenders out into the open and disclose the true identities of those who bankroll political ads.

Please update and strengthen the FEC?s disclosure rules to protect our democracy.

Comments provided by :
Stull, Ginger

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Lowther_Donald_01_14_2015_19_19_46_CommentText.txt

=====

I oppose the FEC's proposed rule, and am writing to demand that the FEC keep the Internet free. This Administration may not always like the content of what Americans say or write on the Internet. But the Administration and the FEC must uphold the First Amendment and respect our right to voice our opinions on the Internet, even when our message is inconvenient to the Administration

Comments provided by :
Lowther, Donald

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Alexander_Judith_01_14_2015_19_21_17_CommentText.txt

=====

The Supreme Court's Citizens United decision assumes that spending to influence elections will be public. But in the five years since that decision, hundreds of millions has been spent from secret sources. This really undermines our democracy. The public has the right to know the actual identities of those who are buying political advertising.

Please update and strengthen the FEC's disclosure rules.

Comments provided by :
Alexander, Judith

=====

=====

We have a right to know to whom elected officials are beholden, but our current system allows many political spenders to hide their true identities. That's simply unacceptable in a democracy. Please enact new rules to bring dark money political spenders out into the open and disclose the true identities of those who bankroll political ads.

In Citizens United, the Supreme Court assumed we would know who is trying to influence our decisions on Election Day ? and who is buying attention from our elected officials. But since that decision five years ago, hundreds of millions of dollars from secret sources have been spent in ways that will lead to corruption.

Please update and strengthen the FEC's disclosure rules to protect our democracy.

Comments provided by :
Stefano, Lori

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_modena_carol_anne_01_14_2015_19_22_01_CommentText.txt

=====

As citizens, we have a right to know to whom elected officials are beholden, but our current system allows many political spenders to hide their true identities. That's simply unacceptable in a democracy. Please enact new rules to bring dark money political spenders out into the open and disclose the true identities of those who bankroll political ads.

In Citizens United, the Supreme Court assumed we would know who is trying to influence our decisions on Election Day ? and who is buying attention from our elected officials. But since that decision five years ago, hundreds of millions of dollars from secret sources have been spent in ways that will lead to corruption.

Please update and strengthen the FEC's disclosure rules to protect our democracy.

Comments provided by :
modena, carol anne

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_gottbrath_richard_01_14_2015_19_22_12_CommentText.txt

=====

The public should know who makes major contributions to political campaigns.

Comments provided by :
gottbrath, richard

=====

=====

The government should not be regulating free speech on the internet. It is one of the last bastions of free speech. All opinions, all viewpoints, should be allowed to be expressed. Otherwise, someone will be censored, and who will get to determine what's acceptable and what is not ? Please do not allow such a disastrous thing to happen to the internet - it needs to be free from any censorship by any governing body, period !

Comments provided by :
Garrison, Phillip

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Hensley_Michael_01_14_2015_19_22_39_CommentText.txt

=====

No more earmarks and supporting the liberal agenda that is destroying America.

Comments provided by :
Hensley, Michael

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Wise_Shirley_01_14_2015_19_23_32_CommentText.txt

=====

I oppose the FEC's proposed rule, and I am writing to demand that the FEC keep the Internet free. This Administration may not always like the content of what Americans say or write on the Internet. But, the Administration and the FEC must uphold the First Amendment and respect our right to voice our opinions on the Internet, even when our message is inconvenient to the Administration.

Comments provided by :
Wise, Shirley

=====

=====

Enormous sums of money are spent to influence what I buy, what I eat, what prescription medicine to take, what TV network I should stay tuned to. It pretty clear that a Safeway add influencing me to shop at Safeway comes from Safeway. An add to influence me to take a statin drug comes from the company that makes it.

I want the same ability when it comes to messages that are meant to influence my vote. Millions and millions of dollars spent to influence elections, are spent by many who don't want to be known. They want to remain in the shadows, and that is not good for elections, or democracy. If billionares, unions want to influence my vote, let the voters know who is spending to money to influence them. If a corporation wants to influence my vote, let them say so.

Advocacy ads need to state the sources of funding. For my vote to truly be informed and matter, secrecy of funding sources must end.

Democracy requires accountability.

Comments provided by :
framson, michael

=====

=====

We have a right to know to whom elected officials are beholden, but our current system allows many political spenders to hide their true identities. That's simply unacceptable in a democracy. Please enact new rules to bring dark money political spenders out into the open and disclose the true identities of those who bankroll political ads.

In Citizens United, the Supreme Court assumed we would know who is trying to influence our decisions on Election Day ? and who is buying attention from our elected officials. But since that decision five years ago, hundreds of millions of dollars from secret sources have been spent in ways that will lead to corruption.

Please update and strengthen the FEC's disclosure rules to protect our democracy.

Comments provided by :

Clark, Allen

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Brody_Janet_01_14_2015_19_24_45_CommentText.txt

=====

It is very important for the future of our democracy (republic) that all donors to all elected officials be shown. It is not good for some people to be able to support candidates without having to show themselves. It is important for the future of this country that all contributors must be made public for all elections.

Thank you for considering my opinion.

Comments provided by :
Brody, Janet

=====

=====

I want to know who my elected representatives are representing besides me. I cannot afford to make big campaign donations and it is ironic that those who can are doing everything they can with their money to make sure I can't influence my own elected representatives because those with the money want even more money and want policies that make sure I don't have the money to influence my elected representative. Please make these stealth campaign donors have to have their names in public and what their agenda is so that I can vote in my own best interests.

Comments provided by :
Isidoro, Edith

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Howell_Amy_01_14_2015_19_25_32_CommentText.txt

=====

If we start censoring the internet, what next?
We are a free people, let's keep it that way!

Comments provided by :
Howell, Amy

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_DiMatteo_Richard_01_14_2015_19_25_33_CommentText.txt

=====

Full political fundraising disclosure is sine qua non necessary for democracies to properly serve the people they govern, so I want the fullest possible disclosures in law ASAP.

Comments provided by :
DiMatteo, Richard

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Quasne_Willie_01_14_2015_19_25_16_CommentText.txt

=====

The internet allows us to exchange ideas freely, don't stifle that exchange!

Comments provided by :
Quasne, Willie

=====

=====

? I oppose this proposed rule, and am writing to demand that the FEC keep the Internet free. This latest attempt to stifle free speech and restrict our First Amendment rights fits into a long and repeated pattern of abuse from this Administration.

? I oppose this proposed rule, and am writing to demand that the FEC keep the Internet free. There is bipartisan opposition to the FEC's proposed regulations to clamp down on the Internet. Americans of all political points of view understand what's at stake here ? our treasured First Amendment liberties!

? I oppose the FEC's proposed rule, and am writing to demand that the FEC keep the Internet free. This Administration may not always like the content of what Americans say or write on the Internet. But the Administration and the FEC must uphold the First Amendment and respect our right to voice our opinions on the Internet, even when our message is inconvenient to the Administration.

? I oppose this proposed rule, and am writing to demand that the FEC keep the Internet free. As Americans, we enjoy the right to freedom of speech and the freedom to petition our government. In today's modern age, that includes the right to make political satire videos on YouTube, the right to assemble and form 501c groups, the right to criticize the Administration on Twitter, and the right to make political commentary on Facebook. The First Amendment applies to the digital arena, and the FEC needs to understand that basic point.

? I oppose this proposed rule, and am writing to demand that the FEC keep the Internet free. President Truman once said in a speech to Congress, "Once a government is committed to the principle of silencing the voice of opposition, it has only one way to go, and that is down the path of increasingly repressive measures, until it becomes a source of terror to all its citizens and creates a country where everyone lives in fear." I hope the FEC will heed this advice and NOT regulate the Internet.

Comments provided by :
Gregory, Wallace

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Morgan_Erik_01_14_2015_19_25_41_CommentText.txt

=====

Accountability and transparency
should be the government's priority. Don't let money destroy our democracy and freedom.

Comments provided by :
Morgan, Erik

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Alarie_Henry_01_14_2015_19_26_01_CommentText.txt

=====

Take our government into the open. NOT hidden behind big money
Something like these comments scares them doesn't it No more hiding
As the saying goes.....WE THE PEOPLE.....

Comments provided by :
Alarie, Henry

=====

=====

I oppose this proposed rule, and am writing to demand that the FEC keep the Internet free. As Americans, we enjoy the right to freedom of speech and the freedom to petition our government. In today's modern age, that includes the right to make political satire videos on YouTube, the right to assemble and form 501c groups, the right to criticize the Administration on Twitter, and the right to make political commentary on Facebook. The First Amendment applies to the digital arena, and the FEC needs to understand that basic point.

Comments provided by :
Lowther, Donald

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Holmes_Jean_01_14_2015_19_26_45_CommentText.txt

=====

As a presenter of nonpartisan information on ballot issues for the League of Women Voters, I have frequently been asked, who are the supporters or opponents of measures. It makes a difference.

Our democratic tradition is based on open discussion before the secret ballot. That tradition should be continued by strong regulation from the FEC.

Jean Holmes

Comments provided by :
Holmes, Jean

=====

=====

I oppose this proposed rule, and am writing to demand that the FEC keep the Internet free. As Americans, we enjoy the right to freedom of speech and the freedom to petition our government. In today's modern age, that includes the right to make political satire videos on YouTube, the right to assemble and form 501c groups, the right to criticize the Administration on Twitter, and the right to make political commentary on Facebook. The First Amendment applies to the digital arena, and the FEC needs to understand that basic point.

Comments provided by :
Kupper, Stephanie

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Mrozek_Barbara_01_14_2015_19_27_12_CommentText.txt

=====

The lack of transparency in government is an ongoing fight. Transparency is absolutely a must if our democracy is to survive (it's already in grave danger). I appreciate efforts by our elected officials to uphold laws to protect our country. That goes for lobbyists, too - they should be severely restricted in amount of money spent for influencing legislation that promotes their personal interests.

Comments provided by :
Mrozek, Barbara

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Hatfield_John_01_14_2015_19_26_47_CommentText.txt

=====

Leave the internet it is an expression of free speech and free marketing. Enough said.

Comments provided by :
Hatfield, John

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Lynn_Richard_01_14_2015_19_27_24_CommentText.txt

=====

PROTECT FREE SPEECH ON THE INTERNET!!!!

Comments provided by :
Lynn, Richard

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_IMPARATO_VICTOR_01_14_2015_19_27_08_CommentText.txt

=====

THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD NOT BE CONTROLLING ANY KIND OF FREE SPEECH.

Comments provided by :
IMPARATO, VICTOR

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Silver_Dan_01_14_2015_19_28_19_CommentText.txt

=====

We have a right to know to whom elected officials are beholden, but our current system allows many political spenders to hide their true identities. That's simply unacceptable in a democracy. Please enact new rules to bring dark money political spenders out into the open and disclose the true identities of those who bankroll political ads.

In Citizens United, the Supreme Court assumed we would know who is trying to influence our decisions on Election Day ? and who is buying attention from our elected officials. But since that decision five years ago, hundreds of millions of dollars from secret sources have been spent in ways that will lead to corruption.

Please update and strengthen the FEC's disclosure rules to protect our democracy.

Comments provided by :
Silver, Dan

=====

=====

We have a right to know to whom elected officials are beholden, but our current system allows many political spenders to hide their true identities. That's simply unacceptable in a democracy. Please enact new rules to bring dark money political spenders out into the open and disclose the true identities of those who bankroll political ads.

In Citizens United, the Supreme Court assumed we would know who is trying to influence our decisions on Election Day ? and who is buying attention from our elected officials. But since that decision five years ago, hundreds of millions of dollars from secret sources have been spent in ways that will lead to corruption.

Please update and strengthen the FEC's disclosure rules to protect our democracy.

Comments provided by :
Guenther, James

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Duke_Nancy_01_14_2015_19_28_19_CommentText.txt

=====

As Americans we pride ourselves as people of "Free Speech". We don't have to agree with it all but we need to allow every person to be able to speak on their beliefs.

The US Government does not, and should not, control anyone's thought process. They are not a God.

I hate a lot of what I hear and see in the US but I still believe this is the correct thing to do.

Comments provided by :

Duke, Nancy

=====

=====

Dear Federal Election Commission Members;

I am writing this message to you in order to let you know how aware I am of the corruption in our political system. The United States of America IS A DEMOCRACY! And at the advent of the five miserable years since Citizens United came to take over the power in the United States Congress and Senate, We the Citizens of the United States, are here to speak our minds, in hope that you listen to our voices! Whoever named the entity, CITIZENS UNITED, what they named it, was a sham, a cover name, for giving what it is, a different outward appearance! Corporations and wealthy special interests groups hide behind their front groups, to keep us from knowing who's trying to influence our votes, or aid is suppressing our votes, or to feign to be for the majority of the people, but, we all know that they are For, the Corporate & ideologically Dominionist 1%!

We all know that this kind of current system allows one too many political spenders to hide their real identities, and THAT, IS SIMPLY UNACCEPTABLE IN A DEMOCRACY! I join in with many, many others to ask you to please enact new rules to bring dark monied-political spenders out into the open, to hold them to accountability and transparency, to disclose the true identities of those who bankroll political ads!

In Citizens United, SCOTUS is said to have apparently "assumed" we would know who is trying to influence our decisions on Election Day -- and who is buying attention from our elected officials....(I say HA!); Just ask that question to FOXNews viewers, and see if they know the answers to that question! Rupert Murdoch, Roger Ailes, and their highest paid "star", Bill O'Reilly, and spinoffs, such as Beck and Limbaugh, to name a couple, and operationally, the shady and sinister group, ALEC, (Americans for Legislative "Exchange" Commission), are SO blatantly Dishonest, and they are so well-funded by these smoke & mirrors donors, whose goal is to corrupt the minds of the less-educated citizenry, into believing the lies they spread to their fans, who believe them, yet, at their own risk and harm, yet those ideologically influenced victims, don't realize, sadly, they've been convinced to support, the Agenda of ultimately the dishonest 1%! Since the five year anniversary of the decision to let CITIZENS UNITED do it's destruction to our Democracy, we feel it's TIME, to implore you now, or dare we say demand, that you consider, no, rather, move forward, and propose, new rules to expose the dark money spenders, and secret sources, flooding our airwaves with anonymous political ads, and buying attention from our elected officials, with hundreds of millions of dollars, that has already been spent in ways that have already, and will, future-time, lead to more increased corruption! Please update, amend, and strengthen the FEC's disclosure rules to protect our Democracy! Thank You in advance! We're expecting you to do the right thing and take part into making America a leader once more in Character and Honesty and Morality!

Comments provided by :
Nawada, Christina

=====

=====

We have a right to know to whom elected officials are beholden, but our current system allows many political spenders to hide their true identities. That's simply unacceptable in a democracy. Please enact new rules to bring dark money political spenders out into the open and disclose the true identities of those who bankroll political ads.

In Citizens United, the Supreme Court assumed we would know who is trying to influence our decisions on Election Day ? and who is buying attention from our elected officials. But since that decision five years ago, hundreds of millions of dollars from secret sources have been spent in ways that will lead to corruption.

Please update and strengthen the FEC's disclosure rules to protect our democracy.

Comments provided by :
Hays, Helen

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Quirk_Leo_01_14_2015_19_29_10_CommentText.txt

=====

All donors to political campaigns in the USA should be identified to the public by name and city and state of residence if their donations exceed \$200. per year.

Comments provided by :
Quirk, Leo

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

The Supreme Court's 2010 decision in Citizens United unleashed a flood of corrupting special interest money into our elections-- drowning out the voices of average voters. I recognize that the Commission cannot overturn this decision, even if it wanted to. What the Commission can do, though, is bring the Commission's disclosure requirements into closer alignment with the Supreme Court's own expectation of full disclosure expressed in Citizens United.

I respectfully urge the Commission to revise its disclosure rules to ensure the public receives full and complete information about the true donors funding political ads. This means that groups paying for these "independent expenditures" must disclose the real sources of the money they use to fund these campaign ads. As a federal court ruled recently, the Commission's electioneering communication disclosure rule is illegal because it creates an "easily exploited loophole that allows the true sponsors of advertisements to hide behind dubious and misleading names." The Commission must close the dark money loophole that it created-- and make good on the Citizens United Court's promise that the flood of special interest money it unleashed on our elections would be fully disclosed.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in this proceeding.

Comments provided by :
Thomas, Stephen

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_warren_Charles_01_14_2015_19_29_10_CommentText.txt

=====

Protect the freedom of speech and the media.

Comments provided by :
warren, Charles

=====

=====

SIR, LAST TIME I KNEW THIS WAS AMERICA THE LAND OF THE FREE AND NOT A COMMUNIST COUNTRY TO SILENCE FREEDOM OF SPEECH. THE WHITE HOUSE AND THE ADMINISTRATION THERE ARE ON A COMMUNIST SOCIALIST PATH AND WE THE PEOPLE OF THIS GREAT LAND DO NOT GO ALONG WITH HIS CORRUPT AGENDA. THE MEDIA AT LEAST THE MAINSTREAM ARE ALREADY CENSORED AND HE HAS THE WIFE BROTHER HUSBAND ETC OF ALL OF THE EXECS OF THE STATIONS WORKING IN HIS ADMINISTRATION. IT IS A SAD DAY IN AMERICA TO BE TURNING INTO WHAT WE HAVE FOUGHT FOR YEARS TO KEEP FROM DOING TO OTHER NATIONS. NOW IT HAS COME TO AMERICA. WE PRAY THAT YOU DO THE RIGHT THING AND SAVE OUR COUNTRY AND OUR FREEDOMS. THANK YOU Jeanne MOORE

Comments provided by :
MOORE, JEANNE

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Sonderman_J_J_01_14_2015_19_31_06_CommentText.txt

=====

I am against the US government controlling and/or regulating the internet.
It is not needed. Moreover, the government involvement in an enterprise
usually raises costs to consumers, depresses the level of service, and has huge cost overruns

Comments provided by :
Sonderman, J J

=====

=====

Concerning the FEC's Proposed Rule Changes for the Internet:

I oppose this proposed rule, and am writing to demand that the FEC keep the Internet free.

As Americans, we enjoy the right to freedom of speech and the freedom to petition our government. In today's modern age, that includes the right to make political satire videos on YouTube, the right to assemble and form 501c groups, the right to criticize the Administration on Twitter, and the right to make political commentary on Facebook.

The First Amendment applies to the digital arena, and the FEC needs to understand that basic point.

Comments provided by :
Miller, Sandie

=====

=====

Big money is NOT and should NEVER be the equivalent of free speech despite the bought decision of the reactionaries on the Supreme Court.

The CROmnibus plunder was a terrible deal for our air, water, and democracy. One provision raised the limit individuals are allowed to contribute to political parties, further eroding the firewalls keeping money out of politics.

The money that the Western States Petroleum Association and other members of the oil lobby spend is well spent, since it has allowed Big Oil to sabotage state and federal laws protecting the air, water and environment.

If money contributed by corporate interests directly and indirectly affect the voting of our representatives in the House and Senate, we are no longer living in a democracy. Since we already know that corporate money controls votes at city, state and federal government levels across the country as well as in the Courts, we are, de facto, no longer a democracy.

Voters have a right to know who's trying to buy elections and elected officials. Please update and STRENGTHEN the FEC's disclosure rules to stop Dark Money from billionaires and other special interests from subverting our democracy. Give them REAL teeth.

Revealing exactly what PEOPLE (not the false fronts of PACs and corporate driven interest groups) give money to which politicians is an essential part of our democracy until we can get money OUT of elections entirely.

Future elections MUST be publicly funded as a House and Senate full of millionaires clearly CANNOT represent the interests of ordinary Americans.

Comments provided by :
Amsden, Liz

=====

=====

I would like to add my comments to the discussion of political speech on the internet.

Political speech should never be silenced whether on a public street, in a home, or in a blog on the internet.

Individuals have the right of freedom of speech that cannot be regulated away by an over-reaching government or federal agency.

Though, the methods of communication have greatly changed over the decades & centuries since the founding of our country, the basic right of freedom of speech remains the same.

The internet has the ability to be a great source of information. Those choosing this method of information over traditional medias should not be limited in the thoughts, and information available.

The individual posting information on websites and blogs have every right to be heard without regulatory approval of the comment or video.

The reader or viewer of the information can make their own assessment of the importance, validity and/or truthfulness of the information

provided. It is not the role of the government to be involved in the control of free speech.

Comments provided by :

Lundewall, Dana

=====

=====

Elected officials need to remember that they are supposed to be representatives of ALL the people, NOT corporations!!! You were elected into a public office by citizens of the USA, therefore ALL citizens have a right to know the complete source of any and all money and other donations used toward gaining the official government job you were elected for. You are an elected official and the people of the USA have a right to know all transactions that had any relations toward you obtaining the government official position that you are campaigning for or that you were won the election for. You cannot honestly & fully represent ALL USA CITIZENS without complete disclosure.

We have a right to know to whom elected officials are beholden, but our current system allows many political spenders to hide their true identities. That's simply unacceptable in a democracy. Please enact new rules to bring dark money political spenders out into the open and disclose the true identities of those who bankroll political ads.

In Citizens United, the Supreme Court assumed we would know who is trying to influence our decisions on Election Day ? and who is buying attention from our elected officials. But since that decision five years ago, hundreds of millions of dollars from secret sources have been spent in ways that will lead to corruption.

Corporations and wealthy special interests hide behind front groups to keep us from knowing who's trying to influence our votes, and to make sure we won't know whom our elected officials will owe favors to after they take office. It's dishonest, and it's bad for our democracy.

In the five years since Citizens United, Senate Republicans have repeatedly filibustered the DISCLOSE Act which would shine a light on secret spending. The FEC has the right and the responsibility to do what it can ? and if we all speak out, it'll know that the pressure is on.

If dark money groups try to challenge new disclosure rules in court, the FEC will have your comments to show the court why transparency in political spending is important to you and how critical it is to a democracy of, by, and for the people.

At the current state of our democracy, only the wealthy are receiving the full benefits of living in a democratic society and this condition is NOT DEMOCRACY!!!! If we are truly a democratic society, all should be disclosed, nothing should be done in secret from the citizens. Sick and tired of the wealthy buying our government elected officials!!!!!!

Please update and strengthen the FEC's disclosure rules to protect our democracy.

Comments provided by :
LaBarbera, Carolyn

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Hesselman_Claude_01_14_2015_19_32_55_CommentText.txt

=====

The events in Paris show what becomes of a society that "agrees" to limit ideas and speech. We do not need the government making rules that "we" "agree" with.

Comments provided by :
Hesselman, Claude

=====

=====

I oppose this proposed rule, and am writing to demand that the FEC keep the Internet free. President Truman once said in a speech to Congress, "Once a government is committed to the principle of silencing the voice of opposition, it has only one way to go, and that is down the path of increasingly repressive measures, until it becomes a source of terror to all its citizens and creates a country where everyone lives in fear." I hope the FEC will heed this advice and NOT regulate the Internet.

Comments provided by :
Lowther, Donald

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

I respectfully urge the Commission to revise its disclosure rules to ensure the public receives full and complete information about the true donors funding political ads. This means that groups paying for these "independent expenditures" must disclose the real sources of the money they use to fund these campaign ads. As a federal court ruled recently, the Commission's electioneering communication disclosure rule is illegal because it creates an "easily exploited loophole that allows the true sponsors of advertisements to hide behind dubious and misleading names." The Commission must close the dark money loophole that it created and make good on the Citizens United Court's promise that the flood of special interest money it unleashed on our elections would be fully disclosed.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in this proceeding.

Comments provided by :
Nelson, Scott

=====

=====

The below statement copied from Common Cause reflects my own thinking. The Supreme Court's decisions on Citizens United and McCutcheon have caused great harm to our election process and practically turned our nation into a plutocracy. We are no longer the nation that we used to be. Please work toward correcting this unsustainable condition.

"We have a right to know to whom elected officials are beholden, but our current system allows many political spenders to hide their true identities. That's simply unacceptable in a democracy. Please enact new rules to bring dark money political spenders out into the open and disclose the true identities of those who bankroll political ads.

In Citizens United, the Supreme Court assumed we would know who is trying to influence our decisions on Election Day ? and who is buying attention from our elected officials. But since that decision five years ago, hundreds of millions of dollars from secret sources have been spent in ways that will lead to corruption.

Please update and strengthen the FEC's disclosure rules to protect our democracy."

Comments provided by :
Barisano, Edward

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Kime_Allen_01_14_2015_19_35_38_CommentText.txt

=====

Hands off the Internet

Comments provided by :
Kime, Allen

=====

=====

I

?oppose
?this
?proposed
?rule,
?and
?am
?writing
?to
?demand
?that
?the
?FEC
?keep
?the
?Internet
?free.
? As
?Americans,
?we
?enjoy
?the
?right
?to
?freedom
?of
?speech
?and
?the
?freedom
?to
?petition
?our
? government.
?In
?today's
?modern
?age,
?that
?includes
?the
?right
?to
?make
?political
?satire
?videos
?on
? YouTube,
?the

?right
?to
?assemble
?and
?form
?501c
?groups,
?the
?right
?to
?criticize
?the
? Administration
?on
?Twitter,
?and
?the
?right
?to
?make
?political
?commentary
?on
?Facebook.
?The
? First
?Amendment
?applies
?to
?the
?digital
?arena,
?and
?the
?FEC
?needs
?to
?understand
?that
?basic
? point.
?

Comments provided by :
Forrest, Lew

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Green_Patricia_01_14_2015_19_36_31_CommentText.txt

=====

Please maintain our rights under our constitution to keep free speech free.

Comments provided by :
Green, Patricia

=====

=====

The legal path our nation is currently following is an un-Constitutional and dangerous one. Plainly put, The S.C.O.T.U.S. got the decision in Citizens United v. F.E.C. wrong, from both a Constitutional standpoint, as well as from the standpoint of serious legal precedent. Having just thrown of one tyrant-king, the legal framers of our U.S. Constitution were rightfully weary of setting another such tyrant in his place. And so, recognizing the corrupting influences of large amount of money in national and international politics, the Framers made clear that one-man equaled one-vote, regardless of that citizen's personal or business riches, or lack thereof. Also, regardless of legal gymnastics or political chicanery, anyone adult with two-licks of common sense will tell you to your face that you're either an idiot or a liar if you believe that corporations ARE people, from the standpoint of citizenship as defined by our Constitution. Ladies and Gentlemen of the F.E.C., it is time to lay this blatantly manipulative and patently insane idea of corporations being *equal* to U.S. citizens! I hope and pray that, in your wisdom and love of our Democratic Republic, you will find your way to restoring fairness and equity to our national elections processes. Thank you for your time and consideration in this crucially important matter!

Comments provided by :
Moriarty, Thomas

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_egan_Joseph_01_14_2015_19_37_37_CommentText.txt

=====

The FEC must protect. Free speech on the Internet!

Joe Egan

Comments provided by :
egan, Joseph

=====

=====

I oppose this proposed rule, and am writing to demand that the FEC keep the Internet Free. As Americans, we enjoy the right to keep freedom of speech and the freedom to petition our government. In today's modern age, that includes the right to make political satire videos on YouTube, the right to assemble and form 501c groups, the right to criticize the Administration on Twitter, and the right to make political commentary on Facebook. The First Amendment applies to the digital arena, and the FEC needs to understand that basic point.

Comments provided by :
Holling, Julie

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Murphy_John_01_14_2015_19_36_55_CommentText.txt

=====

Dear Sirs, I am against any further interference of the government in the control of the internet. This is something no one I know wants. Maybe the government should pass a law repealing the FEC?

Comments provided by :
Murphy, John

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Grier_Cindy_01_14_2015_19_38_10_CommentText.txt

=====

Freedom is my right as a human. MY RIGHT.

Comments provided by :
Grier, Cindy

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Eiche_Trini_01_14_2015_19_38_06_CommentText.txt

=====

I oppose the FEC's proposed rule, and am writing to demand that the FEC keep the Internet free. This Administration may not always like the content of what Americans say or write on the Internet. But it is not for the the government to judge the content of anyone's speech.

This Administration and the FEC must uphold the First Amendment and respect our constitutional right to voice our opinions on the Internet and elsewhere. Even when our message is inconvenient to this Administration.

Comments provided by :
Eiche, Trini

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Schumacher_Mark_FEC_01_14_2015_19_38_15_CommentText.txt

=====

Freedom of speech is just that, freedom of speech, regardless of venue.

Comments provided by :
Schumacher, Mark FEC

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_shier_jerry_01_14_2015_19_39_34_CommentText.txt

=====

free speech should not be curtailed in any form it is guaranteed all americans.

Comments provided by :
shier, jerry

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_dusseau_steven_01_14_2015_19_38_45_CommentText.txt

=====

Hands off the internet. We don't want government control.

Comments provided by :
dusseau, steven

=====

=====

I oppose this proposed rule, and am writing to demand that the FEC keep the Internet free. President Truman once said in a speech to Congress, "Once a government is committed to the principle of silencing the voice of opposition, it has only one way to go, and that is down the path of increasingly repressive measures, until it becomes a source of terror to all its citizens and creates a country where everyone lives in fear." I hope the FEC will heed this advice and NOT regulate the Internet.

The last thing we need is the FEC politicizing the internet and suppressing individual liberties by deciding what is and what isn't 'approved' for posting on the internet.

Keep you noses out of our business!

Please.

Comments provided by :
Rene, Randy

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Saalwaechter_Susie_01_14_2015_19_40_02_CommentText.txt

=====

Please strengthen FEC disclosure rules for the benefit of the people. The people. Transparency in government. Please help us, the people. We have no chance against corporations and wealthy individuals. No chance, unless the FEC looks out for us. We are just average American people. Please help keep democracy in place, not an advocate and catalyst for a plutocracy.

Thank you.

Comments provided by :
Saalwaechter, Susie

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_French_Joe_01_14_2015_19_41_29_CommentText.txt

=====

Uncontroled spending on elections is getting worse and worse! !!

Comments provided by :
French, Joe

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

The Supreme Court's 2010 decision in Citizens United unleashed a flood of corrupting special interest money into our elections, drowning out the voices of average voters. I recognize that the Commission cannot overturn this decision, even if it wanted to. What the Commission can do, though, is bring the Commission's disclosure requirements into closer alignment with the Supreme Court's own expectation of full disclosure expressed in Citizens United.

I respectfully urge the Commission to revise its disclosure rules to ensure the public receives full and complete information about the true donors funding political ads. This means that groups paying for these "independent expenditures" must disclose the real sources of the money they use to fund these campaign ads. As a federal court ruled recently, the Commission's electioneering communication disclosure rule is illegal because it creates an "easily exploited loophole that allows the true sponsors of advertisements to hide behind dubious and misleading names." The Commission must close the dark money loophole that it created and make good on the Citizens United Court's promise that the flood of special interest money it unleashed on our elections would be fully disclosed.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in this proceeding.

Comments provided by :
Lohne, Jack

=====

=====

I oppose this proposed rule, and am writing to demand that the FEC keep the Internet free. President Truman once said in a speech to Congress, "Once a government is committed to the principle of silencing the voice of opposition, it has only one way to go, and that is down the path of increasingly repressive measures, until it becomes a source of terror to all its citizens and creates a country where everyone lives in fear." I hope the FEC will heed this advice and NOT regulate the Internet. Where will you stop with our freedoms being deluded every day.

Monte Leveaux

Comments provided by :
Leveaux, Monte

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Vandiver__Kathleen_M_01_14_2015_19_43_03_CommentText.txt

=====

Comments:

Our current system is unfair. Corporations are not persons.

Right now the system allows many big political spenders and corporations to hide their true identities and to outspend the voting population. That's simply unacceptable. Please enact new rules to bring dark money political spenders out into the open and disclose the true identities of those who bankroll political ads.

In Citizens United, the Supreme Court assumed we would know who is trying to influence our decisions on Election Day ? and who is buying attention from our elected officials. But since that decision five years ago, hundreds of millions of dollars from secret sources have been spent in ways that will lead to corruption.

Please update and strengthen the FEC's disclosure rules to protect our democracy.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Dr. Kathleen M. Vandiver

Comments provided by :
Vandiver , Kathleen M

=====

=====

The media are exempt from campaign law because otherwise it would be an infringement of their 1st Amendment rights:

2 USC 431 (9) (B) (i) The term "expenditure" does not include any news story, commentary, or editorial distributed through the facilities of any broadcasting station, newspaper, magazine, or other periodical publication, unless such facilities are owned or controlled by any political party, political committee, or candidate;

But the 1st Amendment does not grant freedoms of speech and press only to staff of media corporations.

In 1998 Senator McConnell said it well:

"Section 431(9)(B)(i) makes a distinction where there is no real difference: the media is extremely powerful by any measure, a "special interest" by any definition, and heavily engaged in the "issue advocacy" and "independent expenditure" realms of political persuasion that most editorial boards find so objectionable when anyone other than a media outlet engages in it. To illustrate the absurdity of this special exemption the media enjoys, I frequently cite as an example the fact that if the RNC bought NBC from GE the FEC would regulate the evening news and, under the McCain-Feingold "reform" bill, Tom Brokaw could not mention a candidate 60 days before an election. This is patently absurd

Had the senate debate on the McCain Feingold bill advanced to the point of amendments, among the first I offered would have been one to delete section 431 (9) (B) (i). Whenever the opportunity presents itself in the future, I look forward to doing just that. I believe that it would be an enlightening discussion."

A free press is the right to use a printing press without a license from government. Other than who pays for it, there is no difference between an editorial, slanted news story and a political ad?

The corruption campaign laws are supposed to protect the public from what is institutionalized by media corporations beholden to Uncle Sam for exemption from same! The corporate media exemption is a perfect example of how federal campaign laws have corrupted the process in favor of special interests.

Lovell v. City of Griffin SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES 303 U.S. 444 Argued February 4, 1938 Decided March 28, 1938

The liberty of the press is not confined to newspapers and periodicals. It necessarily embraces pamphlets and leaflets. These indeed have been historic weapons in the defense of liberty, as the pamphlets of Thomas Paine and others in our own history abundantly attest. The press in its historic connotation comprehends every sort of publication which affords a vehicle of information and opinion. What we have had recent occasion to say with respect to the vital importance of protecting this essential liberty from every sort of infringement need not be repeated. *Near v. Minnesota*, supra; *Grosjean v. American Press Co.*, supra; *De Jonge v. Oregon*, supra.[note 2]

Whatever differences may exist about interpretations of the First Amendment, there is practically universal agreement that a major purpose of that Amendment was to protect the free discussion of governmental affairs. This of course includes discussions of candidates, structures and forms of government, the manner in which government is operated or should be operated, and all such [384 U.S. 214, 219] matters relating to political processes. The Constitution specifically selected the press, which includes not only newspapers, books, and magazines, but also humble leaflets and circulars, see *Lovell v. Griffin*, 303 U.S. 444, to play an important role in the discussion of public affairs.

If freedom of religion was regulated the way campaign laws regulate freedom of speech, press and assembly only the clergy and not the congregation would be free to worship.

Senator Ted Cruz has offered a solution but the MSM have not reported it:

S.2416 - Free All Speech Act of 2014

<https://beta.congress.gov/113/bills/s2416/BILLS-113s2416is.xml>

Comments provided by :
Lewis, Michael

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

The Supreme Court's 2010 decision in Citizens United unleashed a flood of corrupting special interest money into our elections-- drowning out the voices of average voters. I recognize that the Commission cannot overturn this decision, even if it wanted to. What the Commission can do, though, is bring the Commission's disclosure requirements into closer alignment with the Supreme Court's own expectation of full disclosure expressed in Citizens United.

I respectfully urge the Commission to revise its disclosure rules to ensure the public receives full and complete information about the true donors funding political ads. This means that groups paying for these "independent expenditures" must disclose the real sources of the money they use to fund these campaign ads. As a federal court ruled recently, the Commission's electioneering communication disclosure rule is illegal because it creates an "easily exploited loophole that allows the true sponsors of advertisements to hide behind dubious and misleading names." The Commission must close the dark money loophole that it created-- and make good on the Citizens United Court's promise that the flood of special interest money it unleashed on our elections would be fully disclosed.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in this proceeding.

Comments provided by :
Enriquez, Frances

=====

=====

As an America citizen I have a right to know to whom elected officials are obligated. However, the current system allows many political contributors to hide their identities. That is unacceptable in a democracy. You need to enact new rules to reveal hidden moneyed political spenders and disclose the true identities of those who bankroll political ads.

In Citizens United, the Supreme Court made a mistake in assuming we would know who is influencing our decisions on Election Day, who is buying power from our elected officials. Since that decision five years ago, hundreds of millions of dollars from secret sources have been spent in ways that will lead to corruption.

Please update and strengthen the FEC's disclosure rules to protect our democracy.

Thank you for your consideration.

Comments provided by :
Cole, Corrine

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Hesse_Robert_01_14_2015_19_43_59_CommentText.txt

=====

Please clean up American elections by stopping special interest groups, unions, wealthy individuals and corporations from remaining anonymous when they attempt to influence our political system. Please require full disclosure of funding sources for political advocacy. Everyone should be allowed to make their opinions known, but they must be identified when they do so.

Comments provided by :
Hesse, Robert

=====

=====

The internet is an area where we are told it is "public domain" which tells me that it is a forum for FREE SPEECH. Free Speech implies that a person or organization may state whatever their views are without any retribution from the government officials. But as with everything else in our society, our government is attempting to STEAL our Constitutional rights and freedoms from the ordinary citizen. I find that the behavior of our current administration in constantly overstepping its authority is ABSOLUTELY REPREHENSIBLE. The action it is taking toward the control of the Internet falls into this category also. Like most American citizens who revel in the freedoms that we have, am very disgusted with the Obama administration! KEEP THE INTERNET FREE FOR OTHERS IDEAS, NOT JUST THE RADICAL LEFT'S!!!!

Comments provided by :
Shreve, Betina

=====

=====

Honorable Commissioners,

Due to the Supreme Court's 2010 decision in Citizens United unleashing a flood of corrupting special interest money into our elections (local, State, and Federal) the voices of average American Citizen voters is being drown out. I recognize the Commission cannot overturn this decision, even if it wanted to. What our Commissioners can do, though, is bring the Commission's disclosure requirements into closer alignment with the Supreme Court's own expectation of full disclosure expressed in Citizens United.

I respectfully urge the Commission to revise its disclosure rules to ensure the public receives full and complete information about the true donors funding political ads. This means that groups paying for these "independent expenditures" must disclose the real sources of the money they use to fund these campaign ads. As a federal court ruled recently, the Commission's electioneering communication disclosure rule is illegal because it creates an "easily exploited loophole that allows the true sponsors of advertisements to hide behind dubious and misleading names." The Commission must close the dark money loophole that it created-- and make good on the Citizens United Court's promise that the flood of special interest money it unleashed on our elections would be fully disclosed.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment inre: this important matter.

Comments provided by :
Rabaut, Charles

=====

=====

The populace has a right to know to whom elected officials are beholden, but our current system allows many political spenders to hide their true identities. That's unacceptable. Please enact new rules to bring dark money political spenders out into the open and disclose the true identities of those who bankroll political ads.

In Citizens United, the Supreme Court assumed it was ok to influence our decisions on Election Day ? and buy attention from our elected officials. But since that decision five years ago, hundreds of millions of dollars from secret sources have been spent in ways that lead to corruption.

Please update and strengthen the FEC's disclosure rules to protect the populace.

Comments provided by :
Miller-Hampton, Martha

=====

=====

Citizens of this country have a right to know to whom elected officials are beholden, but our current system allows many political spenders to hide their true identities. That's simply unacceptable in a democracy. Please enact new rules to bring dark money political spenders out into the open and disclose the true identities of those who bankroll political ads.

In Citizens United, the Supreme Court assumed we would know who is trying to influence our decisions on Election Day ? and who is buying attention from our elected officials. But since that decision five years ago, hundreds of millions of dollars from secret sources have been spent in ways that will lead to corruption.

Please update and strengthen the FEC's disclosure rules to protect our democracy.

Corporations and wealthy special interests hide behind front groups to keep us from knowing who's trying to influence our votes, and to make sure we won't know whom our elected officials will owe favors to after they take office. It's dishonest, and it's bad for our democracy.

I am tired of living in a country ruled and run by big money from a few wealthy people/corporations. Why do we even pretend to be a democracy?

Comments provided by :
Tucker, Terry

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Laughlin_Lois_01_14_2015_19_46_39_CommentText.txt

=====

I am, as a member of The league of Women Voters for almost 50 years, focused politically on studying and acting on the issues that impact the lives of Washington state and U.S. citizens.

Knowing who provides the money that funds various points of view is important to this endeavor.

The Citizens United decision is corrupting the way Our Democracy was designed to work.

PLEASE STRENGTHEN THE F.E.C. DISCLOSURE RULES NOW.

Lois Laughlin

Comments provided by :
Laughlin, Lois

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Fiscarelli_Susan_01_14_2015_19_46_36_CommentText.txt

=====

Do you not with the 1% drown out the voice of the majority.

Comments provided by :
Fiscarelli, Susan

=====

=====

In light of our highest court's strenuous efforts to dismantle our status as a legitimate democracy, we turn to your power for help. I add my voice to those requesting that, as part of your duties, you strengthen and improve the FEC's dark money rules to allow the voters to see who is buying and who is selling our rights to informed and effective citizen voting.

Comments provided by :
Gardner, Lorraine

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Burke_Deبرا_01_14_2015_19_47_21_CommentText.txt

=====

Elected officials, measures to be voted on, etc. all require transparency when it comes to what money (from where) is funding for or against them. Please work for full disclosure in government.

Deبرا Burke

Comments provided by :
Burke, Deبرا

=====

=====

We have a right to know to whom elected officials are beholden, but our current system allows many political spenders to hide their true identities. That's simply unacceptable in a democracy. Please enact new rules to bring dark money political spenders out into the open and disclose the true identities those who bankroll political ads.

In Citizens United, the Supreme Court assumed we would know who is trying to influence our decisions on Election Day ? and who is buying attention from our elected officials. But since that decision five years ago, hundreds of millions of dollars from secret sources have been spent in ways that will lead to corruption.

Please update and strengthen the FEC's disclosure rules to protect our democracy.

Comments provided by :
Mazaika, Kathryn

=====

=====

I adamantly oppose this proposed rule.

Freedom of speech means freedom of speech. It does not mean the right to not be offended by free speech; on the contrary, it is through others expressing views or opinions we may not agree with or may not like that true understanding may evolve.

There is NO need to try and "regulate" anything on the internet. The First Amendment applies to the digital world in the same way it has applied to every other aspect of American life since her inception. Regardless who posts it, regardless its subject, any attempt to "regulate" internet speech will only serve to stifle expression and while it may serve someone's petty little ends today, it has chilling implications in the long term.

This rule must not pass.

Thank you.

Comments provided by :
Garner, PJ

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Lord_Frank_01_14_2015_19_46_50_CommentText.txt

=====

As a concerned citizen I urge you to enact rules that will require full disclosure of who is making financial contributions to political campaigns for individual candidates and PACs. We need to know the source of the money that has such a great influence on how our elected representatives enact legislation.

Comments provided by :
Lord, Frank

=====

=====

The Project for a New American Century said about 15 years ago that the problem with our country is "an excess of democracy." Citizens United has certainly that perceived problem. The extent to which money is used to buy political influence for the rich nowadays is truly obscene, and will get even worse if more restrictions are removed with regard to identifying political donors. PLEASE do not make a horrible situation even worse by allowing wealthy donors with vested interests to buy political control even to a greater extent than they already do.

Comments provided by :
Matcho, Michael

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Grabianowski_Carla_01_14_2015_19_48_36_CommentText.txt

=====

I oppose this proposed ruling. Our individual or collective group views, such as political advertising or commentary, are still part of our first amendment rights and should be free - both in print and monetarily, on the Internet or YouTube. This ruling would be stifling to the free exchange of ideas.

Comments provided by :
Grabianowski, Carla

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Ryan_Terry_W_01_14_2015_19_48_42_CommentText.txt

=====

Please,

The internet must be kept free of government content regulation, particularly political comment. YouTube, Facebook and the other social media outlets must not fall to government control. These areas of expression are essential to our political systems.

Sincerely,
Terry W. Ryan

Comments provided by :
Ryan, Terry W

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Crother_Patricia_J._01_14_2015_19_48_58_CommentText.txt

=====

Dark Money paying for millions of dollars worth of advertising in election campaigns have been used since Citizen United was passed by the Supreme Court. The donor of this type of money should be clearly identified, otherwise our Democracy is in jeopardy. Thank you for your support. Patricia J. Crother

Comments provided by :
Crother, Patricia J.

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Hall_Diane_01_14_2015_19_50_03_CommentText.txt

=====

Free speech is a right of all Americans and that includes the internet. No organization should tell us otherwise. Keep the internet free of laws and rules that interfere with our rights. This is America not a communist country, in spite the intentions of others to make it so.

Comments provided by :
Hall, Diane

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Evans_II_Harry_01_14_2015_19_50_16_CommentText.txt

=====

The fact politicians can receive money from hidden sources leads to corruption in government. This government is corrupt as it is, and, politicians beholden to hidden money sources just adds to the problem.

Comments provided by :
Evans II, Harry

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_dekornfeld_george_f._01_14_2015_19_51_16_CommentText.txt

=====

The Constitution of the United States: Amendment I: Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances

Comments provided by :
dekornfeld, george f.

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_McLeod_Elliottt_01_14_2015_19_51_24_CommentText.txt

=====

The constitution guarantees free speech whether verbal, by letter, by the internet so taking it away is an assault on our freedom and one of the guarantees of the Constitution

Comments provided by :
McLeod, Elliottt

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Davenport_Rita_01_14_2015_19_52_01_CommentText.txt

=====

I believe the public has a right to know who is financing an ad to influence their votes.

Comments provided by :
Davenport, Rita

=====

=====

Commissioners,

The Supreme Court's 2010 decision in Citizens United unleashed a flood of corrupting special interest money into our elections--drowning out the voices of average voters. I recognize that the Commission cannot overturn this decision, even if it wanted to. What the Commission can do, though, is bring the Commission's disclosure requirements into closer alignment with the Supreme Court's own expectation of full disclosure expressed in Citizens United.

I respectfully urge the Commission to revise its disclosure rules to ensure the public receives full and complete information about the true donors funding political ads. This means that groups paying for these "independent expenditures" must disclose the real sources of the money they use to fund these campaign ads. As a federal court ruled recently, the Commission's electioneering communication disclosure rule is illegal because it creates an "easily exploited loophole that allows the true sponsors of advertisements to hide behind dubious and misleading names." The Commission must close the dark money loophole that it created-- and make good on the Citizens United Court's promise that the flood of special interest money it unleashed on our elections would be fully disclosed.

Last year California passed the landmark SB 27 bill to force Dark Money non-profits to reveal their secret funders. Thanks to its passage, any non-profit spending \$50,000 or more on California elections now has to reveal their secret funders.

Please follow California's lead and put an end to Dark Money on a national level to safeguard our federal elections.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in this proceeding.

Suzanne E. Pena

Comments provided by :
Pena, Suzanne

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Milton_Jack_01_14_2015_19_52_51_CommentText.txt

=====

We have a right to know to whom elected officials are beholden, but our current system allows many political spenders to hide their true identities. That's simply unacceptable in a democracy. Please enact new rules to bring dark money political spenders out into the open and disclose the true identities of those who bankroll political ads.

In Citizens United, the Supreme Court assumed we would know who is trying to influence our decisions on Election Day ? and who is buying attention from our elected officials. But since that decision five years ago, hundreds of millions of dollars from secret sources have been spent in ways that will lead to corruption.

Please update and strengthen the FEC's disclosure rules to protect our democracy.

Comments provided by :
Milton, Jack

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Edwards_Laura_01_14_2015_19_53_21_CommentText.txt

=====

Dark money has no place in our democracy. Citizens have a right to know who is making large contributions in the electoral process and for what candidates or causes. Please do all you can to strengthen the FEC's disclosure rules! Don't let our democracy erode any further than it already has! Thank you.

Comments provided by :
Edwards, Laura

=====

=====

I feel strongly that as citizens who vote for our elected officials we have a right to know to whom elected officials are beholden. It is outrageous that our current system allows many political spenders to HIDE their true identities. That's simply UNACCEPTABLE in a democracy. Please enact new rules to bring dark money political spenders out into the open and disclose the true identities of those who bankroll political ads. It seems to me that currently we are living not in a democracy, but in a "hidden oligarchy".

I was absolute astounded by the Supreme Court's decision to call a corporation a "person". In Citizens United, the Supreme Court assumed we would know who is trying to influence our decisions on Election Day ? and who is buying attention from our elected officials. But since that decision five years ago, hundreds of millions of dollars from secret sources have been spent in ways that will lead to corruption.

Please. I urge you, update and strengthen the FEC's disclosure rules to protect our democracy.

Comments provided by :
Kraemer, Lillian

=====

=====

Informed voters are critical to our democracy. People (including corporations) have recently had their right to freedom of speech turned loose with no limits by the US Supreme Court. Unfortunately, "people" with huge amounts of money can make their "speech" to dominate our sources of information... excluding much of the information informed voters need. Worse, the elected officials that benefit from this "speech" are obligated to support the big money "people" who funded them ... with little or no regard for the rest of the citizens of the United States.

At the very least, voters need to know who these "people" are so that we can tell if their "speech" is honest or self-serving. It is a lot easier to tell legitimate "speech" from damaging "speech" if we know where that speech is coming from. Please make it mandatory that sources of political support are made public!

Comments provided by :
Foster, CT

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Russell_Dennis_01_14_2015_19_53_52_CommentText.txt

=====

Please work to keep the Internet free from those who would
control the most useful democratic tool created in the last
1000 years!

Comments provided by :
Russell, Dennis

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

The Supreme Court's 2010 decision in Citizens United unleashed a flood of corrupting special interest money into our elections-- drowning out the voices of average voters. I recognize that the Commission cannot overturn this decision, even if it wanted to. What the Commission can do, though, is bring the Commission's disclosure requirements into closer alignment with the Supreme Court's own expectation of full disclosure expressed in Citizens United.

I respectfully urge the Commission to revise its disclosure rules to ensure the public receives full and complete information about the true donors funding political ads. This means that groups paying for these "independent expenditures" must disclose the real sources of the money they use to fund these campaign ads. As a federal court ruled recently, the Commission's electioneering communication disclosure rule is illegal because it creates an "easily exploited loophole that allows the true sponsors of advertisements to hide behind dubious and misleading names." The Commission must close the dark money loophole that it created-- and make good on the Citizens United Court's promise that the flood of special interest money it unleashed on our elections would be fully disclosed.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in this proceeding.

Comments provided by :
Cripps, Phillip

=====

=====

We have a right to know to whom elected officials are beholden, but our current system allows many political spenders to hide their true identities. That's simply unacceptable in a democracy. Please enact new rules to bring dark money political spenders out into the open and disclose the true identities of those who bankroll political ads.

In Citizens United, the Supreme Court assumed we would know who is trying to influence our decisions on Election Day ? and who is buying attention from our elected officials. But since that decision five years ago, hundreds of millions of dollars from secret sources have been spent in ways that will lead to corruption.

Please update and strengthen the FEC's disclosure rules to protect our democracy.

Comments provided by :
Klomprens, Karen

=====

=====

I believe that if donating money is protected free speech, then it is not protected by an expectation of privacy, anymore than a bumper sticker is entitled to privacy protection. Every dollar given to a candidate concerns the public good and that need exceeds the need for the donors privacy. The supreme court gave us bad law, but the FEC is free to proclaim every dollar granted to a political candidate or to any cache of funds over which he/she has influence, directly or indirectly should be made available to the press. The definition of what should be revealed should be determined by the media, not the candidates. When it comes to money, there should be no privacy concerning public office.

Comments provided by :
stahlman, Scott

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Sanstrom_Valli_01_14_2015_19_56_46_CommentText.txt

=====

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 :
Sanstrom, Valli

=====

=====

I strongly oppose any new rule(s) that would expand the scope of FEC regulation of political speech via the Internet. The Internet has been the greatest force for encouraging political debate, discussion, and involvement by ordinary citizens, just the kind of speech the 1st Amendment is intended to protect.

The potential for politically motivated abuse of Americans' free speech rights by the FEC and other regulators is a bigger danger than the free, open, wide-ranging forum for diverse views that is today's Internet. Don't mess with what ain't broke.

Comments provided by :
Steyn, Ruth

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Foster_Crystal_01_14_2015_19_57_32_CommentText.txt

=====

We the public should know who is paying for ads we are watching so we can make a decision as to whether we believe it or not. Sunlight is the best disinfection. I want to know who is giving me info so I can make my own judgement, as to what to believe.

Comments provided by :
Foster, Crystal

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_gircys_gintaras_01_14_2015_19_57_18_CommentText.txt

=====

There is no place in democracy for secrecy. The U.S. is not communist
China.

Comments provided by :
gircys, gintaras

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Espiritu_Jennifer__01_14_2015_19_57_51_CommentText.txt

=====

NO MORE... regulating speech on the internet!!! FREE SPEECH is our Constitutional Right!

Comments provided by :
Espiritu, Jennifer

=====

=====

I oppose this proposed rule, and am writing to demand that the FEC keep the Internet free. As Americans, we enjoy the right to freedom of speech and the freedom to petition our government.

In today's modern age, that includes the right to make political satire videos on YouTube, the right to assemble and form 501c groups, the right to criticize the Administration on Twitter, and the right to make political commentary on Facebook. The First Amendment applies to the digital arena, and the FEC needs to understand that basic point.

Comments provided by :
Mintus, David

=====

=====

We have a right to know to whom elected officials are beholden, but our current system allows many political spenders to hide their true identities. That's simply unacceptable in a democracy. Please enact new rules to bring dark money political spenders out into the open and disclose the true identities of those who bankroll political ads.

In Citizens United, the Supreme Court assumed we would know who is trying to influence our decisions on Election Day ? and who is buying attention from our elected officials. But since that decision five years ago, hundreds of millions of dollars from secret sources have been spent in ways that will lead to corruption.

Please update and strengthen the FEC's disclosure rules to protect our democracy.

Comments provided by :
Patterson, George

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Hill_Gerald_01_14_2015_19_58_41_CommentText.txt

=====

Please make financial contributions to politicians public.

Comments provided by :
Hill, Gerald

=====

=====

We have a right to know to whom elected officials are beholden, but our current system allows many political spenders to hide their true identities. That's simply unacceptable in a democracy. Please enact new rules to bring dark money political spenders out into the open and disclose the true identities of those who bankroll political ads.

In Citizens United, the Supreme Court assumed we would know who is trying to influence our decisions on Election Day ? and who is buying attention from our elected officials. But since that decision five years ago, hundreds of millions of dollars from secret sources have been spent in ways that will lead to corruption.

Please update and strengthen the FEC's disclosure rules to protect our democracy.

It's hard to believe that unlimited political contributions are not buying access and the votes of our elected officials.

Comments provided by :
Rice, Robert

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Eberling_Jack_01_14_2015_19_59_17_CommentText.txt

=====

Proposed changes would be a blatant abuse of 1st Amendment rights. We are a country governed by the Constitution, not by the biased wishes of a corrupt administration. This is not a police state.

Comments provided by :
Eberling, Jack

=====

=====

If we wish to claim to be a democracy it is simply contradictory to permit the use of dark money (or any money, in my view) in our elections. The voices and desires of ordinary people are simply overwhelmed by money flooding into campaigns from millionaires and billionaires with whom we can never compete. ANd when they pay to elect their candidates they rightly expect those candidates to represent their interests against those of the people.

It is my belief that government is the only entity we the people have which has the potential to stand up to corporate power. Once government is bought by corporations, we the people lose our voice, and our hope. As Mussolini put it, "Fascism is the merging of the corporation with the state."

If money is allowed to rule our free elections we will have lost something vital to our democracy.

Comments provided by :
Kastner, Jenny

=====

=====

We, the citizens of the United States, are entitled to know to whom our elected officials are beholden. Unfortunately, our current system allows large donors to hide their identity. To allow such people to do so destroys democracy.

Please enact new rules to bring dark money political spenders out into the open and disclose the true identities of those who bankroll political ads.

But since the Citizens United decision, hundreds of millions of dollars from secret sources have been spent in ways that will lead to corruption.

Please update and strengthen the FEC's disclosure rules to protect our democracy.

Comments provided by :
Brown, Richard

=====

=====

I oppose this proposed rule, and am writing to demand that the FEC keep the Internet free.

Any citizen has any right to express his views, opinions, agreements and disagreements on any topic, consent or dissent on any policy, etc. Go see the First Amendment.

On the other hand, any administration, and particularly THIS administration has the duty to uphold the Constitution, including all constitutional rights - among them those written down in the First Amendment. The First Amendment applies to the digital agora (which - these days - includes YouTube, Facebook, Twitter etc.) as well as it applies to a free citizenry with a free press, and a free citizenry with free soap boxes under the free sky.

FEC proposed rule attempts a raw power grab (motive : political "gain", technique : censorship, outcome : silencing voices of opposition).

Not only the current, but also future administrations must abstain from wielding the club of censorship.

The proposed FEC rule has to be declared D.O.A. (that is, dead on arrival).

Comments provided by :

Rudolf, Ludwig

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Mintus_Ruth_01_14_2015_20_02_13_CommentText.txt

=====

I oppose this proposed rule, and am writing to demand that the FEC keep the Internet free. President Truman said in a speech to Congress, "Once a government is committed to the principle of silencing the voice of opposition, it has only one way to go, and that is down the path of increasingly repressive measures, until it becomes a source of terror to all its citizens and creates a country where everyone lives in fear." I hope the FEC will heed this advice and NOT regulate the Internet.

Comments provided by :
Mintus, Ruth

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Cain_Viola_01_14_2015_20_03_37_CommentText.txt

=====

These things need to be seen in the cold light of day.

Comments provided by :
Cain, Viola

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Jesson_Shawn_01_14_2015_20_03_32_CommentText.txt

=====

I oppose the proposed rule, and I am respectfully writing this to demand that the FEC keep the internet free. This latest attempt to stifle free speech and restrict our First Amendment rights fits into a long and repeated pattern of abuse from this Administration. Furthermore, with bipartisan opposition, it is further showing a disdain from this Administration regarding our most basic Constitutional rights.

Comments provided by :
Jesson, Shawn

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Wood_Robert_01_14_2015_20_04_11_CommentText.txt

=====

Since Citizens United special interests have been able to spend big money to promote their own interests. Please do not let them give money in secret. I strongly support full disclosure.

Comments provided by :
Wood, Robert

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

The Supreme Court's 2010 decision in Citizens United unleashed a flood of corrupting special interest money into our elections-- drowning out the voices of average voters. I recognize that the Commission cannot overturn this decision, even if it wanted to. What the Commission can do, though, is bring the Commission's disclosure requirements into closer alignment with the Supreme Court's own expectation of full disclosure expressed in Citizens United.

I respectfully urge the Commission to revise its disclosure rules to ensure the public receives full and complete information about the true donors funding political ads. This means that groups paying for these "independent expenditures" must disclose the real sources of the money they use to fund these campaign ads. As a federal court ruled recently, the Commission's electioneering communication disclosure rule is illegal because it creates an "easily exploited loophole that allows the true sponsors of advertisements to hide behind dubious and misleading names." The Commission must close the dark money loophole that it created-- and make good on the Citizens United Court's promise that the flood of special interest money it unleashed on our elections would be fully disclosed.

Comments provided by :
Lee-Figueroa, K.

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Ingram_Kim_01_14_2015_20_04_43_CommentText.txt

=====

I oppose this proposed rule, and am writing to demand that the FEC keep the Internet free. This latest attempt to stifle free speech and restrict our First Amendment rights fits into a long and repeated pattern of abuse from this Administration.

Comments provided by :
Ingram, Kim

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Swaney_C_Barnett_01_14_2015_20_06_34_CommentText.txt

=====

I oppose this proposed rule, and am writing to demand that the FEC keep the internet free. This is nothing but an attempt to further stifle free speech and restrict our First Amendment rights. We have seen a long and frequent pattern of abuse from this administration. Free speech means that all people can express their opinions and I am fed up with this administration silencing anyone who disagrees with them.

Comments provided by :
Swaney, C Barnett

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Allen_Jason_01_14_2015_20_06_40_CommentText.txt

=====

Claims are we are too deep down the rabbit hole of privately funded campaigns to turn back. Any hope of shining any light on our democracy within this dark hole, seems to be in holding campaign contributors up to the light of government transparency.

Comments provided by :
Allen, Jason

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_chasse_margaret_01_14_2015_20_06_30_CommentText.txt

=====

oppose the federal election commission attempt to silence us. These people don't want the truth to get out because certain people will lose elections THEY DO NOT WANT THE TRUTH OUT. We have the right to freedom of speech and they want us silenced. They do not want the free flow of communication or political free speech. Their wish is to silence the truth and flood the internet with their liberal bull Ann Raud is a democratic willing to stifle the voices of citizens. WE CANN'T STAND FOR THIS.

Comments provided by :
chasse, margaret

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Moore_Kevin_01_14_2015_20_05_49_CommentText.txt

=====

When the federal government meddles with anything they mess it up. The internet is fine the way it is. Please leave it alone. This used to be the land of the free. It no longer is. We need to get back to that. Leaving the internet alone would be a good start.

Comments provided by :
Moore, Kevin

=====

=====

I oppose this proposed rule, and am writing to demand that
the FEC keep the Internet free.
As Americans, we enjoy the right to freedom of speech and
the freedom to petition our government. In today's modern age, that includes the right to make
political satire videos on YouTube, the right to assemble and form 501c groups, the right
to criticize the Administration on Twitter, and the right to make political commentary on
Facebook. The First Amendment applies to the digital arena, and the FEC needs to
understand that basic point.
? I oppose this proposed rule, and am writing to demand that
the FEC keep the Internet free.

Comments provided by :
Allanson, Gwendolyn

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Lewis_Michael_01_14_2015_20_07_10_CommentText.txt

=====

The following are my favorite videos on campaign reform:

Video Karen Simpson & Free Speech -

<http://www.ij.org/freedomflix/33-sampson>

Camp Politics: Training the Next Generation of Censors Since 1974

<http://www.ij.org/freedomflix/category/15/177>

Dan Rather reveals how the Corporation controls the Media

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oW0gGy_95Qw&feature=related

Story of Citizens United v. FEC, The Critique

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tJEeKz1Jlw>

Let's not revisit Alien & Sedition Acts - http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=u_Vh82qoGd4&feature=related

Tweets:

Freedom of the press is the victim of Watergate. The main stream media were exempted, creating a State Approved press!

The only difference between an editorial, slanted news story and a political ad is who paid for it.

Our 1st Right denies Congress authority to abridge freedoms of speech, press and assembly, yet FECA & BCRA regulate all 3.

Nowhere does the 1st Amendment say people can assemble unless they use Super PACs, charitable corporations or churches?

Granting superior rights to news corporations enables hiding the corruption campaign laws were meant to prevent.

To restore equal protection of the law the press exemption must be modified to include citizens and groups.

Freedoms of speech, press and assembly are inalienable rights not privileges government may license and restrict!

Politicians will serve special interests even if campaign contributions are prohibited and campaigns are tax funded.

Without coordination, athletes lose, orchestras are dissonant, dancers lack grace, and business loses money. Why do campaign laws make it a crime?

Uncoordinated political campaigns are only good training for work in our dysfunctional government.

Where does the 1st Amendment say candidates give up freedom of association and freedom to coordinate with like minded citizens?

If you use the logic of campaign laws to define freedom of religion only the institution, not parishioners, would be free to worship.

All campaign laws censor freedom of speech or press and tilt the playing field for one side and against the other.

Exemption from campaign laws makes MSM, dependent on advertising dollars, the ultimate Super Pac?s.

Exempting only media corporations is a violation of the foundational legal concept of equal protection of the law and establishes a State approved press.

Who can publically deny citizens and groups should enjoy equal rights?

News personalities cannot afford to publically express the view they should enjoy 1st Amendment rights superior to their readers, viewers or listeners. And politicians cannot publically express the view that citizens and assemblies of like minded citizens should be censored.

Why even Senator Harry Reid sponsored a Bill a in 2005 to insure citizen's freedom to use the internet to exercise their 1st Amendment rights. <http://amendment10.tripod.com/s678.pdf>

So is it unreasonable to believe Senator Reid would defend citizens 1st Amendment rights to pool their money and use legacy media, newspapers and broadcast networks to compete with billionaires?

Acting as a Group

Some campaign law reformers rail against participation by corporations in American politics. But the Federal Election Commission Citizen?s Guide says the law requires groups of individuals to form PACs or Committees, which are corporations:

"If you and other individuals act together as a group to conduct activities to influence a Federal election, the group may become a "political committee." In general, a group that raises or spends over \$1,000 per year to influence Federal elections must register, keep records on financial transactions and file reports on the committee's activities.

So the question becomes is a media corporation more in the interest of social welfare than any other type of corporation?"

Comments provided by :
Lewis, Michael

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

The Supreme Court's 2010 decision in Citizens United unleashed a flood of corrupting special interest money into our elections-- drowning out the voices of average voters. I recognize that the Commission cannot overturn this decision, even if it wanted to. What the Commission can do, though, is bring the Commission's disclosure requirements into closer alignment with the Supreme Court's own expectation of full disclosure expressed in Citizens United.

I respectfully urge the Commission to revise its disclosure rules to ensure the public receives full and complete information about the true donors funding political ads. This means that groups paying for these "independent expenditures" must disclose the real sources of the money they use to fund these campaign ads. As a federal court ruled recently, the Commission's electioneering communication disclosure rule is illegal because it creates an "easily exploited loophole that allows the true sponsors of advertisements to hide behind dubious and misleading names." The Commission must close the dark money loophole that it created-- and make good on the Citizens United Court's promise that the flood of special interest money it unleashed on our elections would be fully disclosed.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in this proceeding.

Comments provided by :
zelaya, marta

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

I believe that the FEC should follow California's lead in requiring full disclosure of donations which are impacting the political process. The Supreme Court's 2010 decision in Citizens United unleashed a flood of corrupting special interest money into our elections-- drowning out the voices of average voters. While I am aware that the Commission cannot overturn this decision, it can bring the Commission's disclosure requirements into closer alignment with the Supreme Court's own expectation of full disclosure expressed in Citizens United.

I respectfully urge the Commission to revise its disclosure rules to ensure the public receives full and complete information about the true donors funding political ads. This means that groups paying for these "independent expenditures" must disclose the real sources of the money they use to fund these campaign ads. As a federal court ruled recently, the Commission's electioneering communication disclosure rule is illegal because it creates an "easily exploited loophole that allows the true sponsors of advertisements to hide behind dubious and misleading names." The Commission must close the dark money loophole that it created-- and make good on the Citizens United Court's promise that the flood of special interest money it unleashed on our elections would be fully disclosed.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in this proceeding.

Comments provided by :
Sage, ML

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Duffy_Robin_01_14_2015_20_07_54_CommentText.txt

=====

As a part of free speech, we have a right to know who is speaking.

Comments provided by :
Duffy, Robin

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Sturdevant_Robert_01_14_2015_20_09_18_CommentText.txt

=====

Free speech is the foundation of America. To those out there that wish to cancel free speech in any form or do not like it.

Moved to a country that does not allow it. I'm sure you will fit right in with the rest of the communist or ISIS whoever you like!!

Comments provided by :

Sturdevant, Robert

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Maines_Joan_01_14_2015_20_11_56_CommentText.txt

=====

I am extremely opposed to this!!! We are proud to have a constitution which is not broken nor does it need to be fixed!!! In other words, please don't mess with our liberties. I am afraid if you allow this with our internet, what will be next? Our constitution and Bill of Rights are what set us apart from other countries.

Comments provided by :
Maines, Joan

=====

=====

Campaign laws are born of corruption:

1907 Tillman Act

The first federal law in this arena, passed in 1907, was also a ban on corporate contributions to campaigns. The law was dubbed the Tillman Act, after its sponsor, South Carolina senator "Pitchfork Ben" Tillman. Tillman wrote and said little of his motives for sponsoring the ban on corporate contributions, but he hated President Theodore Roosevelt and appears to have wanted to embarrass the president (who had relied heavily on corporate funding in his 1904 election campaign). Tillman's racial politics also clearly contributed to his interest in controlling corporate spending: Many corporations opposed the racial segregation that was at the core of Tillman's political agenda. Corporations did not want to pay for two sets of rail cars, double up on restrooms and fountains, or build separate entrances for customers of different races. They also wanted to take advantage of inexpensive black labor, while Tillman sought to keep blacks out of the work force.

Corporations supported Republicans, and Tillman ? a Democrat, like most post-war Southern whites ? often bragged of his role in perpetrating voter fraud and intimidation in the presidential election of 1876 in order to overthrow South Carolina's Republican reconstruction government. It is clear, then, that Tillman was no "good government" reformer; and far from being born of lofty ideals, federal campaign-finance regulations were, from their inception, tied to questionable efforts to gain partisan advantage.

Nixon and the Hearst Newspaper chain coordinated to get him re-elected

If you are concerned about IRS harassment of conservative groups you should be enraged by the Federal Campaign Act relegating people to second class participants while elevating commercial media to State approved press!

The Newspaper Preservation Act was touted as a relief measure to allow multiple newspapers competing in the same market to cut costs, thus ensuring that no one paper could have supremacy in the market by driving the other(s) out of business. In fact, President Richard M. Nixon initially opposed the passage of the act (as had his predecessor, Lyndon B. Johnson) as being antithetical to the essential practices and character of free market capitalism. He reversed himself upon receiving a letter from Richard E. Berlin, CEO of the Hearst chain of newspapers and magazines. In the 1969 letter, Berlin intimated that failure of the law to pass would carry political consequences, and hinted that support from Nixon would conversely help the President and his allies. The Nixon Administration supported the Act's passage, and in the 1972 Presidential Campaign, every Hearst newspaper endorsed Nixon for reelection. ? sourced from Wikipedia

The newly minted campaign laws should have chastised the 4th estate as well as Nixon.

Instead, shamefully, the Federal Election Campaign Act, to address serious financial abuses in the 1972 Presidential campaign, amended the FECA in 1974 to set limits on contributions by individuals, political parties and PACs. Does this protect the public from corruption or just make it easier for politicians to hide it?

"

Comments provided by :

Lewis, Michael

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Geller_Eric_01_14_2015_20_13_09_CommentText.txt

=====

Please fully disclose political campaign contributions so the public can clearly understand the pedigree of influence.

Comments provided by :
Geller, Eric

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Fischer_Gene_01_14_2015_20_13_35_CommentText.txt

=====

All Citizens may not agree on whether or not money should equal free speech, but almost everyone agrees that We have a right to know to whom our elected officials are beholden to, when that money leverage is used. Unfortunately, our current system allows many political spenders to hide their true identities. That?s simply unacceptable in a democracy. Please enact new rules to bring dark money political spenders out into the open and disclose the true identities of those who bankroll political ads.

Please update and strengthen the FEC?s disclosure rules to protect our democracy.

Comments provided by :
Fischer, Gene

=====

=====

The 2010 Supreme Court decision in Citizens United made legal a flood of corrupting special interest money into our elections--drowning out the voices of average voters. While the Commission cannot overturn this decision, it can bring the Commission's disclosure requirements into closer alignment with the Supreme Court's own expectation of full disclosure expressed in Citizens United.

Please revise the disclosure rules to ensure the public receives full and complete information about the true donors funding political ads. This means that groups paying for these "independent expenditures" must disclose the real sources of the money they use to fund these campaign ads. As a federal court ruled recently, the Commission's electioneering communication disclosure rule is illegal because it creates an "easily exploited loophole that allows the true sponsors of advertisements to hide behind dubious and misleading names." The Commission must close the dark money loophole that it created--and make good on the Citizens United Court's promise that the flood of special interest money it unleashed on our elections would be fully disclosed.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment in this proceeding.

Comments provided by :
Reid, Matthew

=====

=====

Who is behind campaign reform?

The 24 hour news cycle has been around since the advent of television. The fact there have been 10 ? 15 news stories every day for months concerning the evils of the Citizens United decision prove this is just the latest astro-turfed crusade.

Campaign finance reform has never been among the top ten issues of concern to the American voter. Previous pushes for campaign reform were spear headed by the 'exempt' corporate media and astro-turfed by charitable trusts.

Free Speech Needs Jerry Maguire

By Ryan Sager Published 03/18/2005 Excerpt:

That's because campaign-finance reform is not a "movement" as its proponents have claimed, it is a lobby -- funded and orchestrated by eight very liberal foundations which fooled Congress and the American people into believing that the front groups they set up were grassroots organizations.

Senator McConnell Smelled the Pew in 2001

Senator McConnell exposed the charitable trusts behind BCRA in the Congressional Record of April 2, 2001.

The following is excerpted from three pages of the Congressional Record, Proceedings and Debates of the 107th Congress, First Session, Washington, Monday, April 2, 2001, Vol. 147, No. 46:

BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN REFORM

ACT OF 2001? Resumed

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore.

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL.

Who wins?

As I said the other day, who wins are people such as Jerome Kohlberg. This is the billionaire who has decided this is going to be his legacy. This is the full page ad he ran in the Washington Post the other day on behalf of this legislation. I suspect a lot of the lobbyists out in the hall right off the Senate floor are either on his payroll directly or indirectly. People such as Jerome Kohlberg and the big charitable foundations are underwriting the reform movement, hand in hand with the editorial pages of the Washington Post and the New York Times, which have editorialized on this subject an average of once every 6 days over the last 27 months.

At least in the Senate, they are going to get their way shortly, but this new world won't take a penny out of politics, not a penny. It will all be spent. It just won't be spent by the parties. It will be spent by the Jerome Kohlbergs of the world and all of the interest groups out there. As everyone knows, the restrictions on those interest groups will be struck down in court, if we get that far.

Welcome to the brave new world where the voices of parties are quieted, the voices of billionaires are enhanced, the voices of newspapers are enhanced, and the one entity out there in America, the core of the two-party system, that influence is dramatically reduced. I strongly urge our colleagues to vote against this legislation. It clearly moves in the wrong direction.

Comments provided by :

Lewis, Michael

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Boggs__Russell__01_14_2015_20_14_10_CommentText.txt

=====

I am against regulation of the internet. This has got to do with freedom of speech and the way to protect it is not mess with it. This happens to be one method of communication that needs to go unimpeded. It is a citizens right.

Comments provided by :
Boggs , Russell

=====

=====

I oppose the FEC's proposed rule, and am writing to demand that the FEC keep the Internet free.

This Administration may not always like the content of what Americans say or write on the Internet.

But the Administration and the FEC must uphold the First Amendment and respect our right to voice our opinions on the Internet, even when our message is inconvenient to the Administration.

Thank you

Comments provided by :
Cribbs, G

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Hutton_Martha__01_14_2015_20_15_04_CommentText.txt

=====

Please support freedom of speech. It is a right we cherish. A great deal of blood and treasure has been lost so that our rights are preserved. I, for the life of me, don't know why anyone wants to censor the internet.

Comments provided by :
Hutton, Martha

=====

=====

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. The framers of the Constitution intended the individual and individual rights to be paramount; the current tidal wave of unsourced money unleashed by the Citizens United decision makes this impossible.

Comments provided by :
Polson, Judi

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Stringham_Deb_01_14_2015_20_15_44_CommentText.txt

=====

Please get dark money out of politics, it is undemocratic and protects those who use money to influence elections without having to disclose their identity. The American people have a right to know to whom their representatives in Congress owe "favors." Nobody should be able to spend unlimited money for this purpose, let alone do it in secret! Please give us back our democracy.
Thank you.

Comments provided by :
Stringham, Deb

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Bernhard_Sheila_01_14_2015_20_16_03_CommentText.txt

=====

Free speech is right of EVERY American citizen and should not be restricted. Certainly not by the FEC. What is the purposed behind this other than to stifle dissent. Every American is entitled to their opinion, regardless of what this Administration thinks. The fact that they would seek to stifle free-speech shows a lack of regard for hard-working, tax paying American citizens. I stand in opposition to this idea.

Comments provided by :
Bernhard, Sheila

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Erickson_Sheryl_01_14_2015_20_15_45_CommentText.txt

=====

Please do your job for the American people - the electorate - not the dark money men. Bring our elections into the light. Thank you.

Comments provided by :
Erickson, Sheryl

=====

=====

We have a right to know to whom elected officials are beholden, but our current system allows many political spenders to hide their true identities. That?s simply unacceptable in a democracy. Please enact new rules to bring dark money political spenders out into the open and disclose the true identities of those who bankroll political ads.

In Citizens United, the Supreme Court assumed we would know who is trying to influence our decisions on Election Day ? and who is buying attention from our elected officials. But since that decision five years ago, hundreds of millions of dollars from secret sources have been spent in ways that will lead to corruption.

Please update and strengthen the FEC?s disclosure rules to protect our democracy.

Comments provided by :
Schermer, Linda

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Haagenson_Larry_01_14_2015_20_16_33_CommentText.txt

=====

To whom it may concern,

I understand there is a movement underway to limit certain kinds of speech on the internet. It seems wrong to permit some people to express themselves freely and other people's opinion are to be kept to themselves. This is simple not right. Its an infringement upon free speech rights. Please be objective when making a decision like this.

Comments provided by :
Haagenson, Larry

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Sternberg_E._P.__01_14_2015_20_16_39_CommentText.txt

=====

Americans should have the right to know the identity of the contributors to the campaigns of elected officials. This must be disclosed to the FEC. A true democracy requires transparency in all facets of national, state, and local elections. The absence of this requirement has led to widespread corruption in elections & is unacceptable in a nation that prides itself as being a democracy.

Comments provided by :
Sternberg, E. P.

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Childs_Henry_01_14_2015_20_17_16_CommentText.txt

=====

The worldwide phenomenon of the Internet is one of the last bastions of freedom of speech we have and should remain entirely free of any governmental control or influence!

Comments provided by :
Childs, Henry

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Crowle_Noreen_01_14_2015_20_17_25_CommentText.txt

=====

Transparency in political spending is important to you and how critical it is to a democracy of, by, and for the people. Stop the rush to become a fascist country.

Comments provided by :
Crowle, Noreen

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_White_Linda_01_14_2015_20_17_38_CommentText.txt

=====

Contributions made to elect public officials should be public. Secrecy is in no one's best interest.

Comments provided by :
White, Linda

=====

=====

I believe that unlimited, essentially secret, spending on our political elections is a grave danger to democracy.

When a few ultra-rich corporations or private donors, whichever one, can effectively silence anyone who cannot compete in a monetary sense, the "marketplace of ideas" ceases to be a competitive market, but becomes, ultimately, a monopoly of political speech and thought.

Since purchasing "access" to a candidate is, according to the Supreme Court, not bribery or sufficient reason to assume political corruption, there should be no conflict in disclosing all monies given towards the election of public officials. It upheld the rules that corporations, unions and foreign corporations could not give directly to the coffers of American government elections, but why not? If there is no risk of corruption and bribery is not the same as purchasing "access" to a government official, what risk is there that those organizations would corrupt a potential elected official? Obviously, there is none. So they reasoned.

So, in the interest of open, transparent, public American political elections, all monies should be treated as public "comment" and disclosed, much like this one will be.

Comments provided by :
Frenzel, Anthony

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Abbott_John_01_14_2015_20_18_08_CommentText.txt

=====

I strongly favor full public disclosure of all contributors to political organizations. Free speech does not include writing checks in secret.

Comments provided by :
Abbott, John

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Pollock_Palmer_01_14_2015_20_18_43_CommentText.txt

=====

Corporate Government and freedom, can not coexist.

Comments provided by :
Pollock, Palmer

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Wilding_Renee_01_14_2015_20_19_40_CommentText.txt

=====

I oppose the FEC's proposed rule, and am writing to demand that the FEC keep the Internet free. This Administration may not always like the content of what Americans say or write on the Internet. But the Administration and the FEC must uphold the First Amendment and respect our right to voice our opinions on the Internet, even when our message is inconvenient to the Administration. The First Amendment is a sacred part of American freedoms.

Comments provided by :
Wilding, Renee

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Wallace_Amanda_01_14_2015_20_20_39_CommentText.txt

=====

No net neutrality. Congress does not have the authority to confer their legislative power to the executive branch. Internet is not a right and you have no basis to regulate and restrict it.

Comments provided by :
Wallace, Amanda

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_McCabe_Michael_01_14_2015_20_22_01_CommentText.txt

=====

I am very disappointed That members of the FEC feel that they have to control others free speech. Any statement that is respectfully stated that does take away anothers free expression should be encouraged not blocked.

Comments provided by :
McCabe, Michael

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Blake_Roxane_01_14_2015_20_22_41_CommentText.txt

=====

I believe that transparency in political spending is important to our nation and our system of elections and how critical it is to a democracy that is supposed to be of, by, and for the people.

It is not a system that includes corporations - but is designed for donations by individuals. We are entitled to know who is donating to whom and how much in order to gauge the influence that large donations may bring. A system with public funding, and NO donations would be much more supportive to our democracy. Thanks for considering my opinion.

Comments provided by :

Blake, Roxane

=====

=====

It is crucial that voters know to whom elected officials are beholden, but our current system allows many political spenders to hide their true identities. That?s unacceptable in a democracy. Please enact new rules to bring dark money political spenders out into the open and disclose the true identities of those who bankroll political ads.

In Citizens United, the Supreme Court assumed we would know who is trying to influence our decisions on Election Day ? and who is buying attention from our elected officials. But since that decision five years ago, hundreds of millions of dollars from secret sources have been spent in ways that pave the road to corruption.

Please update and strengthen the FEC?s disclosure rules to protect our democracy.

Comments provided by :
Greene, Stephanie

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Holiway_Jim_01_14_2015_20_23_04_CommentText.txt

=====

Please do not pass this rule. The Internet must remain free as it is free speech which is guaranteed by the First Amendment. There is bi-partisan opposition to this proposed rule. Americans of all political stripes realize what is at stake here - our preeminent First Amendment liberties.

Comments provided by :
Holiway, Jim

=====

=====

The FEC has no business nor legitimate interest in controlling The People's blogs and YouTube videos--the very suggestion is simply chilling, an appalling denial of our First Amendment rights.

YouTubes and the internet are a tremendous democratic equalizer, an outlet for the un-monied and the ordinary. By seeking to curb these the FEC seeks to silence the very people whose speech it is allegedly charged to protect.

John Marshall, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, famously said "The power to tax is the power to destroy." Today we could rephrase that as "The power of the FEC to regulate free speech, is the government's power to destroy free speech."

The First Amendment does not include the phrase "...provided the People file innumerable forms in timely manner, to the FEC's satisfaction..."

Such restrictions are undemocratic, unconstitutional, and anti-American. Keep the internet free.

Comments provided by :
Arthur, James

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Johnston_Jon_01_14_2015_20_24_35_CommentText.txt

=====

I do NOT support new regulations restricting speech on the internet. You tube and the internet should be free from federal government control. Our government has gotten too involved in our individual lives and we are not near a free country as we used to be!

Sincerely,
Jon Johnston

Comments provided by :
Johnston, Jon

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Darby_Ronald_01_14_2015_20_26_01_CommentText.txt

=====

We have a right to know to whom elected officials are beholden, but our current system allows many political spenders to hide their true identities. That?s simply unacceptable in a democracy. Please enact new rules to bring dark money political spenders out into the open and disclose the true identities of those who bankroll political ads.

Comments provided by :
Darby, Ronald

=====